

ENCYCLOPEDIA OF

Human Relationships

ENCYCLOPEDIA OF

Human Relationships

HARRY T. REIS, EDITOR
University of Rochester

SUSAN SPRECHER, EDITOR
Illinois State University

VOLUME **2**



Los Angeles | London | New Delhi
Singapore | Washington DC

A SAGE Reference Publication

of the children's social networks, number of friends, or family composition. Children who create imaginary companions are slightly more likely than their peers to be firstborn or only children and to have fewer siblings. Some empirical evidence suggests that children with imaginary companions have a penchant for fantasy more so than children without such companions, and the two groups may also differ on sociability. Contrary to media representations of children with imaginary companions, they tend to be less shy and more sociable than others—if personality differences are found at all.

Although precipitating events, such as moving to a new home or the birth of a sibling, are sometimes cited by parents as causing the appearance or disappearance of an imaginary companion, most companions appear and disappear without an apparent trigger. Once created, the ways in which they are manifest in children's lives may be related to their form. Personified objects are often known to many people in the child's life, including family, teachers, and peers, and often accompany the child everywhere she or he goes. Invisible companions, in contrast, are often known only to family members and associated with home.

In addition to the connection between form and manifestation, whether a companion is invisible or personified may also be related to the kind of relationship the companion provides. Invisible companions, for example, often function as friends for children. In other words, these relationships are typically egalitarian, with the child and the imaginary companion providing companionship and intimacy for each other, as well as help and validation. Relationships with personified objects, in contrast, are often hierarchical in nature. In these relationships, children characteristically provide caregiving and nurturance to the object, and it is treated as less competent and knowledgeable than the child. Interestingly, although pretend identities do not provide relationships in the same way that the other imaginary companions do, their form may also dictate their status relative to the child. These identities, especially when created by boys, tend to be powerful and exciting, exuding competence and capabilities that surpass the child's.

Children create imaginary companions for many reasons, and indeed these reasons probably vary quite a bit depending on the child's age and gender. Still, suggestions have been made in the literature

to explain the functions of imaginary companions. First and foremost, imaginary companions are an exciting form of pretend play. Especially for children who enjoy fantasy and who crave social interaction, an imaginary companion might be the perfect way to always have an available playmate. Second, imaginary companions provide a safe and consequence-free forum for practicing social interactions and understanding social situations. Children sometimes imagine conflict with their pretend friends, and some go so far as to invent imaginary enemies. These creations may be efforts on the child's part to understand and manage the difficulties inherent in social relationships or the potentially unpleasant side of interacting with others. Regardless, the empirical evidence is unequivocal in establishing that the creation of an imaginary companion is neither a sign of psychopathology nor an indication that the child is confused about the difference between fantasy and reality. Children readily admit, and sometimes spontaneously volunteer, that their imaginary companions are not real.

Tracy Gleason

See also Children's Peer Groups; Egalitarian Relationships; Friendships in Childhood; Need Fulfillment in Relationships; Sex Differences in Relationships

Further Readings

- Gleason, T. (2002). Social provisions of real and imaginary relationships in early childhood. *Developmental Psychology, 38*, 979–992.
- Hoff, E. (2004–2005). A friend living inside me—The forms and functions of imaginary companions. *Imagination, Cognition, and Personality, 24*, 151–189.
- Singer, D., & Singer, J. (1990). *House of make believe*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Taylor, M. (1999). *Imaginary companions and the children who create them*. New York: Oxford University Press.

INCEST

The term *incest* refers to the marriage and/or sexual intercourse between two individuals considered

to be close kin according to local cultural norms. Although incest typically applies to cases when couples are in fact genetic relatives, it can also apply when couples are genetically unrelated, yet are categorized as kin according to local customs. In one sense, then, rules against incest can be seen as a way to regulate who one marries (and has sex with) within a particular culture. Although *incest* is typically a term used to understand norms relating to marriage patterns, the related term *inbreeding* is used to mark the degree of genetic relatedness between mating partners. Both incest and inbreeding are used interchangeably, yet they refer to slightly different concepts, with incest being a topic of greater interest in anthropology and cultural psychology and inbreeding a topic of greater interest in biology and cognitive science. This entry focuses on the aspect of incest that overlaps with inbreeding: the mating of individuals who are genetically related by virtue of sharing a recent common ancestor.

Why Is Incest Bad?

There are sound biological reasons that natural selection would have led to the evolution of mechanisms to reduce the probability of mating with a close genetic relative. Throughout the evolutionary history of our species, the selection pressures posed by harmful genetic mutations and disease-causing organisms would have severely negatively affected the health and viability of offspring of close genetic relatives. All else being equal, individuals who avoided mating with a close genetic relative and instead mated with someone who did not share an immediate common ancestor would have left a greater number of healthier offspring. Importantly, the negative consequences of incest are enhanced the more closely related two individuals are, with the most severe consequences occurring between individuals who have a probability of .5 of sharing particular genes (i.e., brother and sister, mother and son, or father and daughter). The deleterious effects drop off as two partners become less closely related. Interestingly, in most (if not all) societies, incest between nuclear family members is forbidden or simply absent. In the United States, incest laws vary by state, but most have sanctions targeting marriage and sexual

intercourse with a parent, child, sibling, grandparent, grandchild, niece, nephew, uncle, and aunt. Although some states even sanction first-cousin marriage, none sanctions second-cousin marriage.

A variety of studies have documented the negative fitness consequences associated with incest. For instance, in both humans and nonhuman animal species, incest is associated with an increased risk of mortality, mental deficiencies, congenital malformations, and disease. Given these negative consequences, it is likely that evolution engineered mechanisms to prevent individuals from choosing close relatives as sexual partners. But what might such mechanisms look like?

How Do Humans Avoid Incest?

To avoid close genetic relatives as sexual partners, a well-designed mechanism would require (at least) two types of procedures: (1) procedures that categorize individuals according to their probability of relatedness (i.e., procedures for detecting kin), and (2) procedures that use information regarding kinship to regulate sexual attraction. With respect to kin detection, what cues do humans use? Because we cannot see another person's DNA, the best evolution could do is to use cues that were reliably correlated with genetic relatedness in the ancestral past to compute a probability of relatedness. To the extent that different cues identified different categories of kin (e.g., mother, father, sibling, offspring), different detection mechanisms likely exist.

One cue found to mediate the detection of a particular type of relative, siblings, is childhood coresidence duration. The longer one lives with another person starting from birth, the greater the sexual aversion that develops toward that individual later during adulthood. Furthermore, longer periods of childhood coresidence are associated with lower incidents of adult sexual behavior and greater moral opposition to sibling incest. The effect of childhood coresidence on sexual attraction is known as the Westermarck Effect after the 19th-century Finnish social scientist, Edward Westermarck, who first proposed that early childhood association leads to the development of a sexual aversion later during adulthood.

Two well-known natural experiments provide compelling evidence for the Westermarck Effect.

The first is the communal childrearing practices of the Israeli kibbutzim, where unrelated children were put into children's houses starting from a few weeks after birth and raised together under sibling-like conditions. In these communities, individuals raised together in the same children's house rarely married one another despite the absence of any rules forbidding such unions. This pattern suggests that early childhood exposure influences later sexual attraction.

The second natural experiment testing the Westermarck Effect is the case of Tawainese minor marriages. In this form of marriage, a young bride is adopted into her future husband's family as a newborn and raised alongside him until one day, during adulthood, the parents determine it is time for them to marry. Compared with marriages in which the husband and wife met for the first time as adults, in minor marriages, there were lower rates of fertility and greater rates of divorces and extramarital affairs.

These two experiments point to childhood coresidence duration as one cue that the human mind uses to detect kin and mediate incest-avoidance behaviors. As they suggest, individuals do not have to be genetically related to develop a sexual aversion toward one another. This can be seen in coreared adopted and stepsiblings who also develop intense sexual aversions toward one another despite knowing they are not genetic relatives.

But cues other than childhood coresidence might also play a role in incest avoidance. For instance, seeing one's mother caring for (e.g., breastfeeding) a newborn might serve as a potent cue to kinship. This cue would have only been available for older siblings already present in the social environment and would have been reliable regardless of coresidence duration. But younger children, who are not around to see their mother pregnant and caring for a newborn, might rely on coresidence duration or other possible cues such as facial similarity or olfactory recognition.

Future Directions

Certainly there is much to be learned about the processes mediating how humans avoid incest. The prior discussion illustrates that particular social cues might govern kin detection and the

development of sexual aversions. But many questions remain. For instance, what cues do humans use to detect other types of close genetic relatives: Are they the same as those found for siblings or do they differ? What emotions regulate incest avoidance? What contextual factors influence opinions about incest? How can scholarly understanding of incest-avoidance mechanisms inform the field of child abuse and neglect? If kinship cues are required to activate sexual aversions toward close genetic relatives, it is important to identify which cues operate for each type of family member. Circumstances in which the evolved cues indicating relatedness are absent might lead to greater risks of incestuous unions (e.g., as can occur when brothers and sisters are reared separately or when men marry women with children from another marriage). Last, how does our evolved psychology influence legal codes related to incest? The next few decades promise to shed light on this culturally universal yet underexplored behavior.

Debra Lieberman

See also Abuse and Violence in Relationships; Evolutionary Perspectives on Women's Romantic Interests; Evolutionary Psychology and Human Relationships; Fictive Kinship; Interpersonal Attraction; Kin Relationships; Kin Selection; Mate Preferences

Further Readings

- Lieberman, D., Tooby, J., & Cosmides, L. (2007). The architecture of human kin detection. *Nature*, *445*, 727–731.
- Shepher, J. (1983). *Incest: A biosocial view*. New York: Academic Press.
- Westermarck, E. A. (1891/1921). *History of human marriage*. London: Macmillan.
- Wolf, A. P. (1995). *Sexual attraction and childhood association: A Chinese brief for Edward Westermarck*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

INDIVIDUATION

Individuation refers generally to the process by which people render themselves as separate and distinct from others. Researchers of human relationships