



INTERPERSONAL ACCEPTANCE

International Society for Interpersonal Acceptance and Rejection

May 2010

Volume 4, No. 2

University of Connecticut

Rohner Center Awards for Distinguished Contributions to Theory, Research, and Practice on Interpersonal Acceptance and Rejection

Mattie Tops, Ph.D.

2010 OUTSTANDING PAPER OF THE BIENNIUM

Tops, M., Riese, H., Oldehinkel, A.J., Rijdsdijk, F. V., & Ormel, J. (2008). Rejection sensitivity relates to hypocortisolism and depressed mood state in young women. *Psychoneuroendocrinology*, 33, 551-559.



Dr. Tops is visiting professor in the Center for Child and Family Studies at the University of Leiden, The Netherlands. He is also a member of the Leiden Institute for Brain and Cognition. There he focuses on the ways in which early experiences and mother-infant interactions relate to psychophysiological adaptations and predispositions in the development of psychopathological syndromes.

An Award of \$1,000 USD is given each biennium to each winner of the University of Connecticut Rohner Center Award to acknowledge outstanding contributions to the field of interpersonal acceptance and rejection, and to help cover expenses associated with attending and giving an Awards Address at ISIPAR's international meetings.

John Pachankis, Ph.D.

2010 OUTSTANDING PAPER BY AN EARLY CAREER PROFESSIONAL

Pachankis, J.E., Goldfried, M.R., & Ramrattan, M.E. (2008). Extension of the rejection sensitivity construct to the interpersonal functioning of gay men. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 76, (2), 306-317.



Dr. Pachankis is Assistant Professor of Psychology at Yeshiva University, Bronx, New York. There he examines the psychological consequences of possessing a stigmatized identity. He follows three closely related lines of investigation: The mental health implications of possessing a concealable stigma like being gay or HIV-positive; anxiety reactions in stigmatized populations (e.g., social anxiety and rejection sensitivity in gay men); and, effective psychosocial interventions for individuals coping with these difficulties. The overarching goal of his research is to identify the social-cognitive mechanisms that may be implicated in mental health complications of stigmatized individuals while applying these findings to the psychotherapeutic alleviation of these difficulties.

INSIDE THIS ISSUE

2010 University of Connecticut Rohner Center Awards Winners	1
Article: The Role of Personal Control in Rejection: A Meta-Analysis of Experimental Research by Jonathan Gerber, Ph.D.	2
Article: Social Invisibility by Judy Tan, M.A.	4
2010 ISIPAR Election Results	6
2010 ICIAR Speakers	7
2nd Term as ISIPAR President and Past-President	7
Wisdom Quotes	7
2010 Congress-at-a-Glance	8
4th ICIAR	9

*Congratulations
Awards Winners!*

The Role of Control in Rejection: A Meta-Analysis of Experimental Research



by Jonathan Gerber, Ph.D.

Macquarie University

Sydney, Australia

Jonathan.Gerber@psy.mq.edu.au

Recent experimental research on rejection in social psychology has been divided over the effect of the rejection experience. Some researchers, for example, believe that rejection causes psychological distress, but others argue that rejection causes people to become numb. The *self-regulation account* of experimentally manipulated rejection (Baumeister, 2008; DeWall & Baumeister, 2006) suggests that such rejection turns people into zombies. This view says that experimentally manipulated rejection causes numbness: It makes people shut down emotionally and impairs their self-regulation. As a result, they don't know how to act, and may act antisocially—which may then prevent them being reincluded in the long run. Evidence for this accounting of experimentally manipulated rejection comes from studies suggesting that these rejected people often take foolish risks and choose unhealthy options (Baumeister, 2008; Oaten, Williams, Jones, & Zadro, 2007), and that these people lack interest in the results of future events, or the pain of others (DeWall & Baumeister, 2006). However, evidence of a lack of predicted *future* emotion may not actually reflect lack of *current* emotion given that predictions of future emotion often do not match actual emotions experienced (Wilson & Gilbert, 2003).

Ostracism theorists, on the other hand, subscribe to a view of rejection more similar to classic romantic comedies where rejection makes people feel bad, sad, and act in ways to regain lost belongingness and other thwarted needs. The evidence for this view comes from a series of studies using ostracism paradigms (described below). These studies have found that ostracism is nearly always painful, even when we are ostracized by those we wouldn't wish to be associated with, or when we are told that we were ostracized by a computer (see Williams, 2007, for a review). The constant distress of ostracism and the overlap of physical and social pain systems (Eisenberger, 2010; Williams & Eisenberger, 2007) suggest that humans are primed to detect ostracism and that this distress alerts us to an important environmental threat. Williams (2001) has argued that the threat of ostracism consists of its impact on four needs: Belonging, (i.e., having interactions with people), control (i.e., being able to exert some influence or control over people or things), self-esteem (i.e., feeling that you are worthwhile as a person), and meaningful existence (i.e., the sense that your life is meaningful). The problem with these studies is that the sole measure of the four needs is often a 12-item ostracism-needs scale used by Williams and colleagues (e.g., Zadro, Williams & Richardson, 2003).

In an attempt to start resolving some of these issues, we conducted a meta-analysis of experimental research on rejection (Gerber & Wheeler, 2009). In a broad sense we asked two sets of questions: How does experimentally manipulated rejection make people *feel*, and how does experimentally manipulated rejection make people *act*? We focussed particularly on individuals' current emotional state to assess the numbness accounts, and we compared self-report and behavioral measures to assess the needs-based distress accounts.

How do social psychologists experimentally reject people?

Social psychologists utilize four basic types of experimental rejection manipulations: 1) In the *reliving rejection* paradigm, rejection participants are asked to write a story about a time they were rejected, while control participants write either about a neutral experience or a time when they were included in an interpersonal event. 2) In the *future* (i.e., anticipated) *rejection* paradigm, participants complete a personality test. Rejected participants are told that the results reveal they are likely to end up alone in the future, whereas control participants are told they will have a future of either physical mishaps or social inclusion. Participants in this paradigm do not experience actual rejection: They are told it will happen years in the future. 3) In the *demarcated rejection* paradigm, the rejection of participants is clearly signalled. Typically, triplets of participants engage in some type of group task (e.g., discussion or group puzzles). Target individuals are then informed by the experimenter that no one wished to work with them, and that they will have to work alone. Included participants are told that everyone wishes to work with them, and as a result, pairs can't be worked out. Therefore, all participants will have to work alone on the next task. Demarcated rejection involves explicitly telling people that they have been rejected. 4) In the *ostracism tasks* paradigm, participants are excluded from a task but not told that they are being excluded. For example, participants may find themselves receiving no throws from two other participants with whom they had previously been playing a friendly computer game

The Role of Personal Control in Rejection...continued on Page 3

of ball toss. It usually takes participants some time to realise they have been excluded, making ostracism experientially different from demarcated rejection.

How does experimentally manipulated rejection make people *feel*?

When all the experiments were combined in the meta-analysis we found evidence that experimentally manipulated rejection affects mood ($d^+ = -0.50$). Where scales had separate measures of positive and negative mood, it was possible to show that positive mood was decreased following rejection, and that negative mood was increased. This finding of increased negative affect was not in line with predictions from self-regulation or numbness theory which predicts affect flattening (i.e., less negative affect) following experimentally manipulated rejection. When only current measures of arousal were considered, people did not appear to have lower arousal following rejection. Arousal (measured either by self-report or by physiological measures) did not decrease following relived rejection, demarcated rejection, or anticipated rejection. In the case of ostracism, however, experimentally manipulated rejection did increase arousal. Results of analyses also showed that self-esteem was lowered by exclusion ($d^+ = -0.70$). Rejection made people feel bad about who they were.

How does experimentally manipulated rejection make people *act*?

The actions people take following experimentally manipulated rejection have been one of the hot topics in experimental rejection research in recent years. While most rejection researchers would agree that rejection lowers belongingness, we additionally wanted to see whether there was evidence that control and meaningless existence (from Williams' ostracism model) are affected by more types of rejection than just ostracism. To do this, we tested whether there was evidence of need-threat following rejection, and whether the self-report and behavioural evidence exhibited similar effect sizes.

We classified respondents' reactions following rejection studies as any of three needs: Belonging, control, and meaningful existence. Belonging and control were strongly affected by rejection. People reported feeling out of control ($d^+ = -1.16$) and not belonging ($d^+ = -0.69$). They also tended to react in ways consistent with reestablishing those needs. Importantly, the effect sizes for behavioral and self-report measures of these two needs were similar, suggesting that there is behavioral evidence of belongingness threats and control threats following rejection. The evidence for threat to meaningful existence following

rejection was less convincing. Although there were large self-report effects ($d^+ = -1.79$) there was little behavioral ($d^+ = -0.23$) evidence of meaningful existence threats. One of the more surprising findings was that belongingness had a smaller overall effect size than did control. This may be due to larger variability in the belongingness effect size. Accordingly, we searched for a moderator of belongingness reactions, described next.

Why does experimentally manipulated rejection sometimes cause people to be antisocial and sometimes to act prosocially?

Recently, researchers have suggested there is a "belongingness paradox," in that people sometimes respond antisocially to rejection. Such behavior is likely to further cement their non-belonging status. Our meta-analysis confirmed this belonging paradox, but it also showed that some people respond prosocially to experimentally manipulated rejection. Part of the explanation for this apparent paradox lies in the identity of the target of aggression. That is, if the aggression target (i.e., the person on whom you try to take revenge) was neutral or friendly, then people tended to react prosocially ($d^+ = 0.88$). But if the aggression target was the rejector, then some studies found that the rejected persons tended to act antisocially (i.e., aggressively) whereas other studies found that rejected persons still tended to respond prosocially. So far we have been unable to fully explain this inconsistency. We did observe, however, that many of the antisocial responses seemed like ways of regaining control. For example, in one experimental paradigm, rejected people often saw to it that their rejectors had to pick up the pencils that had fallen to the floor. This constituted a petty form of control over the other person. On the other hand, some belongingness measures had no control component. For example, experimentally rejected people tend to unconsciously mimic the foot tapping rate of an experimenter. This mimicry is unlikely to lead to increased control. Curiously, dividing these belongingness measures into ones where being antisocial led to control versus ones where being antisocial didn't lead to control resolved the aggression (i.e., antisocial) paradox. That is, rejected people tended to be antisocial when they could gain control by being antisocial ($d^+ = -1.17$). On the other hand, rejected people tended to be prosocial if no control was to be gained by being antisocial ($d^+ = 1.21$). This moderator split the studies into two mirror-image groups, and also explained the variability in belongingness effect sizes. These conclusions await further experimental research, but supporting

The Role of Personal Control in Rejection...continued on Page 9



Social Invisibility

by Judy Tan, M.A.

University of Connecticut,
Storrs, CT, USA

judy.tan@uconn.edu

Much research evidence indicates that being the target of interpersonal rejection and exclusion has deleterious effects on the individual, including suboptimal task performance (e.g., Williams, 2007, Williams & Eisenberger, 2007), and physical and psychological pain and distress (e.g., Eisenberg & Lieberman, 2004). While research has focused on how specific targeted acts may lead individuals to feel rejected or left out, relatively little attention has focused on how *non-targeted* acts leave individuals feeling equally hurt and distressed. Based on empirical research that I conducted on experiences of being overlooked, ignored, and slighted, I argue that being a non-target, that is, being *socially invisible*, often results in negative affect and coping strategies (Tan, Pratto, & Johnson, 2010).

In this article, I distinguish social invisibility from ostracism, and then summarize the current literature relating to social invisibility. What makes social invisibility qualitatively distinct from other forms of interpersonal rejection? An anecdote may help clarify the distinction. Gornick (1989) wrote poignantly of her social invisibility at a dinner-party, being “the only woman at the table who is not there as a wife” (p. 123; Gornick, 1989). At the table, she spoke knowledgeably on the topic under discussion. However, it garnered no reaction—it was as if she had not spoken at all. Minutes later, a man parroted what she had said; this time it elicited immediate response and engagement. Important factors distinguish Gornick’s experience from other forms of interpersonal rejection, such as ostracism. First, Gornick was not ostracized *per se* because she was not acknowledged in the first place. The presence of a target must be acknowledged before he or she can be ostracized. Moreover, my findings based on a sample of 254 individuals reporting experiences of social invisibility indicate that the difference between social invisibility and ostracism lies in the way individuals perceive others treating them: Those who felt ostracized reported some type of social acknowledgment not reported by those who felt socially invisible (Tan et al., 2010).

To Gornick, being a woman and Jewish were salient characteristics implicated in her social invisibility. Group-based characteristics of the individual, such as age, gender, ethnicity, and disability status may cue one’s social invisibility in particular social contexts. In this way, social invisibility may be examined not only on an individual or interpersonal level, but also on a structural level as well. For example, scholars in the fields of psychology, communication, education, black identity, feminist, queer, and ethnic minority studies have employed a structural-level analysis in documenting the *obscurity* of stigmatized or devalued social group members (Franklin, 1999; Fryberg & Townsend, 2008; Lott, 1987; Purdie-Vaughns & Eibach, 2008; Saari, 2001; Yeh, Kim, Pituc, & Atkins, 2008). Evidence suggests that, among targets, stigma-related invisibility is associated with hostile outlook and perceiving harmful intentions from others (Tan et al, 2010).

On an interpersonal level, social invisibility has real consequences. Lott (1987), for example, found that when men and women engage in a task to accomplish a goal, men typically engaged in behaviors that *distanced* and *separated* them from women but not men. In a lab experiment in which men and women were paired to complete a task, men who were paired with women often placed goal-related objects out of the women’s reach, thereby directing the women’s attention, speech, and actions away from their partners. In contrast, no such patterns were observed among men paired with male partners. Further, women did not behave differently depending on their partners’ gender.

Based on evidence from other work, being treated as socially invisible may have deleterious effects on psychological wellbeing (e.g., Major, Kaiser, O’Brien, & McCoy, 2007; Mendoza-Denton, Downey, Purdie, Davis, & Pietrzak, 2002). To Gornick, as well as to most participants in my research, for instance, social invisibility resulted in a continuum of outcomes from low-grade humiliation to aggression. In my research, being socially invisible was also associated with negative self-directed attributions and negative affect (Tan et al., 2010). Moreover, other

Social Invisibility continued on Page 5

effects of social invisibility may include the lack of a positive self-identity in the absence of affirming representations in the media (Fryberg & Townsend, 2008). That is, as children become increasingly aware of difference between themselves and others through social interactions, they become aware of the most prevalent social representations. The relevance of media representations thereby becomes important insofar as what is “good” and “right” are identified as being either self-relevant or not (Fryberg & Townsend, 2008; Fryberg & Markus, 2003).

Within social interactions where mutual acknowledgement is required, the experience of social invisibility may paradoxically lead targets to behave in ways that perpetuate their invisibility. Research in the area of social cognition provides evidence for *self-fulfilling effects* (Levine, Resnick, & Higgins, 1993). This evidence suggests that the response to being treated as invisible often leads to “freezing” behaviors (Williams, Forgas, & von Hippel, 2005; Williams, 2007). But this relationship varies by race, gender, and level of rejection sensitivity (Tan & Pratto, 2010). Behavioral observations of black and white men who were treated by confederates as invisible in a lab setting, for example, demonstrated that men in both groups with higher levels of rejection sensitivity actually became more motionless compared to their baseline behavior. Interestingly, a divergence in behavior was observed among those lower in rejection sensitivity: When rendered invisible, white men—but not black men—engaged in a pattern of agitated nonverbal behaviors, presumably to regain the attention of those who ignored them (Tan & Pratto, 2010).

This brief review of the literature on social invisibility offers more questions than answers on the antecedents and consequences of invisibility. The aim of the review was not to provide a comprehensive overview of existing work, but to offer a starting point from which to examine social invisibility, as well as to expand our conception of interpersonal rejection and acceptance. Researchers will advance future research by integrating the extant evidence and by employing innovative research methods that focus on the dynamic, social-interactive nature of social invisibility.

References

- Eisenberger, N. I., & Lieberman, M. D. (2004). Why rejection hurts: A common neural alarm system for physical and social pain. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences, 8*(7), 294-300.
- Fassinger, R. E. (1995). From invisibility to integration: Lesbian identity in the workplace. *Career Development Quarterly, 44*, 148-167.
- Franklin, A. J. (1999). Invisibility syndrome and racial identity development in psychotherapy and counseling African American men. *Counseling Psychologist, 27*(6), 761-793.
- Fryberg, S. A., & Markus, H. R. (2003). On being American Indian: Current and possible selves. *Self and Identity, 2*(4), 325-344.
- Fryberg, S. A., & Townsend, S. S. M. (2008). The psychology of invisibility. In G. Adams, M. Biernat, N. R. Branscombe, C. S. Crandall & L. S. Wrightsman (Eds.), *Commemorating brown: The social psychology of racism and discrimination*. (pp. 173-193). Washington, DC US: American Psychological Association.
- Gornick, V. (1989). Twice an Outsider: On Being Jewish and a Woman. *Tikkun, 4*, 29-31, 123-125.
- Levine, J. M., Resnick, L. B., & Higgins, E. T. (1993). Social foundations of cognition. *Annual Review of Psychology, 44*(1), 585-612.
- Lott, B. (1987). Sexist discrimination as distancing behavior: A laboratory demonstration. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 11*(1), 47-58.
- Major, B., Kaiser, C. R., O'Brien, L. T., & McCoy, S. K. (2007). Perceived discrimination as worldview threat or worldview confirmation: Implications for self-esteem. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 92*(6), 1068-1086.
- Mendoza-Denton, R., Downey, G., Purdie, V. J., Davis, A., & Pietrzak, J. (2002). Sensitivity to status-based rejection: Implications for African American students' college experience. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 83*(4), 896-918.
- Purdie-Vaughns, V. & Eibach, R. P. (2008). Intersectional invisibility: The distinctive advantages and disadvantages of multiple subordinate-group identities. *Sex Roles, 59*(5), 377-391.
- Saari, C. (2001). Counteracting the effects of invisibility in work with lesbian patients. *Journal of Clinical Psychology, 57*(5), 645-654.
- Tan, J. Y., & Pratto, F. (2010). *Behaviors Associated with Being Rejected: Implications for Group-based Interactions*. Manuscript in preparation.
- Tan, J. Y., Pratto, F., & Johnson, B. T. (2010). *Experiences of Social Invisibility among a Diverse Sample: A Process Model*. Manuscript in preparation.
- Williams, K. D. (2007). Ostracism. *Annual Review of Psychology, 58*, 425-452.
- Williams, K. D., & Eisenberger, N. I. (2007). The pain of social ostracism. *Interpersonal Acceptance, 1*, 2-4.

Social Invisibility References continued on Page 9

2010 ELECTION RESULTS

In April, ISIPAR members with paid-up status were asked to vote for a new President-Elect, Secretary-Treasurer, and Regional Representatives from six areas of the world. In accordance with ISIPAR's Bylaws, newly elected members of the Executive Council shall take office at the close of this summer's biennial Business Meeting in Padua, Italy. We are pleased to announce the following election results:

PRESIDENT-ELECT



Abdul Khaleque Ph.D., earned his B. A. Honors in Philosophy from the University of Dhaka, Bangladesh; M. Sc. in Applied Psychology from University of the Punjab, Lahore, Pakistan; M. A. in Family Studies from University of Connecticut, USA; and Doctorate in Psychology from Catholic University of Leuven, Belgium. Currently he is a Senior Scientist in the Ronald and Nancy Rohner Center for the Study of Interpersonal Acceptance and Rejection in the Department of Human Development and Family Studies, University of Connecticut. He is also a Professor in Residence in the Department of Human Development and Family Studies at the University of Connecticut. Formerly he was a Professor of Psychology at the University of Dhaka in Bangladesh. He was also a Visiting Fellow in the Department of Psychology at the University of Delhi, India; and a Visiting Faculty at the University of Otago in New Zealand. Finally, he is a past President of the Bangladesh Psychological Association, a former Vice President and General Secretary of the South Asian Association of Psychologists, a life member of the Human Factors and Ergonomics Society of the USA, and a member of the American Psychological Association. His current research interests include interpersonal acceptance-rejection and lifespan human development, specifically parental acceptance-rejection, intimate partner acceptance-rejection, and teachers' acceptance-rejection. He has published nearly 100 research articles, approximately 25 book chapters, and 12 books in psychology and related areas.

SECRETARY-TREASURER



Shaila Khan, Ph.D., is Professor and Chair of the Department of Psychology in Tougaloo College, Jackson, Mississippi. Dr. Khan received her Doctorate in Social Psychology from the University of Manitoba, Winnipeg, Canada in 1997. Her academic career spans twenty-three years of university teaching in different parts of the world, including at Tougaloo College (United States), University of Manitoba, University of Brandon, (Canada), University of Dhaka, North South University, Independent University of Bangladesh and East-West University (Bangladesh). In the Spring of 2007 she received the Tougaloo College "*Distinguished Professor Award*," and in Spring, 2006 she received the Tougaloo College "*National Alumni Association Teaching Award*." In the last five years she has conducted cross-cultural research with Bangladeshi

college students as well as with African American college students on parental acceptance and rejection, intimate adult relationships, corporal punishment, and psychological well-being. Additionally, she has done NIH funded evaluative research on "Student achievement and its relationship with perceived parental and teacher acceptance-rejection in the Mississippi Delta". Since the summer of 2005 she has regularly taught in Bangladesh as a Visiting Professor. In 2008-2009 she served as ISIPAR's Regional Representative for North America.

REGIONAL REPRESENTATIVE



Central & South Africa Almon Shumba, Ph.D., is Associate Professor in the School of Post Graduate Studies at the University of Fort Hare, Main Campus, South Africa. Dr. Shumba received his Doctorate in Education from the University of the Western Cape, South Africa in 2001. Dr. Shumba also holds the following qualifications: M.Ed. (Educational Psychology) & Dip. Ed. (University of Zimbabwe), and a B.Sc. Ed. (University of Sierra Leone). Dr. Shumba is an Educational Psychologist by profession. His Academic career spans twelve years teaching at Morgenster Teachers' College in Zimbabwe and thirteen years of university teaching in different parts of the Southern Africa Development Community (SADC) including Bindura University of Science Education (Zimbabwe), University of Botswana (Botswana), University of Limpopo (South Africa), University of the Western Cape (South Africa) and University of KwaZulu-Natal (South Africa). He is currently the Central and Southern Africa Representative of the International Society for Interpersonal Acceptance and Rejection. He is the author of the article entitled: Emotional Abuse in the Classroom: A Cultural Dilemma? *Journal of Emotional Abuse*, 2004, 4 (3), 139-149. Dr. Shumba has published a book with colleagues; 6 book chapters and more than 40 articles in accredited Journals. Dr. Shumba is a member of several international associations including the International Society for the Prevention of Child Abuse and Neglect (ISPCAN), the International Association for Cognitive Education in Southern Africa (IACESA), the International Association for Cognitive Education and Psychology (IACEP), the International Association for the Treatment of Sexual Offenders (IATSO), the Southern African Society for Education, and the International Society for Interpersonal Acceptance and Rejection.



East Asia Yun-Joo Chyung, Ph.D., is Assistant Professor in the Department of Consumer and Child Studies at the University of Incheon, Incheon, Korea. Dr. Chyung received her undergraduate and Master's degrees from Seoul National University, Korea. She received her Doctorate in Human Development and Family Studies from the Pennsylvania State University, University Park, Pennsylvania, in the USA. Her research

Continued on page 7

REGIONAL REPRESENTATIVES CONTINUED

interests include parental influences on children's and adolescents' psychological adjustment, as well as on the influence of parents' own childhood experiences on their parenting behaviors. She has contributed to several books on education and care in daycare service for young children.



Europe **Tiia Tulviste, Ph.D.**, is Professor of Developmental Psychology at the University of Tartu. Her main research interest is family and peer socialization in a comparative perspective. She is leading a cross-cultural research project dealing with family and peer interactions in Estonia, Germany, and Sweden. She is serving as ISIPAR's Interim President-Elect.



North America **William Divale, Ph.D.**, received his Doctorate from SUNY Buffalo in 1974. He is now professor of Anthropology at York College and the CUNY Online Baccalaureate Program. He is also the current President of the Society for Cross-Cultural Research. Formerly, he was publisher of the journal *World Cultures*,

and has held several NIH grants. His previous cross-cultural survey research has been on warfare, population control, and matrilineal residence. He and his students have conducted research on parental acceptance-rejection for the past 15 years in countries such as Finland, Romania, Colombia, Spain, and currently in Moldova among both the mentally ill and the general population.



South America **Karen Ripoll-Núñez, Ph.D.**, is Assistant Professor at the University of the Andes, Bogota, Colombia, South America. She received her Doctorate at the University of Connecticut in Human Development and Family Studies. She has co-authored articles and book chapters on interpersonal relationships from an acceptance-rejection perspective. Her research interests include intimate adult relationships and corporal punishment in cross-cultural perspective.



South Asia **Mah Nazir Riaz, Ph.D.**, is Professor of Psychology and Dean of Social Sciences, Frontier Women University Peshawar, Pakistan. Dr. Riaz received her Doctorate in Psychometrics from University of Peshawar, NWFP, Pakistan (1979). Her academic career spans 40 years of University teaching. Among her many achievements

are: University Gold Medal (1966) and President of Pakistan's Award (1966), Professor of Psychology for her outstanding academic achievements (2003), Star Women International Award (1996), Distinguished Professor Award for meritorious

services from Ministry of Education Govt. of NWFP (2003), and President of Pakistan's Award "Izaz-e-Kamal" (Gold Medal & cash Prize) for her lifetime achievements. She was nominated as Eminent Educationist and Researcher by Higher Education Commission, Islamabad (2006). She has published more than 60 articles in national and international journals, is author of three textbooks, and has contributed chapters to edited books published in Pakistan and the USA. Dr. Riaz has conducted several studies on parental acceptance-rejection. Currently she is working as a team member of the International Father Acceptance-Rejection Project. She translated the Parental Acceptance-Rejection Questionnaire into Urdu (2001), and determined the psychometric properties of the scales for Pakistani samples. Recently, she has updated Urdu translation of all the PARQ scales (2008).

2010 ICIAR SPEAKERS

Keynote Speaker, Dr. Melissa Tafoya, will present her Keynote Address entitled "*Human Affectionate Exchange Theory: Exploring Affection as an Adaptive Behavior.*" A Distinguished Address will also be given by each University of Connecticut Rohner Center Awards Winner at the 3rd International Congress on Interpersonal Acceptance and Rejection in Padua, Italy, July 28-31, 2010. Dr. Mattie Tops will speak on "*Social Inclusion as a Source of Interpersonal Control: Implications for Psychopathology and Physiological Response*" and Dr. John Pachankis will speak on "*Psychosocial Mechanisms and Consequences of the Interpersonal Rejection of Sexual Minority Individuals*".

2ND TERM ISIPAR PRESIDENT AND PAST-PRESIDENT

You may recall, in December 2009, the Executive Council approved a plan to have Fatos Erkman remain in the office of President for another two years, until President-Elect Abdul Khaleque takes office as President in 2012. Likewise, Ronald Rohner will also continue for another two years as Past-President.

WISDOM QUOTES

Quotations to inspire and challenge
<http://www.wisdomquotes.com>

No kind action ever stops with itself. One kind action leads to another. Good example is followed. A single act of kindness throws out roots in all directions, and the roots spring up and make new trees. The greatest work that kindness does to others is that it makes them kind themselves. -Amelia Earhart

Third International Congress on Interpersonal Acceptance and Rejection Schedule

Registration details and form are available at <http://isipar2010.psy.unipd.it/registration.php>

Wednesday, July 28

- 08:30-18:00 Registration, ISIPAR Membership Desk, and Book Exhibit
 09:00-10:00 Opening Ceremony
 10:00-10:45 Welcoming Reception
 10:45-12:45 Paper Session 1 Parenting Practices, Acceptance-Rejection, and Offspring Development, I
 Paper Session 2 Consequences of Peer Acceptance-Rejection
 Paper Session 3 Parenting Practices, Acceptance-Rejection, and Offspring Development, II
 12:45-13:45 Lunch (1 hr. break)
 13:45-15:45 Paper Session 4 Intimate Partner Relationships
 Father Love Symposium, I
 Poster Session 1
 15:45-16:00 Coffee/Tea (15 minute break)
 16:00-18:00 Paper Session 5 Parenting Styles, and Psychological and Mental Health Outcomes, I
 Paper Session 6 Parenting Practices, Acceptance-Rejection, and Offspring Development, III
 Workshop: Clinical Application of Parental Acceptance-Rejection Theory (PARTheory) Measures and Microcounseling Skills in Relational Therapy

Thursday, July 29

- 08:30-09:00 Registration, ISIPAR Membership Desk, and Book Exhibit
 09:00-10:00 Distinguished Address: Mattie Tops **"Social Inclusion as a Source of Interpersonal Control: Implications for Psychopathology and Physiological Response"**
 10:00-10:15 Coffee/Tea break (15 minute break)
 10:15-12:15 Symposium: Father Love and the International Father Acceptance-Rejection Project (International Father Acceptance-Rejection Project)
 Paper session 7 Parenting Styles, and Psychological and Mental Health Outcomes, II
 Paper session 8 Parenting and Its Consequences
 12:15-13:15 Lunch (1 hr. break)
 13:15-15:15 Paper session 9 Consequences of Ostracism and Bullying
 Father Love Symposium, II
 Paper session 10: Parenting Styles and Behavioral and Substance Abuse Outcomes
 15:15-15:30 Coffee/Tea break (15 minute break)
 15:30-17:30 Paper session 11 Acceptance-Rejection in Cultural Context
 Paper session 12 Acceptance-Rejection, Academic Performance, and Children with Disabilities
 Review session. A Look at Childhood: Findings from PARTheory Studies in Turkey
 Poster session 2
 19:00 Banquet
 Keynote Speaker: Melissa Tafoya **"Human Affectionate Exchange Theory: Exploring Affection as an Adaptive Behavior"**

Friday, July 30

- 07:00-08:30 Executive Council Breakfast
 08:30-09:00 ISIPAR Membership Desk and Book Exhibit
 09:00-10:00 Distinguished Address: John Pachankis **"Psychosocial Mechanisms and Consequences of the Interpersonal Rejection of Sexual Minority Individuals"**
 10:00-10:15 Coffee/Tea break (15 minute break)
 10:15-12:15 Paper session 13 Parental Acceptance-Rejection and Psychological Adjustment
 Paper session 14 Teacher and Parental Acceptance-Rejection and Youth's Social and Psychological Adjustment
 12:15-13:45 Lunch (1.5 hrs. break)
 13:45-15:45 Paper session 15 Methodological and Theoretical Issues in PARTheory Research
 Father Love Symposium, III
 Poster session 3
 15:45-16:00 Coffee/Tea break (15 minute break)
 16:00-17:00 Closing Ceremony
 17:00-18:00 ISIPAR Business meeting

Saturday, July 31

Tours of Padua, Venice, and environs. (See website for information) <http://isipar2010.psy.unipd.it>

The Role of Personal Control in Rejection...continued from Page 4

evidence is already available in unpublished form. For example, Warburton, McIlwain, Cairns & Taylor (2006) found that people who believe that aggression leads to control were likely to be highly aggressive following experimentally manipulated rejection.

Conclusions

In summary, our meta-analysis found that experimentally manipulated rejection makes people feel sad and bad about themselves, and feel as if they don't belong and are out of control. I believe that a sense of personal control is pivotal to many forms of rejection, not just to ostracism. Evidence for this pivotal role comes from the large effect size for control, and the role of control in explaining antisocial responses to experimentally manipulated rejection.

Although it may be possible that people switch in and out of numbness following experimentally manipulated rejection, the numbness/self-regulation conclusions were not supported in our meta-analysis. More specifically, neither arousal dampening nor affect flattening occurred. Rejected people may simply be too preoccupied to care. If people are busy pursuing control and belonging needs then they may ignore the results of future events such as the results of football matches, and instead employ their self-regulation resources to pursue restoration of their thwarted needs.

References

- Baumeister, R. F. (2008). Interpersonal rejection in the laboratory. *Interpersonal Acceptance*, 2(1), 1-2.
- DeWall, C. N., & Baumeister, R. F. (2006). Alone but feeling no pain: Effects of social exclusion on physical pain tolerance and pain threshold, affective forecasting, and interpersonal empathy. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 91, 1-15.
- Eisenberger, N. (2010). Rejection hurts: Exploring the shared neural mechanisms underlying physical and social pain. *Interpersonal Acceptance*, 4(1), 1-3.
- Gerber, J. P., & Wheeler, L. (2009). On being rejected: A meta-analysis of experimental research on rejection. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 4, 468-488.
- Oaten, M., Williams, K. D., Jones, A., & Zadro, L. (2007). The effects of ostracism on self-regulation in the socially anxious. *Journal of Clinical and Social Psychology*, 27, 471-504.

- Warburton, W. A., McIlwain, D. J. F., Cairns, D. R., & Taylor, A. J. (2006, July). Restoring perceived control with aggression: Why, how, and who? Paper presented at the 17th meeting International Society for Research on Aggression, , Minneapolis, MN.
- Williams, K. D. (2001). *Ostracism: The power of silence*. New York: Guilford.
- Williams, K. D. (2007). Ostracism. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 58, 425-452
- Williams, K. D., & Eisenberger, N. I. (2007). The pain of social ostracism. *Interpersonal Acceptance*, 1(2), 2-4.
- Wilson, T. D., & Gilbert, D. T. (2003). Affective forecasting. In M. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology*, Vol. 35 (pp. 345-411). New York: Elsevier.
- Zadro, L., Williams, K. D., & Richardson, R. (2003). How Low Can You Go? Ostracism By A Computer Is Sufficient to Lower Self-Reported Levels of Belonging, Control, Self-Esteem, and Meaningful Existence. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 42, 560-567.

Social Invisibility References continued from page 3

- Williams, K. D., Forgas, J. P., & von Hippel, W. (2005). *The social outcast: Ostracism, social exclusion, rejection, and bullying*. New York, NY: Psychology Press.
- Yeh, C. J., Kim, A. B., Pituc, S. T., & Atkins, M. (2008). Poverty, loss, and resilience: The story of Chinese immigrant youth. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 55(1), 34-48.



India
Fourth International Congress on Interpersonal Acceptance and Rejection
 The 4th International Congress on Acceptance and Rejection in 2012 will be held in India. The specific location and dates will be announced at a later time.

Deadline for submission of material for publication in the September 2010 issue of *Interpersonal Acceptance* is **August 6, 2010. Please direct correspondence to Ron Rohner, Editor rohner@uconn.edu**

Editor: Ronald P. Rohner
Editorial Assistant: Lori Kalinowski