SECON D INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS ON INTERPERSONAL ACCEPTANCE AND REJECTION (ICIAR)

Rethymno Greece

JULY 3-6, 2008

“Acceptance, Rejection, and Resilience Within Family, School, and Social-Emotional Contexts”

The Second International Congress on Interpersonal Acceptance and Rejection (ICIAR) will be held July 3–6, 2008 in Rethymno, at the University of Crete, Crete, Greece. Approximately 115 papers, posters, and symposia have been accepted. The official language of the Congress is English with simultaneous translation in Greek. Conference registration and reservations for accommodations can be made online using the Congress website www.isipar08.org. Fees are in Euros. Membership in the International Society for Interpersonal Acceptance and Rejection (ISIPAR) is open to anyone who subscribes to the Society’s mission. The mission is to support and encourage research and practice related to issues of interpersonal acceptance and rejection, including but not limited to parental acceptance-rejection, peer acceptance-rejection, acceptance-rejection in intimate adult relationships, and acceptance-rejection in other attachment relationships throughout the lifespan. Anyone with an interest in these issues is encouraged to become a member of the Society and attend the Congress in Crete this summer. Information about ISIPAR membership and dues payment can be found on page 4 of this newsletter and at www.isiparweb.org. Please encourage everyone you know who shares an interest in interpersonal acceptance and rejection to participate in the Congress, and to become members of the International Society for Interpersonal Acceptance and Rejection.

Invitation for Authors and Book Publishers

Authors and book publishers who wish to display their relevant books in the exhibition area, or who would like to submit their books in advance to the Congress should contact Ibis El Greco S.A. at info@isipar08.org

RESULTS OF THE 2008 ISIPAR ELECTION

In April, ISIPAR members were asked to vote for a new President-Elect and for Regional Representatives from five areas of the world. Approximately 59% of ISIPAR members voted. Please congratulate the following winners of this year’s ISIPAR elections:

- **President Elect**—Robert A. Veneziano, Ph.D., Professor of Social Work and Chair of the Department of Social Work at Western Connecticut State University, Danbury, CT, USA.
- **Regional Representative**, Insular Pacific & Australia—Rapson Gomez, Ph.D., Professor of Clinical Psychology, University of Tasmania, School of Psychology.
- **Regional Representative**, Mexico, Central America & the Caribbean—Claudia Alvarez, Ph.D., Adjunct Professor currently teaching in the Department of Education in the Master’s Program for Research and Evaluation in Education at the Universidad de Puerto Rico.
- **Regional Representative**, North Africa & the Middle East—Ramadan A. Ahmed, Ph.D., Professor of Psychology, College of Social Sciences, Kuwait University, Kuwait
- **Regional Representative**, North America—Shaila Khan, Ph.D., Associate Professor and Chair of the Department of Psychology in Tougaloo College, Jackson, Mississippi.
- **Regional Representative**, Southeast Asia—Shamsul Haque, Ph.D., Senior Lecturer at Monash University, Sunway Campus, and Academic Coordinator of psychology at the School of Medicine and Health Sciences at Monash University in Malaysia.

The incumbents will officially assume office at the end of the Business Meeting at this summer’s 2nd ICIAR in Crete.
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Affectionate Exchange: The Salient Nature of Affectionate Communication

By Melissa Ann Tafoya, Ph.D.
University of Connecticut, USA
melissa.tafoya@uconn.edu

A growing body of literature suggests that humans are biologically hardwired to form close relationships and to connect with others (Steverink & Lindenberg, 2006). Even at birth, infants actively communicate and interact in ways that facilitate social interactions. In turn, these social interactions influence future development (Reis & Collins, 2004). Humans are born with innate mechanisms that facilitate relational development, and fulfill their basic need for interpersonal contact (Guisinger & Blatt, 1994). In other words, humans are inherently driven by a need for intimacy and affection. The following sections describe the significant role that affection and affectionate communication play in a person’s life. Subsequently, a theory of affectionate communication is offered to explain why affection is so important to the human experience.

It may be unsurprising that love and affection are among the most fundamental human needs (Floyd & Morman, 1998). Moreover, affection is mentioned in nearly every typology of fundamental human needs (Floyd, Mikkelson, Hesse, & Pauley, 2007). Researchers have long recognized the importance of affection in human social interaction and interpersonal processes (Floyd & Morman, 1998). It is necessary, however, to differentiate between “affection” and “affectionate communication.” Affection is an internal psychological state of positive, often intimate regard for one another (Floyd & Voloudakis, 1999). Put simply, affection is the feeling of liking, love, trust, and acceptance (Steverink & Lindenberg, 2006). “Affectionate communication,” on the other hand, is the expression of feelings of love, fondness, and positive regard through nonverbal and verbal behaviors (Floyd, Hess, Miczo, Halone, Mikkelonson, & Tusing, 2005).

People express affection both verbally (e.g., “I love you”) and nonverbally (e.g., through hugs, kisses, touch; Guerrero & Floyd, 2006). Floyd and Morman (1998) proposed that nonverbal affectionate behaviors should be placed into two categories: Direct and indirect. Direct nonverbal affectionate behaviors are overt affectionate behaviors, in which the meaning is understood by all individuals involved, including those observing the behavior (e.g., hugging and kissing). Touch is one of the most provoking forms of affection (Guerrero & Floyd, 2006). Guerrero and Floyd include hugging, kissing, caressing another’s face, holding hands, touching one’s arm or leg, and so forth as ways to convey affection, in addition to being interpreted as expressions of affection, love, and intimacy. Indirect nonverbal affectionate behaviors, or supportive affection, are covert behaviors, in which the meaning may not be easily interpreted. For example, doing favors for someone or helping with a particular task may convey affection through the use of helpfulness and supportiveness (Guerrero & Floyd). Altruistic behaviors fit within the category of indirect nonverbal affectionate behaviors. Floyd and Morman (2001) claim that these three forms of affectionate communication may be used differently. That is, patterns found for one form of affection may deviate from patterns found for the other forms of affection (Floyd & Morman, 2001).

The mental and physical health benefits of receiving affectionate messages are well-documented. Although research has focused largely on the positive outcomes and benefits of receiving affectionate communication, emerging research underscores the benefits of expressing affection (Floyd, 2002). Importantly, there are both individual-level and relational-level benefits of expressing affection that are independent of receiving affection. For example, Floyd and Mikkelson (2005) found that expressed affection made a significant and independent contribution to the variance of individuals’ mental and physical well-being, after controlling for the effects of receiving affection. Specifically, Floyd et al. (2005) demonstrated that expressing affection to others is positively related to happiness, self-esteem, and relationship satisfaction, and negatively related to depression susceptibility and fear of intimacy. Not only has expressing affection been shown to be beneficial in self-reports of psychological and emotional well-being, but it has also been shown to benefit objective markers of physical health, such as cholesterol levels (Floyd, Mikkelson, Hesse, & Pauley, 2007a), as well as blood pressure, heart rate, and blood glucose levels (Floyd, Mikkelson, Tafoya, Farinelli, La Valley, Judd, Haynes, Davis, & Wilson, 2007b). Research also shows that expressing affection to a loved one—even when it is not reciprocated—accelerates stress (adrenocortical) recovery following an acute stressor. The effect of expressing affection is significantly greater than simply thinking affectionately about a loved one (Floyd et al., 2007b).

Human affection exchange theory (AET; Floyd, 2001) is an important theoretical framework from which expressing and receiving affection can be addressed. The theory identifies affectionate communication as an adaptive behavior contributing to human’s omnipresent drive for reproductive success (Floyd & Morr, 2003; Floyd, Sargent, & DiCorcia, 2004). Low affectionate communicators have been found to be less advantaged in a number of psychological, emotional, mental, interpersonal, and social characteristics relative to highly affectionate communicators (Floyd, 2002).
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Affectionate exchange theorists make a direct connection between communication of affection and human’s short-term and long-term survival and reproductive abilities (Floyd et al., 2004). The theory offers three major postulates arguing that affectionate communication explicitly contributes to humans’ superordinate goals of viability and fertility (Floyd & Morman, 2001). First, affectionate communication promotes the development and maintenance of human pair bonds (long-term romantic relationships). This provides associated resources and benefits to each person, thereby increasing their chance of survival (postulate 1). Second, short-term reproductive opportunities are increased as an individual’s affectionate communication signals indicate to potential mates that one would be a fit parent (postulate 2). Third, when individuals communicate affection to their biological children, the benefits associated with receiving affection increase the children’s likelihood of reproduction by contributing to their suitability as mates. This serves long-term reproductive-success goals (postulate 3).

AET is grounded in the assumption that affectionate communication is adaptive; therefore, it is governed by the precise superordinate motivations it serves. Thus, affectionate exchange theory posits that expressions or displays of affection will vary, dependent on the motivation being served. The more directly such motivations are served the more likely affectionate behaviors will occur (Floyd & Morman, 2001; Floyd et al., 2004).

Long-term evolutionary success is maximized by investing resources discriminatively in those who are more likely to pass one’s genes to future generation. This is evident in individuals’ tendency toward nepotism and in the fundamental evolutionary principle that “natural selection promotes preferential treatment of relatives over nonrelatives” (Daly & Wilson, 1980, p. 283). Here, it is assumed that individuals are more inclined to share resources with those with whom they are genetically related than with those with whom they are not genetically related (Floyd & Morman, 2001). Research has demonstrated this difference in affectionate communication within various relationships. For example, pair bonds tend to communicate more affection to one another than to siblings or in-laws (Floyd & Morr, 2003); biological children tend to receive more affectionate communication from parents than stepchildren (Floyd & Morman, 2001), and heterosexual children tend to be favored over homosexual children by parental affectionate displays (Floyd et al., 2004).

These findings support Daly and Wilson’s (1980) construct of discriminative parental solicitude, which explains unequal resource allocation by parents as a means of maximizing their chances of passing on their own genes to future generations.

Affectionate communication is one such resource. Affectionate communication is thought to be a resource which contributes to evolutionary success, and is therefore distributed within a given relationship to the extent it serves such success. For instance, the amount of affection parents provide to their children may be mitigated by children’s potential to pass on parental genes.

In conclusion, humans are—above all—intensely social animals (Bjorklund & Blasi, 2005). Compared to all other social mammals, humans establish the most complex and enduring social relationships (Bereczkei, 2000). Reis and Collins (2004) argue that there are few features of the environment that have greater salience in human life than the nature of human’s interpersonal relationships (Reis & Collins, 2004). Across the lifespan, interpersonal relationships play a central and influential role in nearly every domain of existence (Reis & Collins, 2004), whether in families, friendships, romantic relationships, organizations, neighborhoods, or societies (Fishbane, 2007). Interpersonal relationships are the foundation and theme of human life (Reis & Collins, 2004).

Affectionate communication is a critical component of interpersonal relational development, definition, and maintenance (Floyd, 1998). “Besides influencing relationship maintenance, affectionate behavior contributes to everything from physical health and mental well-being to academic performance and individual happiness” (Floyd & Mikkelson, 2005).
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Floyd, K., & Voloudakis, M. (1999). Contributions to Theory, Research, and Practice on Interpersonal Acceptance and Rejection: Outstanding Paper of the Biennium is awarded to Professor Ariel Knafo. Dr. Knafo is currently assistant professor in the Department of Psychology at The Hebrew University of Jerusalem in Israel. His paper, entitled Parental Discipline and Affection and Children’s Prosocial Behavior: Genetic and Environmental Links, co-authored with Robert Plomin of King’s College London, England, was published in the *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 2006, Vol. 90*, No. 1, 147-164. Correspondence regarding the article should be addressed to Ariel Knafo, at msarielk@huji.ac.il. Formal presentation of a US $1,000 award will be made to Dr. Knafo at this summer’s 2nd ICAR in Crete, Greece. Dr. Knafo will give a plenary address on his work at the Congress. Please join the Rohner Center in extending sincere congratulations!

Members of ISIPAR interested in entering the next competition can obtain information at www.isiparweb.org/index_files/Page1034.htm
Parental acceptance-rejection theory (PARTheory) postulates that perceived rejection by a significant other at any point in life is likely to be associated with the same cluster of personality dispositions as those found among children and adults who were rejected by major caregivers in childhood. These dispositions include anger, aggression, passive aggression, or problems with the management of hostility and aggression; dependence or defensive independence, depending on the form, frequency, timing, and intensity of rejection; impaired self-esteem; impaired self-adequacy; emotional unresponsiveness; emotional instability; and negative worldview. Until recently no cross-national study tested this proposition among intimate adult partners. The Special Issue reviewed here rectifies that shortcoming by comparing the eight articles from nine countries in the Issue (Rohner & Melendez, 2008).

In these eight articles, the following questions were explored: 1) To what extent is perceived acceptance or rejection by an intimate partner in adulthood associated with the same form of psychological adjustment or maladjustment that perceived parental acceptance-rejection is known to be in childhood? 2) To what extent do remembrances of maternal or paternal acceptance in childhood mediate or influence in other ways the association between perceived partner acceptance and adults’ psychological adjustment? By comparing these eight studies in this review, the third question asked in the Special Issue could be explored: 3) Do statistical relations found in these questions vary by culture, ethnicity, gender of parent, gender of offspring, or by other contextual factors?

In order to maximize direct comparability across studies, all authors used the same set of measures in their research, translated as needed into required languages. These measures included: The Intimate Adult Relationship Questionnaire, or the Intimate Partner Acceptance-Rejection/Control Questionnaire; adult versions of the Parental Acceptance-Rejection Questionnaire, or Parental Acceptance-Rejection/Control Questionnaire for both mothers and fathers; the Adult Personality Assessment Questionnaire; and the Personal Information Form, or an adaptation of it. Countries in the study included Colombia (combined with Puerto Rico), Finland, India, Japan, Korea, Kuwait, Turkey, and the USA. Sample characteristics are summarized in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Sample size</th>
<th>Age: Mean (SD)</th>
<th>Adult Relationship Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>96 m, 126 f</td>
<td>22 (7.3) m, 22 (6.7) f</td>
<td>Romantic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>32 m, 134 f</td>
<td>28 (9.2) m, 19% Non-romantic f</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>56 m, 59 f</td>
<td>32 (10) m, Non-romantic f</td>
<td>Married</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>24 m, 58 f</td>
<td>22.5 (2.8) m, Non-romantic f</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>71 m, 62 f</td>
<td>23.3 (2.6) m, 36% Non-romantic f</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuwait</td>
<td>179 m, 210 f</td>
<td>21 (2.6) m, Married f</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>161 m, 520 f</td>
<td>31.7 (10.9) m, Married; Romantic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>67 m, 421 f</td>
<td>24 (8.8) m, 22 (4.8) f</td>
<td>Romantic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results of analyses showed that, overall, respondents (both males and females) in all nations reported their intimate partners as well as their parents (both mothers and fathers) to be warm and accepting. There was, however, considerable variation in self-reported psychological adjustment, as shown in Table 2. Variability in both men’s and women’s psychological adjustment tended in all but five instances to correlate significantly with perceived partner acceptance as well as with remembrances of maternal and paternal acceptance in childhood.

Continued on page 6
Table 2. Mean (and Standard Deviations) of Psychological Adjustment and Interpersonal Acceptance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Psychological Adjustment m</th>
<th>Psychological Adjustment f</th>
<th>Partner Acceptance m</th>
<th>Partner Acceptance f</th>
<th>Father Acceptance m</th>
<th>Father Acceptance f</th>
<th>Mother Acceptance m</th>
<th>Mother Acceptance f</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>119.1 (26.4)</td>
<td>120.9 (24.4)</td>
<td>89.9 (23.4)</td>
<td>86.6 (20.1)</td>
<td>106.9 (33.4)</td>
<td>100.2 (33.8)</td>
<td>95.4 (23.2)</td>
<td>97.2 (33.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>117.8 (18.1)</td>
<td>123.7 (18.0)</td>
<td>91.5 (16.9)</td>
<td>86.9 (19.4)</td>
<td>104.0 (31.16)</td>
<td>97.0 (28.01)</td>
<td>82.0 (30.14)</td>
<td>84.0 (26.96)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>139.0 (17.27)</td>
<td>134.2 (22.87)</td>
<td>111.0 (26.92)</td>
<td>100.3 (27.42)</td>
<td>112.4 (31.16)</td>
<td>104.8 (28.01)</td>
<td>110.4 (30.14)</td>
<td>102.5 (26.96)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>148.5 (18.1)</td>
<td>150.7 (17.3)</td>
<td>112.3 (18.0)</td>
<td>103.8 (19.5)</td>
<td>126.4 (24.2)</td>
<td>115.7 (21.0)</td>
<td>110.8 (22.3)</td>
<td>105.8 (21.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>135.8 (24.9)</td>
<td>145.9 (22.8)</td>
<td>103.0 (22.6)</td>
<td>80.0 (20.8)</td>
<td>105.2 (25.8)</td>
<td>104.9 (27.3)</td>
<td>97.3 (18.9)</td>
<td>104.1 (24.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuwait</td>
<td>134.0 (23.0)</td>
<td>136.0 (23.0)</td>
<td>99.0 (24.0)</td>
<td>102.3 (27.0)</td>
<td>106.6 (26.0)</td>
<td>103.0 (27.0)</td>
<td>95.3 (23.0)</td>
<td>101.0 (29.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>127.9 (23.1)</td>
<td>128.2 (23.5)</td>
<td>89.3 (24.9)</td>
<td>87.5 (28.4)</td>
<td>107.8 (31.8)</td>
<td>102.8 (33.0)</td>
<td>95.3 (26.8)</td>
<td>98.7 (34.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>117.3 (22.1)</td>
<td>121.1 (23.6)</td>
<td>83.5 (19.0)</td>
<td>80.2 (19.9)</td>
<td>91.8 (24.1)</td>
<td>92.3 (32.7)</td>
<td>86.0 (22.9)</td>
<td>89.4 (30.2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results of standard multiple regression analyses showed that, overall, the linear combination of the three predictor variables was significantly related to psychological adjustment, including one only marginally significant relationship for men in Japan. However, there was substantial variability in the nature of the contributions (i.e., partners, mothers, fathers, or some combination of these) to adults’ psychological adjustment.

For men, perceived partner acceptance was significantly associated with psychological adjustment in all studies except in Finland. The nature of the association between perceived partner acceptance and psychological adjustment for men varied from being entirely unique (US and Colombia), entirely mediated by remembrances of mothers’ acceptance (Japan), or entirely mediated by remembrances of fathers’ acceptance (India), to partially mediated by just fathers’ acceptance (Kuwait), just mothers’ acceptance (Korea), and both fathers’ and mothers’ acceptance (Turkey). For women, on the other hand, perceived partner acceptance was associated with psychological adjustment in all eight studies. Here the nature of the association varied from being entirely unique (Finland), or entirely mediated by remembrances of fathers’ acceptance (Japan and India) or remembrances of both fathers’ acceptance and mothers’ acceptance (Korea), to partially mediated by just fathers’ acceptance (US) or both fathers’ and mothers’ acceptance (Colombia, Turkey, Kuwait).

A significant independent contribution to psychological adjustment by perceived partner acceptance for both men and women was made in a total of five countries. Remembrances of fathers’ acceptance in childhood made a significant independent contribution for women in all sites, and for both men and women in half of the sites. Remembrances of mothers’ acceptance in childhood made a significant independent contribution to men’s psychological adjustment in five sites, and to women’s adjustment in four out of the eight sites.

With respect to the contribution of other contextual factors, I should note that there were sampling differences related to culture, the nature of the adult relationship, age range, and gender. For example, samples in Japan, Korea and Kuwait had a high proportion of young adults. Colombia, India, Kuwait, Turkey, and the USA reported samples consisting largely of romantic relationships or marriages. From 19% to 68% of the unmarried respondents in Finland, Korea, and Japan, however, reported being in non-romantic friendship relationships. Rough comparisons using either the nature of the relationship or age range did not seem to explain significant amounts of variability in statistical relations reported in the studies.
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Conclusion

Overall, respondents (both males and females) in all nations tended to perceive their intimate partners to be warm and accepting. Respondents also tended to remember their mothers and fathers to have been—overall—warm and accepting in childhood. In addition, after controlling for remembered parental acceptance in childhood, perceived partner acceptance by itself tended in the majority of cases to make a unique and significant contribution to self-reported psychological adjustment. Remembrances of fathers’ acceptance in childhood tended in many cases to be more strongly associated with psychological adjustment than either remembrances of mothers’ acceptance or partner acceptance. Overall, results of these studies are consistent with previous research based on PARTheory (Parmar & Rohner, 2005; Rohner & Khaleque, in press; Rohner & Veneziano, 2001).

Having said this, however, I should point out that there is considerable variation in the psychological adjustment of respondents in these studies, as well as in the magnitude of statistical relations between perceived acceptance-rejection and psychological adjustment. The question remains whether this variation is due to culture, the nature of the adult relationship, age, gender, measurement error, or to a combination of these factors. For instance, perceived partner acceptance did not contribute uniquely to the psychological adjustment of women in Japan, Korea, and India. This may be related to the fact that most wives in the Indian sample were involved in arranged marriages rather than “love” marriages. It may also be related to the fact that 55% of the Japanese women reported being in non-romantic friendship relationships with their intimate partners; 36% of the unmarried Korean women did the same. Although empirical evidence supports the idea that intimate friendships are often significant predictors of psychological adjustment in childhood, it is possible that the meaning of that form of relationship may be different in adulthood.

Finally, I should mention that predictors of psychological adjustment were more variable for men in these studies than they were for women. This variability could be a function—at least in part—of the fact that sample sizes for men also tended to be much smaller than for women. Thus, some of the apparently non-significant statistical relations found among men could be an artifact of small sample size. Future studies should increase sample sizes and focus on distinguishing between the relative contribution of developmental stage, ethnicity, gender, and form of the intimate relationship.
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HOST STILL NEEDED FOR 2010 INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS ON INTERPERSONAL ACCEPTANCE AND REJECTION

Thinking ahead to 2010, a volunteer (or volunteers) is still needed to host the International Congress on Interpersonal Acceptance and Rejection (ICIAr). As we consider the 2010 location, the Conference site should be: Reasonably priced, easily accessible, interesting, comfortable, and available to people of all nationalities. It should also be associated with a university community. Additionally, the chairperson of the local arrangements committee should, ideally, live in the area where the conference will be convened. If you are interested in hosting the 3rd ICIAr—and sharing your part of the world with others—please contact ISPAR’s President (Ronald P. Rohner) at r.rohner@uconn.edu.
NEED TO RATIFY THE REVISED EDITION OF ISIPAR’S CONSTITUTION AND BYLAWS

ISIPAR’s Constitution and Bylaws were recently revised to make them compliant with U.S. federal tax laws. In the course of doing this, the Society was officially incorporated in the State of Connecticut, and is now in the process of applying for federal 501(c)3 tax exempt status. Though the revisions were ratified in July, 2007 by ISIPAR’s Executive Council, they must also be ratified by the full membership of the Society. Accordingly, the Executive Council requests that all members review these documents online at www.isiparweb.org/ISIPAR%20Constitution%20and%20Bylaws.pdf. Members will be asked to vote on the revisions during the Society’s Business meeting this summer at the 2nd ICIAR in Crete.

INTERNATIONAL STUDY ON THE DIFFERENTIAL INFLUENCE OF MATERNAL AND PATERNAL LOVE-RELATED BEHAVIORS

Rob Veneziano, Ph.D., Director, International Father Acceptance-Rejection Project
Western Connecticut State University, USA
raffven@usa.net

Many ISIPAR members have expressed an interest in participating in an international study concerning the relative influence of fathers’ versus mothers’ love-related behaviors on children’s development. Many members have already conducted research showing that fathers’ love-related behavior is often a better predictor of developmental outcomes than mothers’; sometimes fathers’ love-related behavior is the sole predictor of such outcomes for children, adolescents, and adults. Remarkably, these findings have emerged from studies conducted across the globe, including in samples from India, Pakistan, Egypt, Turkey, Colombia, Estonia, Finland, Moldova, Japan, the British West Indies, and other locales including rural and urban North America (see also Mariolijn Blom’s review in this Issue of “Parental Acceptance-Rejection Theory Studies of Intimate Adults Relationships”). The question is no longer: Are fathers important? Rather, the question is now, why do fathers appear to be so very important?

The first focus-group meeting for the International Father Acceptance-Rejection Project (IFARP) was held at the University of Connecticut in March, 2008. Drs. Tiia Tulviste (Estonia), Abdul Khaleque (Bangladesh), Ron Rohner, and I developed a set of guidelines for conducting international research on the topic. We think children’s perceptions of a significant differential between mothers’ and fathers’ power and prestige within families may prove to be an important predictor of their relative impact on children’s development.

At this point we should note that we define power as the ability individuals have to influence the opinions and behaviors of others (Rohner, 1967). Prestige, on the other hand, is defined here in terms of the signs of social approval, esteem, respect, admiration, or being highly regarded by others (Rohner, 1967). Power and prestige in most small groups (e.g., families) tend to be strongly correlated, and they tend to be distributed unequally throughout the group. That is, no two individuals share the same amount of either. Consequently, members of groups may be ranked in both power and prestige—or what we may call the power-prestige structure.

Our goal is to convene a forum at the 2nd International Congress on Interpersonal Acceptance and Rejection. At that time we will expand the initial focus group to include all interested PARtheory researchers. Together we can develop a set of research protocols that scholars from across the globe may employ. The forum will include 1) the goals of the project and possible publication venues; 2) a brief presentation and discussion of several instruments that the initial focus group agreed have the potential to be usable across cultures; and, 3) a brief summary of the key theoretical and statistical explanations offered by scholars for the findings about the relative influence of fathers versus mothers. The remainder of the meeting will serve as both a focus group and a working group to prepare us to identify research designs and help launch research projects over the next one to two years. Scholars working with samples from Bangladesh, Estonia, India, Pakistan, Turkey, the USA, and others are already primed to begin.

If you are interested in joining this project, please let me know, and try to participate in the forum this summer in Crete.

Acceptance: The Essence of Peace

A publication of selected papers from the First International Congress on Interpersonal Acceptance and Rejection held in Istanbul, Turkey, June 2006, will be available for sale at this summer’s Congress in Crete, Greece. For more information about the book contact Fatşi Erkman, Editor, at ferkman@gmail.com.

FORTHCOMING CONFERENCES


Deadline for submission of material for publication in the September issue of Interpersonal Acceptance is August 1, 2008. Please direct correspondence to Ronald P. Rohner, Editor r.rohner@uconn.edu
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