Change Processes in Relationships

Just as each person develops from infancy to adulthood, all interpersonal relationships have a life history that encompasses the changes in how people communicate with each other. This book is about how a relationship transforms itself from one pattern of communication to another. The authors present a unique research method called “relational-historical research”, based on advances in dynamic systems theory in developmental psychology, and qualitative methods in life history research. It rests on three premises: that the developing relationship (not the individual) is the unit of analysis; that change emerges from, but is not entirely constrained by, the patterns of the past; and that the developmental process is best revealed by making frequent observations within a particular case before, during, and after a key developmental transition. Looking specifically at the mother-infant relationship, this is a compelling piece of research that will appeal to an international audience of intellectuals and practitioners.
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0.1 (Prologue) (a) Social frame (mother and infant engaged in face-to-face play without objects), (b) guided object frame (mother demonstrates objects while infant observes), (c) social/object mixed frame (mother uses object socially, as in tickling the baby with the toy), (d) not-guided object frame (the infant explores the object while mother observes).

0.2 (Prologue) A realtime transition from the guided-object (historical) frame, to the social/object mixed (bridging) frame, to the not-guided object (emerging) frame. The bridging frame, in which the mother uses the toy to “kiss” the infant’s face, mediates the realtime transition between the historical frame in which mother is demonstrating the toy while the infant observes and the emerging frame in which the infant is holding the toy while the mother observes.

0.3 (Prologue) Level 1 change, or ordinary variability, during the guided object frame. The mother demonstrates different toys while the infant observes.

0.4 (Prologue) Level 2 change, or innovations, during the guided object frame. Mother attempts to put a toy into the infant’s hand and the infant reaches. On another occasion, mother offers toy and infant takes it. Each of these instances was a divergence from the ordinary variability of the guided object frame. In each case, the frame dynamics quickly return to the
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>List of figures</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1 Observational strategy for microgenetic research in which observation intervals are considerably shorter than the time interval for developmental change.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.1 Developmental trajectories of the best fitting models for the proportional duration (percent of session) of each of the frames are shown. The average growth curve of all dyads as a group is modeled by an $n$th degree polynomial function of infant age. The individual developmental curves are expressed as deviations from the average developmental curve. The social frame is modeled by a cubic function of age, the guided object frame by a linear function of age, the not-guided object frame by a quadratic function of age, and the social/object mixed frame by a cubic function of age.</td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2 Raw data developmental trajectories of the proportional duration (percent of session) of each of the frames as a function of infant age for each of the dyads.</td>
<td>107</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ordinary variability of demonstrating objects while infant observes.</td>
<td>114</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tables

2.1 Developmental sequence of object manipulative actions in the first half year. page 37
2.2 Motor chronology during the first eight months of life from Denver Developmental Screening Test (DDST) and the Bayley Infant Development Test (BIDT). 39
4.1 Definitions of the four frames used in this research. 78
4.2 Computer criteria for the selection of frames from the microanalytic codes. 79
6.1 Infant ages (in weeks) at each observation session prior to and following the acquisition of visually guided reaching. 96
6.2 Toys most frequently used by mothers and infants in this study. 97
7.1 Developmental trajectories of each of the four frames. 106
7.2 Correlations between the durations of frames by individual dyad. 112
7.3 Multilevel model of the association between frames and infant gazing without touching objects. 116
7.4 Multilevel model of the association between frames and infant gazing while touching objects. 117
7.5 Multilevel model of the association between frames and infant touching without gazing at objects. 119
7.6 Multilevel model of the association between frames and infant mouthing while gazing at objects. 120
7.7 Multilevel model of the association between frames and infant mouthing without gazing at objects. 122
7.8 Developmental emergence of individual infant actions under two conditions: When mother held the object for the infant and when the infant held the object independently. 124
7.9 Post-hoc multiple comparisons of pairs of the onset age of individual infant actions. 126
7.10 Developmental sequence of object manipulative actions in the first half year. page 37
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>List of tables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.1 Descriptive statistics of frames by session: Richard.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.2 Frequency of frame transitions for Richard and his mother.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.1 Descriptive statistics of frames by session: Betsy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.2 Frequency of frame transitions for Betsy and her mother.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.1 Descriptive statistics of frames by session: Lewis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.2 Frequency of frame transitions for Lewis and his mother.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.1 Descriptive statistics of frames by session: Susan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.2 Frequency of frame transitions for Susan and her mother.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.1 Developmental sequence of frames for each of the four representative dyads based on the quantitative and qualitative analyses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.2 Proposition 1 sequences that fit each of the four representative dyads based on the quantitative and qualitative analyses.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Acknowledgments

This work was supported by grants to Alan Fogel from the National Institute of Health (R01 HD21036), the National Science Foundation (BNS9006756) and the National Institute of Mental Health (R01 MH48680), and by a grant to Andrea Garvey from the National Science Foundation of Brazil (CNPq). We gratefully acknowledge the comments and suggestions of Yolanda van Beek, Antonella Brighi, George Butterworth, Ken Critchfield, Maria Luisa Genta, Shane Koller, Manuela Lavelli, Marc Lewis, Sarah Lucas, G. Christina Nelson-Goens, Marie-Germaine Pecheaux, Josette Ruel, Lisa Taylor, and Dankert Vedeler.