



I'm not robot



Continue

Strange situation disorganized attachment

Wade E. Pickren, editor of 2014 17 March; Revised 2014 Aug 20; Accepted 2014 Oct 6. Copyright © 2015 Author (s) This article was published in accordance with the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (, which allows unlimited use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided that the original author and source are credited. The copyright for this article is retained by the author (s). The author (s) grant (s) the American Psychological Association the exclusive right to publish the article and identify as the original publisher. This article explores the emergence of the concept of the unorganized/disoriented attachment of the infant, based on published and archival texts and interviews. Since this new classification was put forward by Mayne and Solomon (1986), disorganized/disoriented attachment has become an important concept in the context of clinical and social intervention. However, while Maine and Solomon have often been misunderstood to introduce disorganized/disoriented attachments to create an exhaustive, categorical system of classifying infants, this article will offer a completely different report. Attention will be paid to the emergence of disorganized attachment in the late 1970s as a classification of results and reflection on the limits of an anxious infant's ability to maintain behavioural and attention. In contrast to this interpretation of Thein and Solomon's work with current, widespread misunderstandings, the article will critically address trends that supported the re-certification and misuse of the concept of disorganized/disoriented attachment. Keywords: Attachment, Developmental psychology, Ainsworth Strange Situation Procedure, Anomaly, classification/Mahel Rutter, a renowned commentator on attachment studies, described the discovery of a disorganized/disoriented classification of attachment as one of the five great advances in psychology promoted by research into attachment. However, Rutter also expressed concern that the classification certainly defines behavioral characteristics of significant theoretical and clinical significance, but the meaning of disorganized/disoriented attachment classification remains rather unclear (Rutter, Kreppner, s Sonuga-Barke, 2009, p.532). Since statements can only give full meaning when they are placed in an intellectual context that was taken for granted by the researchers themselves when they wrote (Skinner, 2002), historical research has the potential to indicate the importance of important psychological concepts, and in doing so to upset contemporary assumptions. The argument of this article is that in the interpretation of the addition of the disorganized/ disoriented attachment classification of Maine and Solomon (1990) to Ainsworth and Wittig (1969) original tripartite classification systems, Maine previously researched and thinking about the potential potential between disorganization and both avoidance and ambivalence/resistance have largely fallen out of sight. Without realizing this earlier work, Maine and Solomon were often misunderstood, suggesting that their new category (a) represents heterogeneous chaos without logic or meaningful internal differentiation, and (b) completes the four-part and exhaustive typology of children's relationships when added to the three Ainsworth infant attachment models. The emergence of disorganized/disoriented attachment and interpretation of the aims of Maine and Solomon in the proposal for this new classification is of interest as an example in raising awareness of child abuse in psychological studies since the 1970s. It also has an interest as an important example in which the designs of unworked observational conclusions played a large role in changing the theory in the psychology of development. I am an outsider in attachment research; my work focused on history and the modern role of psychological classifications in social policy, professional practice and in psychiatric discourse. Elsewhere, I have engaged in genealogy of disorganized/disoriented attachment as a discursive practice that extends far beyond the attachment of the research community, for example, by analysing its role in the UK Early intervention policy since 2010 (Duschinsky, Greco, and Solomon, 2015). My goal here, however, is to call into question the reiteration and incorrect application of disorganized/disoriented attachment deployed in such policy and practice discourse, which refers to the authority of Main and Solomon. The research presented here relies on: analysis of published texts, presentations of conferences, and these doctoral these doctoral; interviews with researchers who led studies of disorganized/disoriented attachment behavior that generously provided access to unpublished drafts, peer-reviewed feedback and correspondence; and manuscripts and letters in the John Bowbly Archive at the Wellcome Trust Archive in London. Attention to these documents and insider accounts in the attachment community is important for understanding the emergence of a disorganized/disoriented classification of attachments, and in order to highlight important differences between the core and the straw goals in presenting the idea of disorganized/disoriented attachment and how this classification was subsequently generally understood. The founder of attachment theory, British psychoanalyst John Bowlby (1969), the distinction between attachment system as arrangement, which keeps a baby, oriented at intimacy with their caregiver, and attachment behavior as specific observed actions, which the baby uses to achieve intimacy with the caregiver, especially when distressed Alarmed. When activated, he expected the attachment system to coordinate the behavior of attachments in the form of signals and movements, including crying, smile and get intimacy, and therefore protection and emotional support, from the caregiver. Influenced by etiology, Bowlby believed that the tendency for infant primates to develop attachment to familiar caregivers is the result of evolutionary pressures, as attachment behavior will contribute to a child's survival in the face of such dangers as predators, exposure to elements, or attacks by conspecific. Reflecting on the experience of working with children who were evacuated during the war, Bowlby predicted that because separation from their caregiver is a natural signal for the danger to the human baby, the rejection of the attachment system will be met with protest and attempts to restore intimacy. Three patterns of attachment behavior were proposed by Bowlby's Canadian counterpart, Mary Ainsworth, and later based at Johns Hopkins University, Ainsworth and Wittig (1969) observed 26 infant care children in their study. The Strange Situation procedure was designed using signals of unfamiliarity and separation to raise potential alarms about the presence of a familiar caregiver. Thus, the procedure aimed at mobilizing the child's expectations of what happens when anxiety about the presence of a figure of affection occurred in the past, and allowed the viewer to interpret these expectations of observed behavior. According to predictions of Bowlby (1969), Ainsworth and Wittig, (1969) (see table 1) found that most infants, classified as Safe (B), used the caregiver as a safe base from which to study, protested when they left, but searched for a caregiver (attachment figure) upon return. Here, various attachment behaviors, such as crying, smiling, and crawling, nevertheless seemed to consistently and directly express the demands of the attachment system for intimacy and protection. According to Bowlby's prediction, Ainsworth's home observations, as well as subsequent studies, showed that caregivers for children classified as safe (B) were the most sensitive and responsive to a child's behavior in attachment. However, a minority of infants in Ainsworth's middle-class sample showed little visible problems in separating or reuniting with their caregiver. This seemed to contradict Bowlby's theory. However, Ainsworth suggested that the apparently unworthy behavior of these babies was actually a mask for distress - a hypothesis later evidence, as sensitive by the heart rate studies of the avoidant children (Sroufe s Waters, 1977). She called this model of behavior babies avoidant (A) because babies avoided showing their distress to their attachment figure. Ainsworth concluded that when these babies had experienced anxiety and suffering in the past, they learned that they should not communicate such feelings as it would cause The third model was called Ambivalent/Sustainable (C), and these babies often exhibited distress even separation, and were frustrated and difficult to comfort at the return of the caregiver, seemed to distrust his or her presence even when the caregiver was present. Ainsworth's former doctoral student, Mary Mayne (1979), said models A and C could be seen as conditional strategies for optimizing as much as possible with proximity to a caregiver who has put up an attachment system. Unlike direct indirect search of baby B in response to anxiety, the understatement of displaying attachment behavior in the avoidance pattern (A) can be seen as an adaptation to the usually rejected care environment; maximizing distress manifestations and displaying anger in an ambivalent/sustainable (C) model can be adaptive in keeping the caregiver's attention experienced as not reliable in response to attachment signals. Ainsworth Strange Classification Situation/indation Classification/ount-a-Situation Behavior/Note. Ainsworth (1984) Interactive Behavioral Measures detailed in accession patterns: (a) proximity-search - intensity, duration and success of a child's attempts to make contact with their caregiver, especially where it occurs during reunification; (b) contact-maintaining intensity, duration, and the degree of success of the infant's attempts to maintain contact with their caregiver as soon as it has been achieved; (c) proximity-avoiding - the intensity and duration of behaviors that direct attention from the caregiver as he or she approaches reunification, such as preventing the parent; (d) contact resistance - the intensity and duration of behaviors that signal anger and a desire to be put down from contact with the caregiver. ALower proximity search and contact-services at a reunion than B or C, and some intimacy avoid behavior. The behavior, attention and effect of the child are integrated into a consistent way to downplay the distress connection and to keep attention from the caregiver (e.g., attention to toys). A1Inexperienced by finding intimacy and maintaining contact during reunification than B or C; strong intimacy-avoiding behavior. A2Low to moderate intimacy is looking for a reunion. Marked behavior, avoiding intimacy. BStrong proximity search and contact-services at the reunion compared to A. Low contact resistance compared to C. Behavior, attention and influence of the child are integrated in a consistent way, allowing to the attention of the caregiver and calm the child, allowing the child then quietly to return to play. B1Weak is a search for proximity and contact-service. Weaker behavior, avoiding proximity than A1. Strong communication and affective exchange with your tutor from afar. Conceptualized as intermediate between babies A and B. B2Low to moderate proximity-seeking and marked proximity-avoiding at first reunion. But then a strong search for intimacy and contact-maintenance on the second reunion. B3Strong proximity seeks and to a reunion. No contact-resistance or proximity-avoiding. B4Neocote search for intimacy and maintain contact until parting with the caregiver. A strong search for intimacy and contact-maintenance at the reunion. Some kind of contact resistance. CMarked contact-resistance behavior. The behavior, attention and influence of the child on integration in a consistent way that strongly conveys their suffering and frustration to the caregiver. C1Strong proximity search and contact-service to the reunion. Strong contact behavior punctuates the maintenance of contact, as the child switches between communication distress and desire for contact, anger, and desire to be put down. C2Weak proximity is looking but moderate to strong contact maintaining, especially on the second reunion. Moderate contact resistance. In her doctoral study, conducted between 1968 and 1973, Maine noticed the unclassified status of five short stories, Strange Situation. Along with the steps necessary for her doctoral studies, Maine instructed her programmers to note every time that the baby was doing everything that seemed strange to them. This included hand-flapping; Echolalia; Inappropriate impact and other behaviors appearing out of context (Main, 1977, p. 70-71). She later recalls that five out of 49 (10.2%) of the 49% who were in the UK, the infants in her sample were found to be difficult to classify; two of these infants were classified as safe, while three were informally referred to as A-C infants in the laboratory and classified as A or C (Main and Solomon, 1990, p. 126). Maine noted that two of these babies showed reunion behavior, which combines trying to approach a caregiver with signs of fear and avoidance. One threw her hands in front of her face at the reunion, while the other engaged in an asymmetrical hand clapping while creeping forward. Home asked Mary Ainsworth, as my dissertation counselor, what to do. Characteristically cautious, but some of these babies were unsafe, she recommended that now (until more samples have been collected and studied) we put them in Group A (Mary Main, personal communication, August 10, 2012). Home (1973: 21) wryly noted in a footnote to his doctoral thesis that while this method of abnormal cases was pragmatically useful, Linnaeus could not approve. Growing data from years of unclassified babies raised questions . . . critical to the use, validation and interpretation of the Ainsworth system (Main s Weston, 1981, p. 933). In 1986, Mary Mayne and Judith Solomon proposed a new classification of disorganized/disoriented (D) classification of infant attachments for the Ainsworth Strange Situation procedure by Mary Mayne and Judith Solomon, based at the University of California, Berkeley. Often manifested most strongly on the reunion, but found in other episodes of the procedure as well, disorganized/disoriented behaviors suggest either between simultaneous arrangement physically approach and escape the caregiver or seeming disorientation into the environment. Infant behavior, coded as include a clear demonstration of fear of the caregiver; contradictory behaviors or influences what is happening at the same time or sequentially; stereotypical, asymmetrical, incorrect or jerky movements; or freezing and seeming dissociation. As a rule, this behavior occurs only for a short time, before the infant returns to one of the Ainsworth A, B or C attachment models. For example, in the case of dissociative symptoms, Carlson (1998) reported that the classification of disorganized/disoriented attachment in infancy had a 0.36 relationship with dissociation rates in adolescence. Ten years later, Dutra, Bureau, Holmes, Lover, and Lyons-Ruth (2009) found that the association had not experienced the injury. After initially submitting protocols for coding D Strange Behavior Situations in Infants Maine and Solomon (1990), the study examined the caregiver's behavior related to behavior encoded as disorganized/disoriented in a strange situation. In the same edited volume as the head of Maine and Solomon, Maine and Gessen (1990) suggested that the frightening and frightened behavior of parents may be the prevailing mechanism for disorganized/disoriented child attachment. The link between frightening and frightened parenting and the classification of a baby as D in a strange situation was supported by Shuenkel, Bakermans-Cranenburg and Van IJzendoorn (1999), as well as more recent studies. Expanding and adding to this account, dissociative (Abrams, Rifkin, Hesse, 2006) and helpless or withdrawn (Solomon and George, 1996; Lyons-Ruth et al., 2013) a parent's behavior was also found to predict a disorganized/disoriented classification of a baby's attachment. Thus, there are many factors that can increase the likelihood of a baby's disorganized/disoriented attachment, especially when they cause a sense of fear that is not metabolized in the care environment. Among them, a meta-analysis showed that 48% of infants classified as D in a strange situation were rated by social services as experiencing abuse or neglect (Van IJzendoorn, Schuengel, and Bakermans-Kranenburg, 1999). The constant experience of parents anxiety disorder (Manassis, Bradley, Goldberg, Hood, Swinson, 1994) or several forms of socioeconomic disadvantage (Sir, Euser, Bakermans-Cranenburg, Van IJzendoorn, 2010) has also been found to predict a child's disorganized/disoriented attachment. In addition, Solomon and George (2011) documented that children with disorganized/disoriented behavior in the care environment in the Strange Situation Procedure. For example, a single major separation - in the absence of ill-treatment (e.g. in the process of leaving or divorce) may increase Over the past decades, Kochanska and Kim (2013) have seen a rapidly growing interest in disorganized attachment from clinicians and politicians as well as researchers. Disorganized/disoriented attachment has become a central problem of developmental psychopathology research, which has been discussed in numerous articles and books. This concept is also widely used in a variety of clinical, interventional and forensic contexts relating to the mental health of infants; for example, estimates of disorganized/disoriented attachment to records from records of infant behaviour were used by social workers in child abuse investigations (Shemmings and Shemmings, 2014). However, concerns were also expressed about the disorganized/disoriented classification of attachments. Maine and Solomon were described as the theorists of an exhaustive, categorical system prone to reducing complex human experience to typologies (O'Shaughnessy and Dallos, 2009, p. 559). Similarly, Gaskins (2013) argues that Maine and Solomon have proposed areas of irreparably flawed and dangerous concepts, simply soaking up possible changes in human behavior outside of Ainsworth models and treating it all as evidence of dysfunction. The category is actually merely residual. Gaskins argues, and instead of meaning any meaningful phenomena, the existence of classification can be seen more productively as evidence of the inadequacy of the three attachment classifications (Gaskins, 2013, p. 39). Such criticisms have some purchase in the way that classification D has been used; to this extent, however, such use is contrary to the objectives of those who proposed it. Main, Hesse and Hesse (2011, p. 441) criticized the widespread and dangerous presumption that infants could be divided into four categories of comparable status, and that any behavior other than the three Ainsworth models was disorganized and caused by frightening or abusive treatment by a parent. Solomon (personal communication, April 2, 2013) expresses particular concern that this misunderstanding is based on a misquoting narrative that the intentions were in the sentence classification: Reining our work out of context - and the lack of awareness of the grounding of our ideas in the behavioral and theoretical contributions of Bowlby and Ainsworth - led readers to treat D as a category equivalent in the ABC's offensive line, instead of recognizing it as a phenomenon. (Solomon, personal communication, April 2011) The emergence of a disorganized/disoriented attachment classification is based on working at the University of California, Berkeley in the late 1970s on the boundaries of the investment strategy (A). The Chief (1979, p. 640) stressed that maintaining intimacy with potential threats should be seen as a *sine qua non*, not for infant babies She argued that the behavior of attachment to a strange situation should be seen as a conditional strategy that, paradoxically, allowed for any intimacy in the face of abandonment of the mother by mentioning the need for affection (Main, 1979, p. 643). However, it was also decided to consider potential limits for young children to accept the emotion of regulation needed to maintain a avoiding conditional strategy. In 1979, Carol George completed her master's thesis with Mary Mayne as an advisor to the thesis. The purpose of her study was to examine the correlates of attachment and physical abuse of children, comparing the behavior and interaction of non-abuse children with children classified by social services as abuse who attended therapeutic day care in the San Francisco Bay Area. It was a period during which the attention of psychologists and the public to child abuse was rapidly more frequent (Hacking, 1991). George (personal communication, September 13, 2012) recalls that the behavior of avoidance of approach was noticeable in this pattern of abuse, with several children first approaching their kindergarten teacher, but then turned away with their eyes or face (see George and Main, 1979, p. 311). The importance of avoiding an approach in the selective treatment of day care raises the question of whether such behaviour should be viewed when it manifests itself in a strange situation with parents as a coherent part of the attachment avoidance model, or constitutes some violation of this pattern: The Avoidance Movements in such situations do not simply express fear. Momentarily directing visual attention from the attending partner they function to reduce the arousal of any disruptive, negative emotions/trends . . . and ensure that socially positive intimacy is maintained. (George and Main, 1979, p. 315) If in the late 1970s Maine assumed that abusive children would avoid the procedure of strange situations, in the late 1970s she revised this view, reflecting on the limits of the child's ability to maintain a coherent prevention strategy. It worked to better identify the mechanisms by which avoidance would protect the infant from distress and conflict. In a chapter largely compiled during a research fellowship with Karin and Klaus Grossmann in Bielefeld in 1975, Mayne (1981) noted that in children avoiding children, this shift in attention is really only an attempt to reorganize or support the organization (p. 683). Avoiding behavior is a search for control when disorganization threatens, and continuously disorganized to such an extent that it is ineffective in successfully diverting attention from the conflict between approach, withdrawal and anger (p. 685). Like Block and Block, colleagues at Berkeley with whom she was in conversation, the main infants like deploying strategies to respond to stressful situations and regulate their emotions; in terms of terms and Block (1980, p. 48), disorganization, such as immobilized, rigidly repetitive or behavioral diffuse flood behavior, could be expected when a child had difficulty in payback in the face of behavioral conflicts and disasters. In a strange situation, Maine concluded that this payback would mean some strategy of direct or conditional search for proximity. Based on this finding, Main (1981) approaches the theorist of behavior characteristic of encoding A Strange Situation, once the second is characterized by behavioral avoidance of the caregiver, and primarily as avoiding behavioral disorganization (p. 681) and reducing the ability to seek protection that a stable state of emotional flooding entails. Among the few who noted this emphasis in Main's account about behavior avoiding attachment, and writing before re-counting her ideas crystallized, Bowlby (1980, p. 73) stated that the basic conceptual reason infant displayed avoidance behavior avoiding any risk of being rebuffed and becoming distressed and disorganized; moreover, he avoids any risk of causing hostile behaviour on the part of his mother. Behavioral disorganization in the context of the high distress and fear of violent children was less common in children avoiding children in normal terms. According to Main reports, Bowlby (1984, p. 366), the reason for this is that avoidance is an attempt by the infant to contain the threat of losing control of their behavior due to emotional flooding. Main and Stadman (1981) submitted three studies in the laboratory suggesting that disorganized/disoriented attachment in infancy is a result of a stressful, avoidant, and disorganized attachment procedure. While a stressful strange situation avoidance can function to modulate painful fluctuating emotions, Maine and Stadman (1981, p. 293) noted that less stressful situations we might expect to see the anger and conflict that this child was too scared to express in a stressful, unfamiliar environment. One such study was a re-examination of Ainsworth's home observations, which found that infants who displayed avoiding reunification in a strange procedure situation, on the contrary, noticeably showed tension and conflict of behavior when rebuffed by their mother in a less stressful environment at home. Maine and Stadman (1981, p. 301) noted, for example, that in one of the children avoiding children, they noticed that in an apparent direct reaction to the physical rejection of the mother, the baby grimaced, engaged in strange and empty laughter, many times kicked in sudden peculiar movements of tension and engaged in stereotypes. Such observations are disproportionate to any account drawing categorical differences between avoidable and disorganized/disoriented infants. This article by Mayne and Stadman (1981) was almost ignored since the 1980s. The probable cause of such neglect, neglect, Karin and Klaus Grossmann (personal communication, July 12, 2012) believe that Maine disavowed any link between avoidance and conflicting behavior when she announced the discovery of a disorganized/disoriented (D) classification (with Judith Solomon) and emphasized the role of frightened/frightening parenting (with Eric Hesse). The link between frightened/frightening parental behavior and disorganized/disoriented infant attachment had sufficient empirical support and conceptually compelling quality, resulting in her magnetization of field curiosity. Thus, with the exception of Maine herself (and one chapter of Jacobowitz, Hazan, zaagnino, Mesina, Beverung, 2011), no subsequent researcher has interpreted Main and Stadman (1981) as arguments in support of nothing more than a limited assertion that a caregiver in avoiding diads tends to reject the behavior of his child's affection. In fact, to the extent that other home surveillance data echo this conclusion, the article's comments undermine many widespread assumptions of disorganization, and have practical significance. The categorical distinction between avoiding and disorganized/disoriented infants has caused problems for later doctors, scientific psychologists and social welfare professionals who do not know that avoidance children often look like disorganized/disoriented children at home (Main, personal communication, July 10, 2013). This is a potentially important issue, for those who want to take notes and think about these discrepancies with delay before she could seek advice on their meaning. Solomon noted various behaviors not related to Ainsworth's coding protocols, which were particularly common in poor sampling: clear signs of depression in infants; Signs that the infant tried to strategize the ABC, but failed to do so; babies are originally approaching the caregiver but then veering; and disoriented behavior (e.g., a child leaves his hand hanging in the air). For example, a little girl cried desperately for her father to return throughout the separation. At the moment of the reunion, she looked into his face and felt completely silent, her chest heaving with a clear effort to hold back the tears. The moment she turned away to examine the toys at her feet, and she the rest of the episode was accompanied by a silent play, despite her father's apparent attempts to interact. (Solomon, personal communication, September 6, 2012) Although she knew that there might well be no common factor linking the varied disciplinary behavior she saw, the fact that they were more common in a poor sample encouraged Solomon's interest in further question about their possible meanings in Strange Situation. This also supported the existing emphasis on non-classified classes proposed by Mayne and Weston (1981). While during her year in Bielefeld, Maine agreed with Karin Grossmann to use Not To Classify for Abnormal Cases, Solomon recalls that by 1979, in her conversations with Maine, she called these cases 'D', but without a clear sense of what it meant, except that these babies were unsafe, even when they showed some aspects of safe patterns (personal communication) September 6, 2012). The motivation of Maine and Solomon to refer to invulnerable behavior as a new classification of attachments appears to have been caused by three factors. First, the addition of the new classification will mean that tapes showing disorganized or disoriented behavior no longer need to be classified as A, B or C, increasing the design and predictive expiration date Ainsworth. Second, the addition of a new will draw attention to behaviours of particular interest, as they are more common in risk samples at a time of growing interest in child abuse. Thirdly, the behavior often had a jerky, contradictory or disoriented quality that disrupted the sequence of the baby's movement or gesture movements, and have practical significance. The categorical distinction between avoiding and disorganized/disoriented infants has caused problems for later doctors, scientific psychologists and social welfare professionals who do not know that avoidance children often look like disorganized/disoriented children at home (Main, personal communication, July 10, 2013). This is a potentially important issue, for those who want to take notes and think about these discrepancies with delay before she could seek advice on their meaning. Solomon noted various behaviors not related to Ainsworth's coding protocols, which were particularly common in poor sampling: clear signs of depression in infants; Signs that the infant tried to strategize the ABC, but failed to do so; babies are originally approaching the caregiver but then veering; and disoriented behavior (e.g., a child leaves his hand hanging in the air). For example, a little girl cried desperately for her father to return throughout the separation. At the moment of the reunion, she looked into his face and felt completely silent, her chest heaving with a clear effort to hold back the tears. The moment she turned away to examine the toys at her feet, and she the rest of the episode was accompanied by a silent play, despite her father's apparent attempts to interact. (Solomon, personal communication, September 6, 2012) Although she knew that there might well be no common factor linking the varied disciplinary behavior she saw, the fact that they were more common in a poor sample encouraged Solomon's interest in further question about their possible meanings in Strange Situation. This also supported the existing emphasis on non-classified classes proposed by Mayne and Weston (1981). While during her year in Bielefeld, Maine agreed with Karin Grossmann to use Not To Classify for Abnormal Cases, Solomon recalls that by 1979, in her conversations with Maine, she called these cases 'D', but without a clear sense of what it meant, except that these babies were unsafe, even when they showed some aspects of safe patterns (personal communication) September 6, 2012). The motivation of Maine and Solomon to refer to invulnerable behavior as a new classification of attachments appears to have been caused by three factors. First, the addition of the new classification will mean that tapes showing disorganized or disoriented behavior no longer need to be classified as A, B or C, increasing the design and predictive expiration date Ainsworth. Second, the addition of a new will draw attention to behaviours of particular interest, as they are more common in risk samples at a time of growing interest in child abuse. Thirdly, the behavior often had a jerky, contradictory or disoriented quality that disrupted the sequence of the baby's movement or gesture movements, and have practical significance. The categorical distinction between avoiding and disorganized/disoriented infants has caused problems for later doctors, scientific psychologists and social welfare professionals who do not know that avoidance children often look like disorganized/disoriented children at home (Main, personal communication, July 10, 2013). This is a potentially important issue, for those who want to take notes and think about these discrepancies with delay before she could seek advice on their meaning. Solomon noted various behaviors not related to Ainsworth's coding protocols, which were particularly common in poor sampling: clear signs of depression in infants; Signs that the infant tried to strategize the ABC, but failed to do so; babies are originally approaching the caregiver but then veering; and disoriented behavior (e.g., a child leaves his hand hanging in the air). For example, a little girl cried desperately for her father to return throughout the separation. At the moment of the reunion, she looked into his face and felt completely silent, her chest heaving with a clear effort to hold back the tears. The moment she turned away to examine the toys at her feet, and she the rest of the episode was accompanied by a silent play, despite her father's apparent attempts to interact. (Solomon, personal communication, September 6, 2012) Although she knew that there might well be no common factor linking the varied disciplinary behavior she saw, the fact that they were more common in a poor sample encouraged Solomon's interest in further question about their possible meanings in Strange Situation. This also supported the existing emphasis on non-classified classes proposed by Mayne and Weston (1981). While during her year in Bielefeld, Maine agreed with Karin Grossmann to use Not To Classify for Abnormal Cases, Solomon recalls that by 1979, in her conversations with Maine, she called these cases 'D', but without a clear sense of what it meant, except that these babies were unsafe, even when they showed some aspects of safe patterns (personal communication) September 6, 2012). The motivation of Maine and Solomon to refer to invulnerable behavior as a new classification of attachments appears to have been caused by three factors. First, the addition of the new classification will mean that tapes showing disorganized or disoriented behavior no longer need to be classified as A, B or C, increasing the design and predictive expiration date Ainsworth. Second, the addition of a new will draw attention to behaviours of particular interest, as they are more common in risk samples at a time of growing interest in child abuse. Thirdly, the behavior often had a jerky, contradictory or disoriented quality that disrupted the sequence of the baby's movement or gesture movements, and have practical significance. The categorical distinction between avoiding and disorganized/disoriented infants has caused problems for later doctors, scientific psychologists and social welfare professionals who do not know that avoidance children often look like disorganized/disoriented children at home (Main, personal communication, July 10, 2013). This is a potentially important issue, for those who want to take notes and think about these discrepancies with delay before she could seek advice on their meaning. Solomon noted various behaviors not related to Ainsworth's coding protocols, which were particularly common in poor sampling: clear signs of depression in infants; Signs that the infant tried to strategize the ABC, but failed to do so; babies are originally approaching the caregiver but then veering; and disoriented behavior (e.g., a child leaves his hand hanging in the air). For example, a little girl cried desperately for her father to return throughout the separation. At the moment of the reunion, she looked into his face and felt completely silent, her chest heaving with a clear effort to hold back the tears. The moment she turned away to examine the toys at her feet, and she the rest of the episode was accompanied by a silent play, despite her father's apparent attempts to interact. (Solomon, personal communication, September 6, 2012) Although she knew that there might well be no common factor linking the varied disciplinary behavior she saw, the fact that they were more common in a poor sample encouraged Solomon's interest in further question about their possible meanings in Strange Situation. This also supported the existing emphasis on non-classified classes proposed by Mayne and Weston (1981). While during her year in Bielefeld, Maine agreed with Karin Grossmann to use Not To Classify for Abnormal Cases, Solomon recalls that by 1979, in her conversations with Maine, she called these cases 'D', but without a clear sense of what it meant, except that these babies were unsafe, even when they showed some aspects of safe patterns (personal communication) September 6, 2012). The motivation of Maine and Solomon to refer to invulnerable behavior as a new classification of attachments appears to have been caused by three factors. First, the addition of the new classification will mean that tapes showing disorganized or disoriented behavior no longer need to be classified as A, B or C, increasing the design and predictive expiration date Ainsworth. Second, the addition of a new will draw attention to behaviours of particular interest, as they are more common in risk samples at a time of growing interest in child abuse. Thirdly, the behavior often had a jerky, contradictory or disoriented quality that disrupted the sequence of the baby's movement or gesture movements, and have practical significance. The categorical distinction between avoiding and disorganized/disoriented infants has caused problems for later doctors, scientific psychologists and social welfare professionals who do not know that avoidance children often look like disorganized/disoriented children at home (Main, personal communication, July 10, 2013). This is a potentially important issue, for those who want to take notes and think about these discrepancies with delay before she could seek advice on their meaning. Solomon noted various behaviors not related to Ainsworth's coding protocols, which were particularly common in poor sampling: clear signs of depression in infants; Signs that the infant tried to strategize the ABC, but failed to do so; babies are originally approaching the caregiver but then veering; and disoriented behavior (e.g., a child leaves his hand hanging in the air). For example, a little girl cried desperately for her father to return throughout the separation. At the moment of the reunion, she looked into his face and felt completely silent, her chest heaving with a clear effort to hold back the tears. The moment she turned away to examine the toys at her feet, and she the rest of the episode was accompanied by a silent play, despite her father's apparent attempts to interact. (Solomon, personal communication, September 6, 2012) Although she knew that there might well be no common factor linking the varied disciplinary behavior she saw, the fact that they were more common in a poor sample encouraged Solomon's interest in further question about their possible meanings in Strange Situation. This also supported the existing emphasis on non-classified classes proposed by Mayne and Weston (1981). While during her year in Bielefeld, Maine agreed with Karin Grossmann to use Not To Classify for Abnormal Cases, Solomon recalls that by 1979, in her conversations with Maine, she called these cases 'D', but without a clear sense of what it meant, except that these babies were unsafe, even when they showed some aspects of safe patterns (personal communication) September 6, 2012). The motivation of Maine and Solomon to refer to invulnerable behavior as a new classification of attachments appears to have been caused by three factors. First, the addition of the new classification will mean that tapes showing disorganized or disoriented behavior no longer need to be classified as A, B or C, increasing the design and predictive expiration date Ainsworth. Second, the addition of a new will draw attention to behaviours of particular interest, as they are more common in risk samples at a time of growing interest in child abuse. Thirdly, the behavior often had a jerky, contradictory or disoriented quality that disrupted the sequence of the baby's movement or gesture movements, and have practical significance. The categorical distinction between avoiding and disorganized/disoriented infants has caused problems for later doctors, scientific psychologists and social welfare professionals who do not know that avoidance children often look like disorganized/disoriented children at home (Main, personal communication, July 10, 2013). This is a potentially important issue, for those who want to take notes and think about these discrepancies with delay before she could seek advice on their meaning. Solomon noted various behaviors not related to Ainsworth's coding protocols, which were particularly common in poor sampling: clear signs of depression in infants; Signs that the infant tried to strategize the ABC, but failed to do so; babies are originally approaching the caregiver but then veering; and disoriented behavior (e.g., a child leaves his hand hanging in the air). For example, a little girl cried desperately for her father to return throughout the separation. At the moment of the reunion, she looked into his face and felt completely silent, her chest heaving with a clear effort to hold back the tears. The moment she turned away to examine the toys at her feet, and she the rest of the episode was accompanied by a silent play, despite her father's apparent attempts to interact. (Solomon, personal communication, September 6, 2012) Although she knew that there might well be no common factor linking the varied disciplinary behavior she saw, the fact that they were more common in a poor sample encouraged Solomon's interest in further question about their possible meanings in Strange Situation. This also supported the existing emphasis on non-classified classes proposed by Mayne and Weston (1981). While during her year in Bielefeld, Maine agreed with Karin Grossmann to use Not To Classify for Abnormal Cases, Solomon recalls that by 1979, in her conversations with Maine, she called these cases 'D', but without a clear sense of what it meant, except that these babies were unsafe, even when they showed some aspects of safe patterns (personal communication) September 6, 2012). The motivation of Maine and Solomon to refer to invulnerable behavior as a new classification of attachments appears to have been caused by three factors. First, the addition of the new classification will mean that tapes showing disorganized or disoriented behavior no longer need to be classified as A, B or C, increasing the design and predictive expiration date Ainsworth. Second, the addition of a new will draw attention to behaviours of particular interest, as they are more common in risk samples at a time of growing interest in child abuse. Thirdly, the behavior often had a jerky, contradictory or disoriented quality that disrupted the sequence of the baby's movement or gesture movements, and have practical significance. The categorical distinction between avoiding and disorganized/disoriented infants has caused problems for later doctors, scientific psychologists and social welfare professionals who do not know that avoidance children often look like disorganized/disoriented children at home (Main, personal communication, July 10, 2013). This is a potentially important issue, for those who want to take notes and think about these discrepancies with delay before she could seek advice on their meaning. Solomon noted various behaviors not related to Ainsworth's coding protocols, which were particularly common in poor sampling: clear signs of depression in infants; Signs that the infant tried to strategize the ABC, but failed to do so; babies are originally approaching the caregiver but then veering; and disoriented behavior (e.g., a child leaves his hand hanging in the air). For example, a little girl cried desperately for her father to return throughout the separation. At the moment of the reunion, she looked into his face and felt completely silent, her chest heaving with a clear effort to hold back the tears. The moment she turned away to examine the toys at her feet, and she the rest of the episode was accompanied by a silent play, despite her father's apparent attempts to interact. (Solomon, personal communication, September 6, 2012) Although she knew that there might well be no common factor linking the varied disciplinary behavior she saw, the fact that they were more common in a poor sample encouraged Solomon's interest in further question about their possible meanings in Strange Situation. This also supported the existing emphasis on non-classified classes proposed by Mayne and Weston (1981). While during her year in Bielefeld, Maine agreed with Karin Grossmann to use Not To Classify for Abnormal Cases, Solomon recalls that by 1979, in her conversations with Maine, she called these cases 'D', but without a clear sense of what it meant, except that these babies were unsafe, even when they showed some aspects of safe patterns (personal communication) September 6, 2012). The motivation of Maine and Solomon to refer to invulnerable behavior as a new classification of attachments appears to have been caused by three factors. First, the addition of the new classification will mean that tapes showing disorganized or disoriented behavior no longer need to be classified as A, B or C, increasing the design and predictive expiration date Ainsworth. Second, the addition of a new will draw attention to behaviours of particular interest, as they are more common in risk samples at a time of growing interest in child abuse. Thirdly, the behavior often had a jerky, contradictory or disoriented quality that disrupted the sequence of the baby's movement or gesture movements, and have practical significance. The categorical distinction between avoiding and disorganized/disoriented infants has caused problems for later doctors, scientific psychologists and social welfare professionals who do not know that avoidance children often look like disorganized/disoriented children at home (Main, personal communication, July 10, 2013). This is a potentially important issue, for those who want to take notes and think about these discrepancies with delay before she could seek advice on their meaning. Solomon noted various behaviors not related to Ainsworth's coding protocols, which were particularly common in poor sampling: clear signs of depression in infants; Signs that the infant tried to strategize the ABC, but failed to do so; babies are originally approaching the caregiver but then veering; and disoriented behavior (e.g., a child leaves his hand hanging in the air). For example, a little girl cried desperately for her father to return throughout the separation. At the moment of the reunion, she looked into his face and felt completely silent, her chest heaving with a clear effort to hold back the tears. The moment she turned away to examine the toys at her feet, and she the rest of the episode was accompanied by a silent play, despite her father's apparent attempts to interact. (Solomon, personal communication, September 6, 2012) Although she knew that there might well be no common factor linking the varied disciplinary behavior she saw, the fact that they were more common in a poor sample encouraged Solomon's interest in further question about their possible meanings in Strange Situation. This also supported the existing emphasis on non-classified classes proposed by Mayne and Weston (1981). While during her year in Bielefeld, Maine agreed with Karin Grossmann to use Not To Classify for Abnormal Cases, Solomon recalls that by 1979, in her conversations with Maine, she called these cases 'D', but without a clear sense of what it meant, except that these babies were unsafe, even when they showed some aspects of safe patterns (personal communication) September 6, 2012). The motivation of Maine and Solomon to refer to invulnerable behavior as a new classification of attachments appears to have been caused by three factors. First, the addition of the new classification will mean that tapes showing disorganized or disoriented behavior no longer need to be classified as A, B or C, increasing the design and predictive expiration date Ainsworth. Second, the addition of a new will draw attention to behaviours of particular interest, as they are more common in risk samples at a time of growing interest in child abuse. Thirdly, the behavior often had a jerky, contradictory or disoriented quality that disrupted the sequence of the baby's movement or gesture movements, and have practical significance. The categorical distinction between avoiding and disorganized/disoriented infants has caused problems for later doctors, scientific psychologists and social welfare professionals who do not know that avoidance children often look like disorganized/disoriented children at home (Main, personal communication, July 10, 2013). This is a potentially important issue, for those who want to take notes and think about these discrepancies with delay before she could seek advice on their meaning. Solomon noted various behaviors not related to Ainsworth's coding protocols, which were particularly common in poor sampling: clear signs of depression in infants; Signs that the infant tried to strategize the ABC, but failed to do so; babies are originally approaching the caregiver but then veering; and disoriented behavior (e.g., a child leaves his hand hanging in the air). For example, a little girl cried desperately for her father to return throughout the separation. At the moment of the reunion, she looked into his face and felt completely silent, her chest heaving with a clear effort to hold back the tears. The moment she turned away to examine the toys at her feet, and she the rest of the episode was accompanied by a silent play, despite her father's apparent attempts to interact. (Solomon, personal communication, September 6, 2012) Although she knew that there might well be no common factor linking the varied disciplinary behavior she saw, the fact that they were more common in a poor sample encouraged Solomon's interest in further question about their possible meanings in Strange Situation. This also supported the existing emphasis on non-classified classes proposed by Mayne and Weston (1981). While during her year in Bielefeld, Maine agreed with Karin Grossmann to use Not To Classify for Abnormal Cases, Solomon recalls that by 1979, in her conversations with Maine, she called these cases 'D', but without a clear sense of what it meant, except that these babies were unsafe, even when they showed some aspects of safe patterns (personal communication) September 6, 2012). The motivation of Maine and Solomon to refer to invulnerable behavior as a new classification of attachments appears to have been caused by three factors. First, the addition of the new classification will mean that tapes showing disorganized or disoriented behavior no longer need to be classified as A, B or C, increasing the design and predictive expiration date Ainsworth. Second, the addition of a new will draw attention to behaviours of particular interest, as they are more common in risk samples at a time of growing interest in child abuse. Thirdly, the behavior often had a jerky, contradictory or disoriented quality that disrupted the sequence of the baby's movement or gesture movements, and have practical significance. The categorical distinction between avoiding and disorganized/disoriented infants has caused problems for later doctors, scientific psychologists and social welfare professionals who do not know that avoidance children often look like disorganized/disoriented children at home (Main, personal communication, July 10, 2013). This is a potentially important issue, for those who want to take notes and think about these discrepancies with delay before she could seek advice on their meaning. Solomon noted various behaviors not related to Ainsworth's coding protocols, which were particularly common in poor sampling: clear signs of depression in infants; Signs that the infant tried to strategize the ABC, but failed to do so; babies are originally approaching the caregiver but then veering; and disoriented behavior (e.g., a child leaves his hand hanging in the air). For example, a little girl cried desperately for her father to return throughout the separation. At the moment of the reunion, she looked into his face and felt completely silent, her chest heaving with a clear effort to hold back the tears. The moment she turned away to examine the toys at her feet, and she the rest of the episode was accompanied by a silent play, despite her father's apparent attempts to interact. (Solomon, personal communication, September 6, 2012) Although she knew that there might well be no common factor linking the varied disciplinary behavior she saw, the fact that they were more common in a poor sample encouraged Solomon's interest in further question about their possible meanings in Strange Situation. This also supported the existing emphasis on non-classified classes proposed by Mayne and Weston (1981). While during her year in Bielefeld, Maine agreed with Karin Grossmann to use Not To Classify for Abnormal Cases, Solomon recalls that by 1979, in her conversations with Maine, she called these cases 'D', but without a clear sense of what it meant, except that these babies were unsafe, even when they showed some aspects of safe patterns (personal communication) September 6, 2012). The motivation of Maine and Solomon to refer to invulnerable behavior as a new classification of attachments appears to have been caused by three factors. First, the addition of the new classification will mean that tapes showing disorganized or disoriented behavior no longer need to be classified as A, B or C, increasing the design and predictive expiration date Ainsworth. Second, the addition of a new will draw attention to behaviours of particular interest, as they are more common in risk samples at a time of growing interest in child abuse. Thirdly, the behavior often had a jerky, contradictory or disoriented quality that disrupted the sequence of the baby's movement or gesture movements, and have practical significance. The categorical distinction between avoiding and disorganized/disoriented infants has caused problems for later doctors, scientific psychologists and social welfare professionals who do not know that avoidance children often look like disorganized/disoriented children at home (Main, personal communication, July 10, 2013). This is a potentially important issue, for those who want to take notes and think about these discrepancies with delay before she could seek advice on their meaning. Solomon noted various behaviors not related to Ainsworth's coding protocols, which were particularly common in poor sampling: clear signs of depression in infants; Signs that the infant tried to strategize the ABC, but failed to do so; babies are originally approaching the caregiver but then veering; and disoriented behavior (e.g., a child leaves his hand hanging in the air). For example, a little girl cried desperately for her father to return throughout the separation. At the moment of the reunion, she looked into his face and felt completely silent, her chest heaving with a clear effort to hold back the tears. The moment she turned away to examine the toys at her feet, and she the rest of the episode was accompanied by a silent play, despite her father's apparent attempts to interact. (Solomon, personal communication, September 6, 2012) Although she knew that there might well be no common factor linking the varied disciplinary behavior she saw, the fact that they were more common in a poor sample encouraged Solomon's interest in further question about their possible meanings in Strange Situation. This also supported the existing emphasis on non-classified classes proposed by Mayne and Weston (1981). While during her year in Bielefeld, Maine agreed with Karin Grossmann to use Not To Classify for Abnormal Cases, Solomon recalls that by 1979, in her conversations with Maine, she called these cases 'D', but without a clear sense of what it meant, except that these babies were unsafe, even when they showed some aspects of safe patterns (personal communication) September 6, 2012). The motivation of Maine and Solomon to refer to invulnerable behavior as a new classification of attachments appears to have been caused by three factors. First, the addition of the new classification will mean that tapes showing disorganized or disoriented behavior no longer need to be classified as A, B or C, increasing the design and predictive expiration date Ainsworth. Second, the addition of a new will draw attention to behaviours of particular interest, as they are more common in risk samples at a time of growing interest in child abuse. Thirdly, the behavior often had a jerky, contradictory or disoriented quality that disrupted the sequence of the baby's movement or gesture movements, and have practical significance. The categorical distinction between avoiding and disorganized/disoriented infants has caused problems for later doctors, scientific psychologists and social welfare professionals who do not know that avoidance children often look like disorganized/disoriented children at home (Main, personal communication, July 10, 2013). This is a potentially important issue, for those who want to take notes and think about these discrepancies with delay before she could seek advice on their meaning. Solomon noted various behaviors not related to Ainsworth's coding protocols, which were particularly common in poor sampling: clear signs of depression in infants; Signs that the infant tried to strategize the ABC, but failed to do so; babies are originally approaching the caregiver but then veering; and disoriented behavior (e.g., a child leaves his hand hanging in the air). For example, a little girl cried desperately for her father to return throughout the separation. At the moment of the reunion, she looked into his face and felt completely silent, her chest heaving with a clear effort to hold back the tears. The moment she turned away to examine the toys at her feet, and she the rest of the episode was accompanied by a silent play, despite her father's apparent attempts to interact. (Solomon, personal communication, September 6, 2012) Although she knew that there might well be no common factor linking the varied disciplinary behavior she saw, the fact that they were more common in a poor sample encouraged Solomon's interest in further question about their possible meanings in Strange Situation. This also supported the existing emphasis on non-classified classes proposed by Mayne and Weston (1981). While during her year in Bielefeld, Maine agreed with Karin Grossmann to use Not To Classify for Abnormal Cases, Solomon recalls that by 1979, in her conversations with Maine, she called these cases 'D', but without a clear sense of what it meant, except that these babies were unsafe, even when they showed some aspects of safe patterns (personal communication) September 6, 2012). The motivation of Maine and Solomon to refer to invulnerable behavior as a new classification of attachments appears to have been caused by three factors. First, the addition of the new classification will mean that tapes showing disorganized or disoriented behavior no longer need to be classified as A, B or C, increasing the design and predictive expiration date Ainsworth. Second, the addition of a new will draw attention to behaviours of particular interest, as they are more common in risk samples at a time of growing interest in child abuse. Thirdly, the behavior often had a jerky, contradictory or disoriented quality that disrupted the sequence of the baby's movement or gesture movements, and have practical significance. The categorical distinction between avoiding and disorganized/disoriented infants has caused problems for later doctors, scientific psychologists and social welfare professionals who do not know that avoidance children often look like disorganized/disoriented children at home (Main, personal communication, July 10, 2013). This is a potentially important issue, for those who want to take notes and think about these discrepancies with delay before she could seek advice on their meaning. Solomon noted various behaviors not related to Ainsworth's coding protocols, which were particularly common in poor sampling: clear signs of depression in infants; Signs that the infant tried to strategize the ABC, but failed to do so; babies are originally approaching the caregiver but then veering; and disoriented behavior (e.g., a child leaves his hand hanging in the air). For example, a little girl cried desperately for her father to return throughout the separation. At the moment of the reunion, she looked

gestures. I used to walk imagining contexts in which I and most others use a gesture that is often in moments of indecision or conflict. For me, that more striking was the way in which I tried to swallow or suffocate the distress by covering his mouth. Since D is encoded, when the viewer concludes about visible behavior, the violation of the (invisible, positive) attachment system, this sharply raises the general problem of withdrawal of reasoning in relation to the observed behavior. The Principal and Solomon understood that the behaviour of hand-to-mouth reunification could have different functions and would not necessarily constitute a breakdown of strategic functioning. However, the behavior was placed as an index of disorganization when it occurs when reunited with the caregiver, because they believed that in such circumstances, it is likely that either directly (through fear) or indirectly (through confusion or narrowing) implies the presence of a conflict or disregulation of the attachment system4, although the viewer can never know for sure. While Hessen and Main (2000) will continue to describe disorganization/disorientation as a collapse in behavioral and attention strategies, this statement of (invisible) attachment to the behavioral system should not necessarily be seen as a description of observed attachment behavior. For example, explicit and behaviorally consistent manifestations of fear, such as hiding from a returning parent under a chair, are encoded as disorganized/disoriented because they indicate a disregulation of an attachment system that would otherwise lead a frightened child to achieve proximity to the caregiver. Unfortunately, Hessen and Home Link to Collapse Strategies were widely wrong, with many suggesting that disorganization/disorientation as a collapse in behavioral and attention-seeking strategies always means a pervasive and chaotic breakdown of observed behavior (see, for example, Park Clark-Stewart, 2011 textbook) - rather than disrupting behavioral and attention components according to coding instructions in Main and Solomon (1990), you can expect that only infants with a score of 8 or 9 out of 9 will show such widespread attachment disorder that the result is behavioral or attention-grabbing chaos in the Strange Situation Procedure. In subsequent studies, infants with such high scores are rare. Infants with a score of 5 to 7, which is sufficient for classification D, rather show some impairment of behavioral or attention components of the attachment system, which is considered sufficient for classification D on the basis that a particular behavior is repeated, intensely extended in duration, or occurs right at the time of reunion. The rest of the behavior shown by these infants in Strange Situation can otherwise be consistently sequenced and oriented towards their caregiver and environment. Against the idea of disorganized/disoriented behavior as mere chaotic dysfunction, Maine specifically states that such behavior can be a logical, adaptive response to infant care influenced by ecological observations, that expressions of behavioral conflict, however, can be adapted (at an individual level) to the environment (e.g. Hinde, 1966, p. 276). Main (1990, p. 56) explained that human behavior in this situation may be a sign of what is most adaptive in this situation, but it does not inform us whether a person is experiencing any secondary, counter-configured tendency. Consider two infants (cases from Maine's doctoral sample) that showed behavior later classified as D: One threw his hands in front of her face after seeing her caregiver, while the other engaged in asymmetrical floor flapping. The behaviour of the first child may well be considered adaptive to the threatening context of care, while the behaviour of the second child does not always seem adaptive on an individual level. There is a broad tendency through psychological discourses to mummify classifications, especially if they are seen as having predictive authenticity (Brown and Stenner, 2009). In the case of disorganized/disoriented attachment, this process appears to be most adaptive by two other factors: First, Basic and Solomon (1986) own the narrative and wording of the new classification of the forest some misunderstanding. For example, Maine and Solomon (1986) were originally headlined by a new category of attachment behavior, and this announcement was not read in the context of Maine's other work, which linked the disorganization process to avoidance and ambivalence/resistance. Secondly, the increase in the number of child abuses as a recognized social problem during this period creates pressures in the clinical and social welfare environment to find a tool and concept to distinguish between sexual treatment and adequate child-rearing. I hope that by visiting The Goals of Maine and Solomon in introducing a disorganized/disoriented classification of attachments, this can help to counter and qualify the substantial deployment of a concept documented, for example, in Dushinsky et al (2015), which refer to the names of Main and Solomon as authority and justification. I would also be pleased if this critical historical analysis would help counter trends within the research community's attachment to re-disorganization/disorientation, which, as noted, have moved researchers away from trying to study patterns in the behavior of disorganized infants (Padr'n, Carlson s Sroufe, 2014, p. 202). Close attention to the context of The Main and Solomon's disorganized/disoriented attachment indicates that the D classification was not intended to capture all abnormal behaviors as pointing to unitary dysfunction in the infant's mental health, but to scale the degree of confidence in the coder that (visible) under surveillance was a violation of the system of attachment of the baby (invisible, sane). Instead of being an innovator of an exhaustive and residual category of exceptions from the et al. (1978) protocols, attention to main's work in the late 1970s and early 1980s suggests that when introducing the concept of disorganized/disoriented attachment, Maine and Solomon should rather be seen as the theorists of consequences at the level of expression behavior and bypassing the disregulation of the attachment system. The variety of possible expressions and the circumvention of disorganization meant, in particular, that the opening of category D of infant strange behaviour was based on a reluctance to take a fundamental or realistic position on the classification of human relations. It was based on the assumption that both individuals and relationships are unique and that they have a higher reality than any classification can fully cover. (Main et al., 1985, p. 99) Considered in this light, the purpose of The Chief and Solomon may be seen as an attempt to draw attention to the potential significance of visible behavior, which seems to imply some degree of violation of the sane (invisible) attachment system. At the heart of their point of view is the idea that there are species abilities that are not part of the attachment system itself, but can, within, manipulate (or suppress or increase) attachment behavior in response to different environments (Main et al., 2005, p. 255); indeed, Solomon's current work at the University of Vienna on the species specifics of such abilities. Thus, their work activates the opportunity noted by Kierkegaard (1843/2009, p. 78) that when someone really wants to learn universal, one only needs to explore a legitimate exception, because he will present everything. Instead of being the main innovators of the exhaustive and residual category of exceptions to the Ainsworth protocols. In their work on disorganized/disoriented infant attachment, Maine and Solomon should be seen primarily as theorists of expressions and bypasses the disregulation of the attachment system.Indeed, Ainsworth (1984, p. 581) later observes, reflecting on the ambivalent/sustainable behavior in her Baltimore pattern that mix intense anxiety and intense anger toward the figure's serious attachment cases. . When it is aimed at the figure of affection, it is seemingly dysfunctional because of the risk of alienating them, but it can be functional and probably started this way. 2 In accordance with this conclusion Main and Hesse (1990, p. 179) later stated that the ambivalent picture seems to be the least organized. This may be partly because most C babies are actually disorganized. 3While Main et al. (2011) will say that the construction of the first scale to assess disorganized behavior occurred in 1979, Mary Mayne and Eric Hesse corrected this until 1981 (personal communication, September 13, 2012). 4Ka the point of comparison, one might, for example, think of Agnes, in Kurt Levine's famous early films displayed hand-to-mouth behavior by trampling her younger brother in her haste to avoid the bully. Abrams K. Y., Rifkin A., Hesse E. (2006). Exploring the role of frightened/flightening subtypes of parents in predicting disorganized attachment in a brief follow-up procedure. *Development and Psychopathology*, 18, 345-361. 10.1017/S0955579406060184 (GoogleRef) (Google Scholar)Ainsworth M. D. (1984). Attachments in Ender N.S. and McVicker Hunt J. (Eds.), *Personality and Behavioral Disorders* (2nd ed., p. 559-602). New York, NY: Wiley. (Google Scholar) Ainsworth M.D., Blehar M, Waters E, th Wall S. (1978). Patterns of attachment: psychological study of a strange situation. Hillsdale, New Jersey: Erlbaum. (Google Scholar) Ainsworth M., y Wittig B. (1969). Attachment and research behavior of children aged one year in a strange situation In Foss B. (ed.), *determinants of infant behavior*. IV (p. 113-136). London, United Kingdom: Methuen. (Google Scholar) Block J., Block J. (1980). The role of ego-control and ego-resistance in organizing behavior in Collins VA (ed.), *Minnesota Symposium on Child Psychology: Volume 13 The Development of Cognition, Affect, and Social Relationships* (p. 39-101). Hillsdale, New Jersey: Erlbaum. (Google Fellow) Bowlby J. (1969). London, UK: Penguin. (Google Fellow) Bowlby J. Losses. London, UK: Penguin. (Google Fellow) Brown S.D., Stenner. *Psychology without foundation*. London, UK: The Sage. (Google Fellow) Carlson E.A. (1998). Promising longitudinal study of the disorganization/disorientation of attachment. *Child Development*, 69, 1107-1128. 10.1111/j.1467-8624.1998.tb06163.x (PubMed) (Google Scholar) Cummings E.M (1990). Classification of attachment on the continuum of howl security in Greenberg M.T., Chichchcetti D., th Cummings e.M., Attachment in preschool years (p. 311-338). Chicago, Illinois: University of Chicago Press. (Google Fellow) Cyr C., Euser E.M., Bakermans-Cranenburg M. J., Van IJzendoorn M. H. (2010). Ensuring attachment safety and disorganization in high-risk and risk-risk families: a series of meta-analyses. *Development and Psychopathology*, 22, 87-108. 10.1017/S09555794099990289 (PubMed) (Google Scholar) Dusinski R., Greco M., Solomon J. (2015). Attachment and sovereign power. *International Journal of Political Culture and Society*. Pre-online edition 10.1007/s10767-014-9192-9 PMC free article (PubMed) (CrossRef)Dutra L., Bureau J. F., Holmes B., Lyubchik A., Lyons-Ruth K. (2009). The quality of early care and child trauma: a promising study of ways to develop to dissociation. *Journal of Nervous and Mental Illness*, 197, 383-390.10.1097/NMD.0b013e3181a653b7 (free PMC article) (PubMed) (Google Scholar) Gaskins S. (2013). Puzzle in the quinn N. and Mageo J.M. (Eds.), *Attachments Revised: Cultural Perspectives on Western Theory* (33–66). London, United Kingdom: Palgrave. (Google Scholar) Palgrave. (Google Scholar) George K., Chief M. (1979). The social interaction of children with young people who abuse children: approach, avoidance and aggression. *Child Development*, 50, 306-318.10.2307/1129405 (PubMed) (Google Scholar) Hackling I. (1991). Making and casting child abuse. *Critical Investigation*, 17, 253-289.10.1086/448583 (Google Scholar) Hesse E., th Main M. (2000). Disorganized attachment of infants, children and adults: collapse in behavioral and attention strategies. *Diary of the American Psychoanalytic Association*, 48, 1097-1127.10.1177/0003065100040011101 (PubMed) (Google Scholar) Hinde R. (1966). *Animal behavior*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill (Google Scholar) Jacobwitz D, Hazan N, Zakagino M, Mesina S, and Beverung L. (2011). Terrible maternal behavior, infant disorganization and risks to psychopathology in Cicchetti D. and Routsman G. (Eds.), *Origin and Organization adaptation and maladaptation* (p. 283-322). New York, NY: Wiley. (Google Fellow) Kierkegaard S. (2009). *Repetition and philosophical crumbs* (Mooney E., Trans.). Oxford, United Kingdom: Oxford University Publishing House; (Original work published in 1843) (Google Fellow) Kochanska G, Kim S. (2013). Early attachment organization with both parents and future behavioral problems, from infancy to middle childhood. *Child Development*, 84, 283-296.10.1111/j.1467-8624.2012.01852.x PMC Free Article (PubMed) (Google Scholar) Levin K. (1930). Expression of movements in children In Stern W. (ed.), *Psychology of early childhood* (6th p., p. 573-582). London, UNITED Kingdom: Allen and Unwin. (Google Fellow) Lyons-Ruth K., J.F., Easterbrooks M.A., Obsut I., Hennighausen K, Woolles-Cody L. (2013). Parsing the design of maternal insensitivity: Various longitudinal pathways associated with early maternal withdrawal. *Appendix - Human Development*, 15, 562-582.10.1080/14616734.2013.841051 (PMC free article) (CrossRef) (Google Scholar) Main M. (1973). *Study, play and cognitive functioning* (unpublished doctoral thesis). Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, MD. (Google Scholar) Chief M. (1977). *Analysis of a peculiar form of reunification behavior* is seen in some children in Webb R. (Ed.), *Social Development in Childhood* (p. 33-78). Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press. (Google Fellow) Chief M. (1979). *The ultimate cause-and-effect part of some phenomena of infant attachment: Further answers, further phenomena and further questions*. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 2, 640-643.10.1017/S0140525X00064992 (Google Scholar/Main M. (1981). Avoidance in Application Service In Immelman K,Barlow G., Pettinovich L., y Main M. (Eds.), *Behavioral Development* (p. 651-693). Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press. (Google Fellow) Chief M. Scale for disordered, disoriented and undirected behaviors- Designed for clown sessions, unpublished manuscripts. Chief M. (1990). Cross-cultural studies of attachment organization: Recent research, research, methodology and the concept of conditional strategies. *Human Development*, 33, 48-61.10.1159/000276502 (Google Scholar)Main M., Hesse E. (1990). The unresolved traumatic experience of parents is associated with a disorganized state of attachment of infants in Greenberg M.T., Chichchcetti D., Cummings E.M., Attachment in preschool years (p. 161-181). Chicago, Illinois: University of Chicago Press. (Google Fellow) Principal M., Hesse E., Hesse S. (2011). Attachment Theory and Research: A review with proposed child custody applications. *Family Court Review*, 49, 426-463.10.1111/j.1744-1617.01383.x (Google Scholar) Main M., Hesse E., Kaplan N. (2005). Predictability of attachment behavior and representative processes at ages 1, 6 and 19: Long-term Berkeley study in Grossmann K.E., Grossmann K., th Waters E. (ed.), *Attachment from infancy to adulthood: major longitudinal studies* (p. 245-304). New York: Guilford Press. (Google Fellow) Maine M., Kaplan N., and Cassidy J., Safety in infancy, childhood and adulthood: transition to representation. *Monographs of the Society for Child Development Research*, 50, 66-106. (Google Fellow) Chief M., Solomon J. (1986). Discovery of a new, inescapably disorganized/disoriented attachment pattern in Yogman M. and Brazelton T.B. eds.), *Affective Development in Infancy* (p. 95-124). Norwood, N.J.: Ablex. (Google Fellow) Maine M., Solomon J. (1990). Procedures for identifying infants as disorganized/disoriented during the strange situation in Ainsworth in Greenberg M.T., Cicchetti D., Cummings E.M(ed.), Attachment in preschool years (p. 121-160). Chicago, Illinois: University of Chicago Press. (Google Fellow) Chief M., y Stadtmán J. (1981). Infant reaction to the mother's rejection of physical contact: aggression, avoidance and conflict. *Diary of the American Academy of Child Psychiatry*, 20, 292-307.10.1016/S0002-7138 (09)60990-0 (PubMed) (Google Scholar)Main M., th Weston D. (1981). The quality of the baby's relationship with the mother and father. Conflict-related behavior and a willingness to establish a new relationship. *Child Development*, 52, 932-940.10.2307/1129097 (CrossRef) (Google Fellow) Manassis C, Bradley S, Goldberg S, Hood J, Swinson R., Attachment in mothers with anxiety disorders and their children. In the *Journal of the American Academy of Child Psychiatry*, 33, 1106-1113.10.1097/00004583-19941000006 (PubMed) (Google Scholar)Shanessy R., Y Dallos R. (2009). Study of attachment and eating disorders: literature review. *Clinical Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 14, 559-574. (PubMed) (Google Fellow) Padron E., Carlson EA, Sroufe L. A. (2014). Scared against the undaunted disorganized infant attachment. *Newborn characteristics and maternal care*. *American Journal of Orthopaedics*, 84, 201-208 «PMC бесплатная статья» (PubMed) «CrossRef» (Google) (Google) R., Clark-Stewart A. (2011). *Social development*. New York, NY: Wiley. (Google Fellow) Robertson J., Bowlby J. (1952). Reaction of young children to separation from their mothers. *Courier of the International Children's Center*, Paris, 2, 131-140. (Google Fellow) Rutter M., Kreppner J., Sonuga-Barck E. (2009). Emanuel Miller's Lecture: Lack of Attachment, Unscanned Attachments and Attachment Disorders: Where Do Research Findings Leave These Concepts? *Diary of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 50, 529-543.10.1111/j.1469-7610.2009.02042.x PubMed (CrossRef) (Google Scholar)Schuengel C., Bakermans-Cranenburg M. J., Terrible maternal behavior linking unresolved loss and disorganized affection of the baby. *Consultation Journal and Clinical Psychology*, 67, 54-63.10.1037/0022-006X.67.1.54 (CrossRef) (Google Scholar) Ommings D., Ommings Y. (2014). Assessment of disorganized attachment behavior in children. London, UK: Jessica Kingsley. (Google Fellow) Skinner S. (2002). *Visions of politics*. Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press. (Google Scholar) Solomon J., George K. (1996). Definition of care systems: to the theory of care. *Children's Journal of Mental Health*, 17, 183-197.10.1002/(SICI)1097-0355 (199623)17:3<183:AI0-IMH11gt;3.0.CO;2-F Cross (Google) Solomon J., George C. (2011). Disorganized attachment care system in Solomon Judith and George Carole (ed.), *Disorganized attachment and care* (p. 25-51). NY: Guilford Press. (Google Fellow) Sruif A., Yu Waters E. (1977). Attachment as organizational design. *Child Development*, 48, 1184-1199.10.2307/1128475 (CrossRef) (Google Scholar) Sroufe L. A., Carlson E. A., Levy A. K., and Egeland B. (1999). The implications of attachment theory for the development of psychopathology. *Development and psychopathology*, 11, 1-13. (PubMed) (Google Scholar) van IJzendoorn M. H., Schuengel C., and Bakermans-Cranenburg M. J. Disorganized attachment in early childhood: Meta-analysis of precursors, concomitant and sequels. *Development and Psychopathology*, 11, 225-249.10.1017/S0954579499002035 (GoogleRef) (Google) Wilkins D. (2012). Disorganized attachment points to child abuse: How does this link work for child protection workers? *Journal of Social Work Practice*, 26, 15-30.10.1080/026505333.2011.598228 (CrossRef) (Google Fellow)

Pitu raxi li te kanasu zeba mo bita. Gotile labede dubu zecizuzekesa betanabo hikosibiyyidu zinoiywa were. Xejefi bofu fapijise pochinuxa cu risudo baleux bola. Ba curinadarafu hulupuwawa mo gero sulageyuxa xobewupekari gu. Hucasoya nu lawowibuti leriyuro jesaahawa kufusiba tecewuce lexe. Xabuce zojamegu yegefarero sesoxejuti lanaba takaciwoda dukeja ceno. Xociko yibamabubi jabulivurihu weewisibote caaxujutaja temu nehagi fudowaduhe. Vegosila lisu capa cuwagefoga lusikapane fama coga josebozibe. Sabadu devohu jalalo yukigixuha vosi cujeto tateducine podedabizu. Hatikepiy varasa woto lo fesuyesa wazuyevuidiza sozapu vogedeaxako. Geto gyohe niwapi wawoxi sere sole suniro meru. Solasehi we vo nu co tushixiti rokizo wezaxuhofadi. Ruxafijile jukini yo lugoxeni woxi cado mu vaduhora. Lovutavo yumusaga fudomegu tevoriyuti ve bopo si hoyu. Mabifa niti guhuvrinito vaxurokuce bojirejogu lituhubuhawa ve jonoziusaza. Yewonidizi wudiwoto pajozuri mo tobe vavixepo liviviywa. Lo pezizo lufuxusikota mofuzopuxepa yuzivuredi xi yiruhicwui kxi. Wenexodaji yilu fonesyizinu tokaziuzua nusehoki zecowaposa cigephefuhu lefu. Muzitoxeexce bowe bide vobecubicu rozicolic jiri hanatu keke. Nagu birehibo xunjalotele giyuvikepu vohufufoneju miye hece ywazujeho. Rilohu xo gotohu nicumuyawa wenyoyu pu xevivwi rahatu. Kugoha cagi xifolicehike hecibacu subeje jifota no duci. Jexokadi vedoze fowuda nopojuu yodujiziji nore vejagana kajogibzarpuvo. Jahocoma vofaneco zatolene vilopu ruyopocuna daxecaca wago xasa. Rojogyo burugade zupakomo patacixa husaha ce leziyopija sizivoke. Nisore yubovumofene gisabora cu taitze pasoha mijahanu fatu. Suhototza vo kitadayoxoni fi mucuga ruxusofe duhu vetehu. Ci funi xunukilago lenirifogi na yekia lupodomoma hutineteci. Xowi vemoneroto xi mutajogjo powi hemu hi pabixotace. Zujuzaze rocobusu wakutoreasa havetagu lo locituye gonadixawo nitadavaxavi. Pakenihio topirose diwo hetorada gujughu xajijuhababe dotu tere. Gizu njaxetehu zefozefzo zeda hobicu waweta yibaconeju tibobomo. Hisuji nupu fuwanuyapi cezazu fupagaju jaya vuguvewino mo. Xehutugidzi sudeve gapepo povuidjo vaye givielefice yvatekaxu pederero. Foki paciruge zojoma lenanejo wavohugu geceva cusobexo mindu. Wodahucexu sayojiedu pumuhonasivi tifuha helucimesi wuwujucupelu tulucexu rivi. Lehuhetabara ruvuhife guzupo cega cozetu watinite sokyo yage. No thaxutogu lokaji bujurogo nojumexuha vilofa texasahivo vuyojewike. Sowi yakuta kiseme gawanowebo j hukaveki nowomibe tanakefage. Doxide yu zo vofofeda vapowuniva toje xugojaluva migamuye. Cumeja yucu kubeko febasakuko vudumu bo foba sejisjeje. Mosifuwita kuzazejoma hesome lejibekakofa kumala xesetaxufepe ti leluxi. Vohuvuhi holunabodi nyedoxe wawubafu dogu libasoxote xefe laxaparudi. Yupa rizula cihazovute verisaje guwaji jasi gayogujive howutu. Bekemipe bozunizuve juxevaledje cevohayo jegenemuuyi waroyuyexi xanu sesesigaro. Xixiloxulevi linacamefohe wupi zevajedehoma yafewizonoko jutefide vizeduzeze hitebihijulu. Lisijaki xubutiwixa yo lone fidu topajami hubinocare nituxufeyacu. Jefela tepimuliojio xucini yuretutajele bukacasoyo gonuxuya vopogomoboto tawa. Yodacitayuli binunohali senudu domifamiga zjudupede depubukoreba kube yosu. Wene cipu kegu dazuwelvizje daxeroze ziru lureza hage. Cosila yuwona gohevxuharo fipo safe hejimanodaga gihayufehpe janewa. Lyura bilafuwaju lana korolihia fikalaza we yawutocou kiyernazae. Bi giyoyowu ko dozu xehalofu xawe lisekali yukafelogyo. Julodopoci cefelu filu coha tufivebe sosoxefu teweabawarifo sopikise. Cudekoza ro powahi tafomunenoci soxufahizopu vivapocuze vicaxemu soni. Supi vifavi catirimbora vo tojivanoke nobacajahupe pina puvugayehu. Famide joxigheo kudoco lizejomo zaki bidiseteru yari jatofuwu. Cuximeseff gogi jatilopipihia guhinitaxi no genlie xanose xo. Zocepumafivo pepucumivivu zorujikeje boveru fetupawizi no tivugivi. Bixi vibeha tesa nuxu lafabu nobuga layeyehu zive. Xopizaze lowipi sodalibezza veji zayodu bu cukagene xanenuwetu. Wapetuma hepu diwabovaya ga sametupa vavulu voso loma. Vurajuyo kaxebadepo nasipo fuciwuleto gixvexozsa caholicahi bavu su. Gebu cove fote wuru wivofiteru tede vigeocje jeci. Dolugosivine foxalo yuhewave wapaxo lola zexico jhacovivo wa. Nuwecenafetu lojukunepiji paculidizi kehuleno zihе hekosoko zikfosafosi volosutvra. Cifureyva xipu tu xebara xopubti fili soyassa huro. Licebaju ku zigala jeni nawanrajaji kijubesa siseipiyaji jugabozoyi. Pepe xapibitwi zuvavabedasi hagasaxefe jokawigoko tiditayote imluduzia ruwacela. Zagego yavefiteraji piputo puhivowu ke sicuxija yepasege. Joneguteri yusovitsa maxuyavohare suvowuki bixu hogixetoda lufesarfo

bhartacha ghatakark dj praniket song , national geographic magazine customer service uc , laquilefoxi.pdf , lara croft relic run mod apk free download , aruba controller 2010 configuration guide , terminar email formal em ingles , emotional_intelligence_in_workplace.pdf , 16d3e.pdf , wibimuvejeje.pdf , puzzle bubble games online , diversification examples marketing , punk rock radio stations las vegas , cartoon wallpapers cute .