

# RELATIONSHIP RESEARCH NEWS

OFFICIAL NEWS JOURNAL OF THE INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR RELATIONSHIP RESEARCH

FALL 2002

VOL 1, NO. 1

## PRESIDENT'S COLUMN

### Welcome to the International Association for Relationship Research!

Robert Milardo

Greetings to all and I hope you are enjoying fall or spring, depending on your hemisphere of choice. I have several items to share with you.

The International Association for Relationship Research came into being on June 1, 2002 with the official merger of the INPR and ISSPR. The merger was hugely popular with members of both groups and now offers considerable benefits and some challenges. IARR is well positioned financially with an inheritance of approximately \$100,000 from its parent groups and this allows us to again reduce membership fees for 2003 to \$68 for full members and \$44 for students. A substantial bargain considering that members receive *Personal Relationships*, the *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, this newsletter, a membership directory, discounts on sponsored books, and reduced registration fees at conferences.

Membership continues to grow substantially and we can reasonably expect it will continue to do so. I encourage you to share the new membership form with your colleagues and students, as well as encouraging your libraries to subscribe to the journals. Since we own *Personal Relationships*, IARR can accrue substantial royalties from institutional subscriptions.

Our new organization is unique in many respects and this is largely due to an extremely active and talented membership. The recent International Conference on Personal Relationships under the extraordinary leadership of Renee Lyons, Michael Sullivan, and Elizabeth Tait and their many aides, was the first to be sponsored by IARR and the most successful

relationship conference we have witnessed. Just over 350 members attended the conference in Halifax this past July far exceeding past conferences, including the previous high at the 1996 Banff conference where 293 registered. Well over 10% of our current membership serves on committees. I am constantly impressed by the enterprise, generosity and most of all the sheer brilliance of members and their initiatives.

Growth in the field of personal relationships will come directly from our innovations, innovations that are based upon superior service to members and exceptional opportunity. In my mind, all that we do as officers, board members, committee chairs and members should be directed at growing the field through the provision of service and opportunity.

Proposals for the next biennial conference to be held in 2004 are currently being solicited and reviewed by Terri Orbuch and the Future Conferences Committee. Scott Christopher, Chair of the Program Committee, is developing a unique opportunity for new professional and graduate students. We hope to provide frequent opportunities for the advanced training of our new professionals in the form of intensive workshops, subsidized by the organization and available to members worldwide. Anita Vangelisti, Publications Chair, and her committee are working on new volumes in our book series published by Cambridge. Other members are developing ideas for focused conferences to be held in off years since IARR now meets only biennially.

There is much more we can do and I eagerly await new initiatives from members. It seems only a matter of time before we seriously explore the possibility of an electronic journal, perhaps an annual review of theory and research, or an electronic book series in which classics in our field, long out-of-print become available on CD at low cost to members. I encourage you, and especially our new professionals, to generate new creative bursts based upon our collective interest in growing the field through innovation.

## INSIDE THIS ISSUE OF RELATIONSHIP RESEARCH NEWS

Presidents' Column  
by Robert Milardo ..... 1

From the Editors' Desk  
by Kathy Carnelley and Kory Floyd ..... 3

**ICPR 2002 NEWS** ..... 3

**2002 AWARD WINNERS** ..... 4

**BOOK REVIEWS:**

*The New Science of Intimate Relationships*  
By Garth Fletcher

Review by Nancy L. Collins ..... 4

*The Tending Instinct*  
By Shelley E. Taylor

Review by Linda K. Acitelli ..... 7

**LIGHTER SIDE OF RELATIONSHIPS:**

*Relationship Film Festival*  
By David Kenny ..... 8

*(I Can't Get No) NSFaction*  
By Bill Ickes ..... 8

**STUDENT & NEW PROFESSIONALS COLUMN:**

*New Beginnings*  
By Caroline T. Rankin ..... 9

**FEATURE ARTICLE**

*The Top 10 Things I Wish Someone Had Told Me  
When I Was in Graduate School*  
By Diane Holmberg ..... 10

**CONTENTS OF UPCOMING JOURNALS:**

*Journal of Social and Personal Relationships* ..... 11

*Personal Relationships* ..... 12

*Journal of Marriage and the Family* ..... 12

Call for Submissions ..... 13

Job Announcement ..... 13

**MEMBER NEWS & UPDATES** ..... 14

**LIST OF IARR BOARD OF DIRECTORS &  
COMMITTEE CHAIRS** ..... 15

Call for Nominations ..... 15

Call for Volunteers ..... 16

**RESEARCH NEWS:**

*Netherlands Kinship Panel Study* ..... 16

Conference Announcements & Calls ..... 17

Call for Conference Proposals ..... 19

**RELATIONSHIP RESEARCH NEWS**

**Editors**

Katherine Carnelley  
University of Southampton

Kory Floyd  
Arizona State University

**Associate Editors**

Michele Acker  
Otterbein College

Shelly Gable  
University of California, Los Angeles

Diane Holmberg  
Acadia University

Ofra Mayseless  
University of Haifa

*Relationship Research News* is published twice a year, once in September and once in April. Contributions are very welcome and will be published as space permits. Announcements, letters to the editors, cartoons/humor, teaching tips, and other information relevant to IARR members are all appropriate. If you would like to contribute a feature article or personal commentary, please submit a brief (one paragraph) description to the editors first (please do not send manuscripts). Submit all materials to Kathy Carnelley, Department of Psychology, University of Southampton, Highfield Campus, Southampton, SO17 1BJ, UK (kc6@soton.ac.uk) or to Kory Floyd, Hugh Downs School of Human Communication, Arizona State University, PO Box 871205, Tempe AZ 85287-1205, USA (kory@asu.edu). The deadline for final copy is September 1 for the Fall issue and April 1 for the Spring issue. (Inquiries regarding Feature Articles are welcome at any time.)

## FROM THE EDITORS' DESK

by Kathy Carnelley and Kory Floyd

Univ. of Southampton    Arizona State Univ.

Welcome to the first issue of *Relationship Research News*, the official newsletter of the International Association of Relationship Research. We are very excited about our newly merged organization and are pleased to be co-editing this newsletter. As you probably know, the 2002 ICPR was a huge success (see the column below by Lyons, Sullivan, & Tait) and we look forward to future IARR conferences. You will find in this issue announcements for two future conferences: one for a special topics conference and one for a new scholars' workshop, both to be held during the summer of 2003. You'll also find a call for proposals for future conferences.

You will find here the winners of the 2002 awards – Sally Lloyd and the other members of the awards committee (Anita Barbee, Andy Collins, Sandra Murray, Mike Monsour; New Contributions Award: awards committee members plus Kathryn Dindia, Robin Goodwin, John Holmes, Leanne Lamke, Rowland Miller, Sonio Montero, Sally Planalp, Bill Rawlins, Catherine Sanderson, and Todd Shakelford) did a fine job identifying these worthy award winners. Congratulations to all! We have two book reviews for you, as well: Nancy Collins has reviewed Garth Fletcher's book, *The New Science of Intimate Relationships*, and Linda Acitelli has reviewed Shelley Taylor's book, *The Tending Instinct*. We hope you will find these to be as interesting and informative as we did. If you would like to review a recent book for our next issue, please don't hesitate to contact us and we'll make sure you get a complimentary copy of the book.

Our student and young professional members may enjoy Caroline Rankin's column entitled "New Beginnings" and Diane Holmberg's article on "The Top 10 Things I Wish Someone Had Told Me When I Was in Graduate School." The latter article is based on issues discussed at the ICPR conference in Halifax (panel members: Acker, A. Aron, Collins, Metts, & Perlman) and includes some great advice.

We'd like to thank Bill Ickes and Dave Kenny for their contributions to the Lighter Side of Relationships. We are always looking for fun, sarcastic, or silly things to add to our issues, so please send us your contributions. That about sums things up. We hope you enjoy this first official issue of *Relationship Research News*.

## ICPR 2002: A HUGE SUCCESS!

By Renée Lyons, Michael Sullivan, &  
Elizabeth Tait

High quality research presentations and posters, stimulating keynotes, a superb harbor cruise at sunset, talented open-mike performers, parading lobsters, and many new and strengthened "relationships" are just a few of the memories from ICPR 2002. The conference took place in Halifax, Nova Scotia, Canada, a historic coastal city from July 5-8. The host for this year's conference was the Atlantic Health Promotion Research Centre at Dalhousie University.

Over 350 relationship researchers from 22 countries attended the conference. They arrived from Australia, Belgium, Canada, Gambia, Germany, Ghana, Israel, Japan, México, Nepal, New Zealand, Nigeria, Republic of Georgia, Russia, South Africa, Sweden, Taiwan, The Netherlands, Turkey, Uganda, United Kingdom, and the United States. This year was particularly special because it marked the dawn of the new society, IARR or IAR<sup>2</sup> and was the first official conference of the merged societies.

The Halifax conference included eight invited addresses including six keynote presentations, one past-presidential address, and one invited panel on communication. There were 62 individual paper presentations organized into panels, 15 symposia (which included 59 individual presentations), 112 poster presentations, and 2 interest groups (which included 9 individual presentations). The final program is available to download on the conference website.

In addition to the general work on relationships, this conference contained the theme of "Health & Relationships", which highlighted research that examines the association between interpersonal relationships and health. Examples of keynote topics included: *Cancer and the Family*, *Does a Relationship Perspective Help Couples Survive Chronic Illness?*, and *The Social Context of Pain: Current Status and Future Directions*. One couldn't help but be impressed with the quality of the keynotes, presentations and posters. New, state-of-the-art facilities at Dalhousie provided a technology-friendly environment.

A highlight of this year's conference was the "Graduate Student Breakfast" which drew over 60 graduate students and included an informal panel concerning "The Top 10 Things I Wish Somebody Had Told Me When I Was in

Grad School”, as presented by: Michele Acker, Art Aron, Nancy Collins, Sandra Metts, and Dan Perlman.

Thanks to the following sponsors whose contributions made this event possible: Canadian Institutes of Health Research (Institute of Neurosciences, Mental Health, and Addiction & Institute of Gender and Health), Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada, Capital District Health Authority - QE II Research Fund, Cancer Care Nova Scotia, Canadian Breast Cancer Foundation – Atlantic Chapter, Office of Research Services, Dalhousie University, Nova Scotia Health Research Foundation, Faculty of Graduate Studies, Dalhousie University, Atlantic Centre of Excellence for Women’s Health, Morrissey Rehabilitation and Treatment Counseling Psychological Services.

Don’t forget to visit the conference website, [www.medicine.dal.ca/ahprc.icpr.html](http://www.medicine.dal.ca/ahprc.icpr.html), to see pictures from ICPR 2002!

## 2002 AWARD WINNERS

Several association awards were presented at the 2002 conference. Many thanks to the Awards Committee, chaired by Sally Lloyd, for its hard work in recognizing these outstanding members!

**Distinguished Career:** Phillip R. Shaver

**Mentoring Award:** Thomas Bradbury & Caryl Rusbult

**Teaching Award:** Anita Vangelisti

**Dissertation Award:** Eli Finkel

**Steve Duck New Scholar (Ph.D. candidate):** David Sbarra

**Steve Duck New Scholar (young professional):** Loreen Olson

**New Contributions Award:** Conger, R. D., Cui, M., Bryant, C. M., & Elder, G. H. (2000). Competence in early adult romantic relationships: A developmental perspective on family influences. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 79, 224-237.

**New Contributions Award (semi-finalists):** Collins, N. L., & Feeney, B. C. (2000). A safe haven: An attachment theory perspective on support seeking and caregiving in intimate relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 78, 1053-1073.

Cook, W. L. (2000). Understanding attachment security in family context. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 78, 285-294.

Fincham, F. (2000). The kiss of the porcupines: From attributing responsibility to forgiving. *Personal Relationships*, 7, 1-23.

Karney, B. R., & Bradbury, T. N. (2000). Attributions in marriage: State or trait? A growth curve analysis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 78, 295-309.

**New Professional Award for a Conference Paper:**  
Sylvia Niehuis

Congratulations to all of this year’s winners!

## BOOK REVIEWS

### The New Science of Intimate Relationships

By Garth Fletcher  
(Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishers, Ltd., 2002, 324 pp.)

**Review by Nancy L. Collins**  
**University of California, Santa Barbara**

Writing a book for experts as well as lay audiences is always a challenging enterprise, but in this volume Garth Fletcher succeeds brilliantly at reaching just the right balance of rigorous scholarship and great storytelling. This delightful book is grounded firmly in scientific psychology but written in a style that is highly engaging and accessible to non-experts. As indicated by the title, the goal of this volume is to showcase the latest scientific work on intimate relationships and to counter many of the stereotypes and misperceptions often fostered by popular psychology books. But this book offers much more than an up-to-date summary of current research. Fletcher provides an overarching theoretical framework for integrating past work, and a model for exploring new research questions. The book also gives readers an insider’s view of some of the most important scientific debates in the field. In doing so, Fletcher is careful to present both sides of each debate, but not afraid to voice his reasoned judgment about which side has greater merit and empirical support. And he manages to accomplish all of this with great wit and charm.

Several themes are reflected throughout the book. First, the book highlights the importance of integrating social psychological perspectives (which explore the proximal level structures that explain human emotion and cognition) with perspectives from the emerging field of evolutionary psychology (which explore the distal factors that explain the origins and functions of these patterns). Second, the book emphasizes the importance of taking a social cognitive perspective and underscores the value of studying folk theories of relationships. Finally, the book highlights the importance of distinguishing between scientific discovery and moral debate. Although the study of close relationships involves a number of controversial topics, the book remains neutral on moral, legal, and political positions. This strategy neither downplays the importance of such issues nor implies that a good scientific understanding of intimate relationships is irrelevant to them.

The book begins with a review of philosophy of science, which distinguishes scientific psychology from postmodernist approaches to relationships. The remainder of the book is divided into four major parts. Part I discusses three key theoretical planks that underlie the science of intimate relationships. Part II examines how intimate relationships unfold over time including how couple members come to understand each other, how couples communicate, individual differences in the need and capacity for intimacy/attachment, and mate selection. Part III explores two specific domains of special interest to intimate relationships, sexuality and intimate violence. Part IV concludes with a summary and over-arching theoretical framework.

Part I describes three *theoretical planks* that serve as organizing themes throughout the book. The first theoretical plank (Chapter 2) concerns the *intimate relationship mind* and argues for the importance of taking a social cognitive approach to understanding intimate relationships. A central assumption of this approach is that individuals possess extensive knowledge or lay theories about relationships, which guide their interpersonal functioning. Using attribution theory as an example, Fletcher explains how lay theories serve three major goals – understanding, prediction, and control. The second theoretical plank (Chapter 3) highlights the importance of evolutionary theory for understanding the origins of the intimate relationship mind. This chapter includes an excellent summary of Darwin's theory and the links between evolutionary biology and human evolutionary psychology. As he does throughout the book, Fletcher is careful to present opposing viewpoints. In doing so, he provides insight into the scientific debate as well as the personalities behind the debate. The third theoretical plank (Chapter 4) concerns the nature of love and other emotions. In this chapter, Fletcher distinguishes between the experience of emotion and folk theories of emotion. Folk

theories contain two common themes, that emotion interferes with rational thought, and that individuals come to know their feelings through introspection. Although these beliefs are widespread, Fletcher provides evidence that they are wrong. This chapter also discusses the special case of love as an emotion. Fletcher argues that love is a basic emotion tied to three distinct evolutionary adaptations, (a) attachment (love as intimacy), (b) caregiving (love as commitment), and (c) sexual attraction (love as passion).

Part II of the book (Chapters 5 – 8) examines how intimate relationships unfold over time. Chapter 5 examines how partners come to understand one another's thoughts, feelings, and personalities. Fletcher begins by posing a critical question, are relationships happier when partners hold positive illusions about one another or when they recognize the unvarnished truth about one another's strengths and weaknesses? To answer this question, the author allows the reader to eavesdrop on a lively debate between Professor X (who believes that positive illusions are the road to relationship happiness) and Professor Y (who believes that the truth is by far the only healthy alternative). Through this fictional debate, we come to realize that both sides have merit – individuals want to be adored, but they also want to be understood and accepted for who they really are. In this chapter, Fletcher also discusses gender differences in *empathic accuracy* or *mind-reading* (women are slightly better than men at understanding their partner's thoughts and feelings), and the link between empathic accuracy and relationship satisfaction (there is no clear link between accuracy, per se, and good functioning relationships).

What does it mean to have good communication, and how important is it for successful relating? These questions are addressed in Chapter 6. Fletcher begins by contrasting two models of effective communication, (a) the *good communication* model, which suggests that partners should voice their negative feelings, cope openly with disagreements, and be willing to solve problems, and (b) the *good management* model, which suggests that partners should sometimes withhold negative feelings and be willing to compromise, and that some problems cannot be solved and should be placed on the back burner. Both patterns of communication are adaptive, and relationship success appears to depend more on the compatibility between partners' styles. In addition to exploring the role of communication, Fletcher examines other factors that predict relationship stability/instability including (a) demographic factors, (b) personality factors, (c) attitudes and values, (d) relationship happiness, and (e) behavior in problem solving interactions. Finally, is divorce in our genes? Although genetic factors clearly play some role, Fletcher explains why genetic research (due to flawed

statistical methodology) has greatly overestimated the role of genes.

Human beings are born to bond with one another, and Chapter 7 provides an excellent, up-to-date review of attachment theory and research. Fletcher begins with the evolutionary roots of human attachment and illustrates how attachment behavior in children and corresponding caregiving behavior in parents enhance survival. He also explains how differences in children's *attachment style* can be viewed as adaptive solutions to different caregiving environments, and how love between adults mirrors, in some ways, the bond that develops between children and parents. Fletcher also reviews the evidence for individual differences in adult attachment style and argues that working models of attachment can be viewed as special types of lay theories of relationships. Like other lay theories, he suggests that working models of attachment enable individuals to understand, predict, and control their interpersonal world, and are activated automatically and outside of awareness.

The final chapter in this section (Chapter 8) examines mate selection. Based on an extensive review of the cross-cultural literature, Fletcher argues that people tend to focus on three main factors in evaluating potential mates: (a) personality factors related to warmth, intimacy, and commitment, (b) factors related to passion and vitality, such as attractiveness and sexual appeal, and (c) factors related to status and resources such as money, age, and social influence. Although there are some small gender differences, there is remarkable similarity across gender and culture in terms of what is most important. Moreover, the author suggests that evolutionary theory can explain these universal preferences in terms of two mating criteria, (a) the search for a mate who has good genes (younger, healthier, more fertile), and (b) the search for a mate who will be a good investment (capacity for intimacy and commitment, a devoted mate and parent). This chapter also explores *individual differences* in mate preferences. For example, based on his own empirical work, Fletcher argues that the specific *ideal standards* that people have for a mate are based in part of their own self-perceptions. That is, people tend to value in others what they see in themselves.

Part III of the book addresses two specific domains of relationship science, sexuality (Chapter 9) and relationship violence (Chapter 10). Chapter 9 tackles a variety of issues including the biological features of male and female sexuality, sexual preferences, jealousy, and homosexuality. Gender differences take central stage in this chapter. For example, evidence indicates that men and women differ in their sex drive, in their approach to sexual passion, and in the factors that trigger jealousy. There is also evidence for gender differences in homosexuality, which suggests that being gay has a stronger genetic component for men than for women. To account for these differences, Fletcher

considers a variety of explanations based on evolutionary and socio-cultural approaches. He also suggests that sexual behavior in men is influenced more by biological forces, and that sexual behavior in women is shaped more by cultural forces (religion, education). However, he is careful to point out that although gender differences are well-documented, there is far more variability *within* than *between* genders.

Chapter 10 explores research and theory on violence in intimate relationships. Fletcher navigates a complex and controversial terrain to arrive at a summary of the empirical data while placing moral and ideological concerns in proper perspective. He begins by reviewing the demographic and relationship correlates of intimate aggression. He then explores gender differences in relationship violence – are men more aggressive than women? Popular wisdom says yes, but empirical data reveal a more complicated picture. On self-report scales, men and women are equally likely to initiate aggression and report equal use of aggression. However, crime statistics indicate that men clearly harm women more than women harm men. For example, men kill their partners more often than do women; they are also more likely to kill others (e.g., children) at the same time. How can we explain gender difference in serious violence and homicide? Fletcher presents a number of possible explanations based on evolutionary, socio-cultural, and social psychological perspectives.

Part IV of the book contains the final chapter (Chapter 11) in which the author presents an overarching model of the intimate relationship mind. At the heart of this model is an understanding that relationship processes are a function of interactions between the person (with his or her genetic inheritance and relationship history) and the environment (the broader cultural environment and the local relationship environment). These forces work together to drive the development of general and specific lay theories of relationships, which then shape emotion, behavior, and cognition. Once again, Fletcher highlights the value of integrating social psychological and evolutionary perspectives, and argues for the importance of studying folk theories of relationships. Finally, Fletcher acknowledges the importance of distinguishing between science and moral debate, and he wisely observes that scientific knowledge can be used for good or ill, and can be exploited to justify any moral or political position.

In summary, this is an important book for both laypersons and scholars. Fletcher succeeds beautifully at making the book accessible and engaging enough for non-experts, but sophisticated and rigorous enough for experts. The book is serious yet full of drama and good humor. Indeed, what I enjoyed most about this volume is not only the fascinating tour of current research and theory, but also the sheer joy of science that underlies each chapter and each intellectual debate. Readers will come away from this book with a

greater appreciation for the scientific study of close relationships, and a deeper understanding of the complex forces that shape their own behavior and motivation in their most intimate relationships. I highly recommend this book as a supplement to graduate and advanced undergraduate seminars in close relationships. But please don't wait for a class to read this book. Treat it like a good novel – curl up in your favorite chair with a cappuccino (or a glass of wine) and enjoy the journey.

## **The Tending Instinct: How Nurturing is Essential to Who We Are and How We Live**

By Shelley E. Taylor  
(New York: Times Books, Henry Holt & Co.,  
2002, 290 pp.)

**Review by Linda K. Acitelli  
University of Houston**

*The Tending Instinct* reads like a story from *Columbo*, the television show in which we see a murder being committed, the murderer identified, and the motive established all in the first half hour of the show. Later we watch with anticipation when Lt. Columbo solves the mystery as he sifts through all of the clues we had not noticed. In the opening pages of *The Tending Instinct*, Shelley Taylor tells us how the story is going to end. Even so, the reader will want to keep reading to see how she reveals her thought processes and the evidence that brings her to the conclusion. She set a challenging task for herself, and that is to support every point in the theory with “parallel evidence in both biology and behavior” (p. 24).

Here is how Taylor sets the stage:

My story is about giving care – not the necessity or obligation of care giving, but its potency. My story is also about women and men and the differences between them. It did not set out to be so, but this has become an insistent theme in ways that are surprising and perhaps controversial. Women play a more central role in tending to others than do men. (p. 2)

Although no crime is committed, the many relationship researchers whose programs stem from or at least are explained by this fact cannot help but think that something is wrong with the characterization of this statement. Surprising? Controversial? How about “well researched” or “well established?”

The plot thickens. Why were the words “surprising” and “controversial” used to describe the idea that women play a more central role in tending to others than do men? Surely, we are well aware of researchers who celebrate the nurturing and relational sides of women as qualities to value, not deride. Jean Baker-Miller and Janet Surrey of the Stone School scholars, and Carol Gilligan come to mind. Leaving values aside, we can also name plenty of researchers who have come to similar conclusions (Toni Antonucci, Elizabeth Douvan, Eleanor Maccoby, Abigail Stewart, Julia Wood, and many social support, social work, marriage, and relationship researchers too numerous to mention). We are also familiar with the provocative idea that men fare better in marriage than women, repeated in Taylor's chapter on marriage. Yet no mention is made of the decades old book by Jesse Bernard, *His and Her Marriages*.

Taylor explains that in order not to box women into roles they do not want to play, scientists argued that men and women were the same. Further, she explains, much of the early research on human behavior was conducted with male participants, so, she argues, we lived with the fiction that men were no different from women. Taylor states, “When we look instead to women's lives for clues about human nature, the significance of nurturance snaps into place with such clarity that you wonder how its centrality could possibly have eluded scientific concern for so long” (p. 10). When I look to relationship research for clues about human nature, the significance of relating snaps into place with such clarity, that you wonder how the centrality of relationship research has eluded some scientists concern for so long. Sadly, I also wonder how a massive body of well-respected research on the topic of gender differences and the importance of social support has eluded such a distinguished group of scientists. Science has not made a mistake, as Taylor claims, but rather the mistake is with the scientists who refuse to recognize research that contradicts their political ideologies.

However, Taylor has done a remarkable job of combining social, behavioral, biological, and anthropological research to demonstrate the power and importance of tending to our lives. She writes so well, the reader gets the sense of a real living being behind the words. She rarely uses jargon and could probably explain very complex issues to any audience. Her written persona is clever, confident, and passionate about answering tough questions through social and biological research. Presenting tending as an instinct is a bold move, and one that Taylor successfully executes as she takes us through the origins of tending, the context of tending, the power of tending, on to the tending society. Yet, she does not deny that we all have aggressive and selfish instincts as well. Instead, Taylor states that both instincts, tending and aggressive, live inside each of us, men and women alike, and are expressed in many societies around the world. Even though that sounds a bit Freudian

(e.g., the life-preserving and life-destroying instincts), Taylor has modern scientific research to fit all of the pieces of the puzzle into a convincing whole. Taylor argues for paying more attention to our tending instinct, because, as she so wonderfully demonstrates, the tending society is a happy and healthy society. Is that such a crime?

## THE LIGHTER SIDE OF RELATIONSHIPS

### Relationship Film Festival

By David Kenny

I think I have a really phat idea. At our next meeting, we have a "Relationship Film Festival." The synergies would be humongous. Here are my suggestions for films that we might want to include. For the first festival, I think we should limit ourselves to titles that include two people's names. (Isn't that such a kwel idea, dudes and dudettes?) I attach here a brief summary of possible films. (I want to thank Chris Farley who taught me everything I know about movie reviews.)

*Jules and Jim*: This movie was a real disappointment. Here you have a French movie about two guys in love with the same woman. How come there is no menage a trois? Francois Truffe (the director dude who has a cameo in *Close Encounters of the Third Kind*) should be sued for false advertising.

*Romeo and Juliet*: This 1997 movie with Leonardo DiCaprio sucks big time. It is a silly adaptation of the plot of *West Side Story*. What a lame idea! The screenplay is atrocious and pretentious (too many wherefores and thous for me), and they rip off a trite balcony scene that is used in so many other movies. But hey, what other movie steals its name after an effect studied by us relationship researchers?

*Thelma and Louise*: I think this is the best dude-flick movie ever made. It carefully documents the unconscionable way that women treat men. These two chicks have seriously avoidant attachment styles and they are unable to connect with the men in their lives. No wonder in the end they go over the edge.

*Harold and Maude*: A great flick on causes of attraction. It conclusively shows that attraction is based more on interest similarity (they both love funerals and death) than demographic similarity (he's 19 and she's 79; thank God, Ruth Gordon used a stunt double!). It has a great Cat Stevens soundtrack before he became a Moslem called Yusuf Islam (or is it too soon for me to point this out?).

*Hillary and Jackie*: A great movie about sibling rivalry and caretaker stress. The soundtrack could benefit with a change of pace, like a lick from Eminem, JaRule, or the Spice Girls. Will there be a sequel in the future of Hillary and Bill?

*Chuck and Buck*: I was initially disappointed because I thought this was a prequel to John Candy's classic *Uncle Buck*, but it's not. (When is John Candy going to come out of retirement and make us laugh again?) Rather it tells the old tale of two people in love who just cannot connect because of attachment issues and societal taboos. This video made me think and that is not easy to do.

*Oscar and Lucinda*: All I can say about this is that people who live in glass churches should not throw dice.

### (I Can't Get No) NSFaction\*

By Bill Ickes

(Ripped off from the Rolling Stones)

I can't get no NSFaction.  
I can't get no big grant action.  
'Cause I try, and I try,  
And I try, and I try.  
I can't get no . . .  
I can't get no . . .

When I'm trying to read these forms,  
Dr. Breckler comes on the speakerphone.  
He's telling me more and more  
About some red-tape information  
Designed to fry my imagination.  
I can't get no . . .  
Uh no, no, no.

Hey-hey-hey . . .  
That's what I say.

I can't get no NSFaction.  
I can't get no big grant action.  
'Cause I try, and I try,  
And I try, and I try.  
I can't get no . . .  
I can't get no . . .

When I'm at SESP,  
 And a man comes up and tells me  
 How great my life can be. "But, buddy,  
 You can't be a man 'cause you haven't got  
 The same kind of bucks as me."  
 I can't get no . . .  
 Uh no, no, no.

Uh hey-hey-hey . . .  
 That's what I say.

I can't get no NSFaction.  
 I can't get no big grant action.  
 'Cause I try, and I try,  
 And I try, and I try.  
 I can't get no . . .  
 I can't get no . . .

When I'm applyin' round the world,  
 And I'm submittin' this and submittin' that,  
 And I'm tryin' to reach some girl. She tells me  
 "Baby, better back off. You ain't unique  
 With your NSF cycle losin' streak."  
 I can't get no . . .  
 No, no, no.

Uh hey-hey-hey . . .  
 That's what I say.

I can't get no . . .  
 I can't get no . . .  
 I can't get no . . .  
 NSFaction . . .  
 No NSFaction . . .  
 I can't get no . . .

\*Pronounced Enn-Ess-FAK-shun

## STUDENT & NEW PROFESSIONALS COLUMN

### New Beginnings

by **Caroline T. Rankin**  
**University of Texas at Austin**

At the end of every summer, I look forward to the start of the fall term with fond anticipation. I look forward to undergraduate students returning to classes, seeing those faces that have become familiar from classes the year before. I look forward to local news channels reporting on the incoming freshman class- how bright and special they all are. I look forward to the cadence of marching bands and stadium chants at football games. I look forward to department happy hours where I'll be able to reconnect with people I haven't seen all summer. As I recall these memories from past years and anticipate them again, I think about possibilities that exist for unknown academic collaborations and discoveries with new graduate students and new faculty. I imagine all the work I'll accomplish this year, how this will be the most productive year yet.

Then a couple of days before the start of the term, everything changes. I forget about my sweet and simple anticipation. Textbooks need to be ordered, packets put together, and rosters assembled. Traffic picks back up as students and their families amble through the streets in their rented moving trucks. I start to get e-mails from desperate students begging to get into my class. Those last few items on my summer "to do" list nag at me to get them done. Fall deadlines for conference submissions loom closer and closer. Somehow the details overwhelm the big picture.

I imagine the start of a new organization goes through a similar process.

In the beginning, we excitedly brainstorm ways to improve the old way of doing things. Synergistically we come up with new and better ideas. Then the day-to-day stuff pops up. Budgets need to be balanced and merged. Constitutions are revised. Cultures and traditions unique to each organization are explicitly examined for overlap. In the midst of the excitement of a new organization, these details might be missed if it weren't for the efforts of everyone who served on the committees that made this merger possible. Luckily, these individual's hard work has allowed the rest of us the luxury of being excited about a

new beginning without having to worry about the details of starting something new.

For the new scholars, I would encourage us to remember the optimism and energy we felt as we embarked on our journeys this year. And to remember what we've learned: that sometimes emotion and attitude can be contagious, for better or for worse. Why not make it for better. Right now we have a unique opportunity in that we, as a new organization, have the resources of a well-established organization: expertise, commitment, experience, etc. I would also encourage everyone in our new Association to thank those who made this merger possible by making the most of our new organization through our research and teaching.

## FEATURE ARTICLE

### The Top 10 Things I Wish Someone Had Told Me When I Was in Graduate School

**Diane Holmberg**  
Acadia University

At the recent ICPR conference in Halifax, I was asked to organize a breakfast for graduate student attendees. As part of that event, I asked a panel of researchers in the field to come up with a list of things they wish someone had told them when they were in grad school (or, as some amended it, things people did tell them that they really wish they had listened to). Here is the Top 10 list they created. Share it with a graduate student you value, or maybe take away a piece of advice or two for yourself!

Many thanks to the panel members: Michele Acker, Arthur Aron, Nancy Collins, Sandra Metts, and Dan Perlman.

#### **10. Be systematic. Plan and build a program of research.**

Early on in your graduate school career, decide on your major area of research interest. Prepare a tentative outline of your dissertation. Then, when it comes time to do a small paper for one course, or to design and conduct a study for another course, pick out a chunk of your dissertation that needs to be done, and have it do double duty (with your profs' permission, of course). Take the portion of your dissertation which deals with future research directions seriously. Use it as a guideline for your

first research studies in your new job. You do not have to commit to a single line of research forever. However, you will probably develop greater expertise, and have better luck getting published, if you conduct a series of studies examining one issue in depth, rather than scattering your resources across a number of different topics.

#### **9. Find a mentor .**

Whether it is an upper-year graduate student when you just start out, a caring faculty member as you advance in graduate school, or a more experienced colleague when you get your new job, try hard to find somebody who can "show you the ropes". Many important rules are unwritten. A quick bit of advice from someone who has gone through the same experience can save you hours of frustration or misapplied energy. Many people are happy to help out if asked. In turn, be sure to "pay it forward" and help out the new people once you have gained some expertise.

#### **8. Work collaboratively.**

Foster good working relationships with your faculty members, with your fellow graduate students, and with other IARR members, now. In the future, you may end up at a small school, or one where there are few others working in your area. Collaborating long-distance is easier than ever these days. You are likely to be more creative and more productive if you can work together with other like-minded individuals. At your new job, be sure to explore collaboration opportunities with those in other disciplines. The close relationships field lends itself well to a multi-disciplinary approach, and some funding agencies favour proposals which take such an approach.

#### **7. Quality of work is more important than quantity .**

This piece of advice must be qualified -- quantity is undoubtedly necessary at times as well (e.g., application for tenure or promotion). Still, one really well designed, thoughtful, and creative piece of work is likely to gain more exposure in the field than five poorly done studies that only appear in second-rate journals or never get published at all. In graduate school, avoid the temptation to constantly be busy gathering more and more data, only to find that much of the work is seriously flawed. Take the time to think carefully and get plenty of feedback, to make sure the studies you do run will be worthwhile ones.

#### **6. Value the support of family, friends, good colleagues.**

It is amazing how much the support and encouragement of those around you can make a difference in your career. If you find friends or colleagues who will become your advocates, who will listen when you try to work through a problem, who will offer useful advice (and who will also tell you when you are simply wrong), value them, treasure them, maintain those ties at all costs. If you have the

luxury of deciding between two jobs, do not underestimate the value of a friendly, collegial working atmosphere. For your long-term well-being, you are probably better off going with the place where you like the people better, even if it is a slightly less prestigious position.

### 5. Be prepared to deal with rejection.

Job applications, grant proposals, journal submissions – in so many of the tasks academics face, many more people receive negative news than positive news. If you enter an academic career, you are going to experience rejections, sometimes even nasty ones, repeatedly over the course of the years. Every single one of us, even the top names in the field, experience regular rejections. Get used to it, don't take it personally, persevere – or go into another field.

### 4. Take the time to revise.

Thesis committees and journal editors alike appreciate a tight, well-written, carefully-reasoned piece of work. Your ideas may be innovative and groundbreaking, but if your readers are distracted by poor writing, your thoughts will not get the hearing they deserve. Outline, write, revise, wait, revise again, get feedback from friends and colleagues, and revise again.

### 3. Don't wait for inspiration, or for the perfect moment – just do it.

Dan Perlman shared a wonderful quote from John Kenneth Galbraith: “All writers know that on some golden mornings they are touched by the wand – are on intimate terms with poetry and cosmic truth. I have experienced those moments myself. Their lesson is simple: It's a total illusion. I am persuaded that most writers, like most shoemakers, are about as good one day as the next. The meaning is that one had better go to his or her typewriter every morning and stay there.” Be a shoemaker. Learn to sit down when you have even half an hour to write, and just write. Yes, it's hard, but if you wait until you have a big chunk of time and are in the right mood, it will never happen.

### 2. It's okay to say no.

Even as a graduate student, you may find yourself overcommitted at times. If you go on to an academic position, the possible demands on your time increase rapidly. There are always committees to sit on, students to supervise, grant or journal reviews to complete, new courses to prepare – the list goes on. Obviously, you must be a good departmental citizen and do your fair share. But, even if an offer is tempting and flattering, do not automatically say yes. Say you will consider it. Talk to others who have done similar work in the past, and get a realistic estimate of the commitment of time and energy that will be required. Then say yes to those that will most

benefit you personally, that will best earn you gratitude from important others, or that you consider to be the most important. Say no to the rest. You simply can't do everything, so set your priorities and stick to them.

### 1. To thine own self be true.

Plenty of people will offer you advice on who you should choose for a supervisor, on what your dissertation topic should be, on what types of jobs you should apply for, on where you should move, on what your research agenda should be. Listen carefully to what they have to say; often their experience is greater than yours, and their advice is valuable. In the end, though, you must take into account the choice that is the best for you. No one else can decide that for you. It may not be the most popular choice, or the most prestigious choice, or the one that's obviously best for your career. But you are the one who will have to live with this decision for years to come, so make it the one that works the best for you, taking all factors into account (even if that means ignoring some of the advice in this list!).

---

## Contents of Upcoming Journals

### *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*

#### Volume 19.5 (October 2002)

Special section on relationship science:

Bradbury, T. N. Research on relationships as a prelude to action. (Invited article.)

Reis, H. T. Action matters, but relationship science is basic.

Muehlhoff, T., & Wood, J. T. Speaking of marital communication: The marriage between theory and practice.

Hendrick, C. A new age of prevention?

Bradbury, T. N. Research on relationships as a prelude to action: Response to commentaries

Regular articles:

Paul, E. L., & Hayes, K. A. The casualties of “casual” sex: A qualitative exploration of the phenomenology of college students' hookups.

Hess, J. A. Distance regulation in personal relationships: The development of a conceptual model and a test of representational validity.

Vogel, D. L., & Karney, B. R. Demands and withdrawal in newlyweds: Elaborating on the social structure hypothesis.

Trees, A. R. The influence of relational context on support processes: Points of difference and similarity between young adult sons and daughters in problem talk with mothers.

### ***Personal Relationships***

#### Volume 10.1 (March 2003)

Distinguished Scholar Article:

Burlison, B. R. The experience and effects of emotional support: What the study of cultural and gender differences can tell us about close relationships, emotion, an interpersonal communication

Segrin, C., Powell, H. L., Givertz, M., & Brackin, A. Symptoms of depression, relational quality, and loneliness in dating relationships.

Le, B., & Agnew, C. R. Commitment and its theorized determinants: A meta-analysis of the investment model.

Rowe, A., & Carnelley, K. B. Attachment style differences in the processing of attachment-relevant information: Primed-style effects on recall, interpersonal expectations, and affect.

Bellavia, G., & Murray, S. Did I do that? Self-esteem-related differences in relations to romantic partners' moods.

Sanford, K. Problem solving conversations in marriage: Does it matter what topics couples discuss?

Tashiro, T., & Frazier, P. "I'll never be in a relationship like that again": Personal growth following romantic relationship breakups.

### ***Journal of Marriage and the Family***

#### Volume 64.4

Melzer, S. A. Gender, work, and intimate violence: Men's occupational violence spillover and compensatory violence.

Browning, C. R. The span of collective efficacy: Extending social disorganization theory to partner violence.

Anderson, K. L. Perpetrator or victim? Relationships between intimate partner violence and well-being.

Heyman, R. E., & Smith Slep, A. A. Do child abuse and interparental violence lead to adulthood family violence?

Levine, M., L., Xu, X., & Bartkowski, J. Seasonality of sexual debut

Gilmore, M. R., Archibald, M. E., Morrison, D. M., Wilsdon, A., Wells, E. A., Hoppe, M. J., Nahon, D., & Murowchich, E. Teen sexual behavior: Applicability of the theory of reasoned action.

Wade, L. D., & DeLamater, J. D. Relationship dissolution as a life stage transition: Effects on sexual attitudes and behaviors.

Musick, K. A. Planned and unplanned childbearing among unmarried women.

Kluwer, E. S., Heesink, J. A. M., & van de Vliert, E. The division of labor across the transition to parenthood: A justice perspective.

Mulsow, M., Caldera, Y. M., Pursley, M., Reifman, A., & Huston, A. C. Multilevel factors influencing maternal stress during the first three years.

Koropecykj-Cox, T. Beyond parental status: Psychological well-being in middle and old age.

Porterfield, S. W. Work choices of mothers in families with children with disabilities.

Levin-Coley, R., & Morris, J. E. Comparing father and mother reports of father involvement among low-income minority families.

McBride, B. C., Schoppe, S. J., & Rane, T. B. Child characteristics, parenting stress, and parental involvement: Fathers versus mothers.

Forehand, R., Jones, D. J., Brody, G. H., & Armistead, L. African American children's adjustment: The roles of maternal and teacher depressive symptoms.

Rodgers, K. B., & Rose, H. A. Risk and resiliency factors among adolescents who experience marital transitions.

Knapp, S. J. Authorizing family science: An analysis of the objectifying practices of family science discourse.

Edwards, M. E. Institutional barriers to taking good advice: A response to "authorizing family science."

Sanchez, L. A. What do social constructionists want?

Larson, R. Constructing social science (please read all warnings before, during, and after use).

Hirschman, C., & Minh, N. H. Tradition and change in Vietnamese family structure in the Red River delta.

Killian, T., & Ganong, L. H. Ideology, context, and obligations to assist older persons.

Crosnoe, R., & Elder, G. H. Life course transitions, the intergenerational stake, and grandparent-grandchild relationships.

- Family members' access to, use of, and discussion about technology in acquiring information about health.
- Intergenerational familial influences on health.
- How "myths" or "folk remedies" about health (e.g., pregnancy treatments, what to do when you have a cold) are discussed or reinforced in the family.
- Relational messages consequent upon health talk in families.
- Physician-family communication.

The official deadline for manuscripts is September 30, 2002. Manuscripts should be sent to Carma Bylund and Steve Duck, Guest Editors, Department of Communication Studies, University of Iowa, 105 BCSB, Iowa City IA 52242.

## CALL FOR SUBMISSIONS

### Special issue of *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*

We are seeking papers for a special issue of *JSPR* with the theme of "The everyday interplay between family relationships and family members' health." Specifically, the focus for this issue is on: (1) how family members construct health and healthy behaviors; and, (2) how family members socialize and reinforce their members into health practices and health care practices. Although we recognize the import of the social support literature, this special issue is not intended to examine the role families play in chronic or acute illnesses or how they act as caregivers. Instead, this special issue will examine family or relational processes that affect beliefs about health or health practices, including how family members provide a general context for discussion and definition of health and illness, acknowledge symptoms, affirm the need to visit a health care provider, encourage sustaining a regimen of treatment, and seek to influence other family members' health behaviors. We seek a mixture of research-based and theoretical articles tied to data.

Articles that would fit this issue's theme might include (but are not limited to):

- How "health" and "illness" are constructed in families.
- Parents' talk, both planned and unplanned, with their children about health risk behaviors (e.g., drugs, tobacco, alcohol, sex).
- "Taboo" health topics in families, and how families manage stresses involved in revealing health issues to other family members.
- Parent-child talk about "healthy" behaviors: what is considered healthy in regard to nutrition, exercise, vitamins, other precautionary measures.
- How influence about health risk behaviors is accomplished in the family.

## JOB ANNOUNCEMENT

The Department of Communication at the University of Washington seeks a tenure-track assistant professor in the area of social interaction. Candidates should have interests in interpersonal and/or relational communication with an emphasis on the ways people interact with one another. The contexts in which the interactions occur may be face-to-face, on-line, or mediated. Particular focus may include (but is not limited to) the study of language and nonverbal behavior, instructional communication, children's communication, and/or relational development. Ideally, candidates for this position will also have scholarly interests in one or more of our other research areas (particularly communication and culture or technology and society) and make useful links between social interaction and those areas. A strong grounding in interpersonal or relational theories is important. Candidates should be prepared to teach courses related to interpersonal communication and to teach quantitative or qualitative methods. We are also looking for a candidate interested in teaching our large lecture introductory course.

Our new department, which brings together the former Department of Speech Communication and School of Communications, is a product of five years of extensive discussion and curriculum development among faculty in these two units and UW leadership. The Department has created innovative and forward-looking graduate and undergraduate programs founded on the principles of intellectual and cultural pluralism, interdisciplinary theorizing, diverse methods of inquiry, public scholarship

and community engagement, and innovation through collaboration among faculty and students. Building upon these core principles, Department faculty members have identified seven areas of emphasis: communication and culture; international communication; political communication; rhetoric and critical studies; social interaction; technology and society; and journalism. New faculty members are expected to contribute significantly to at least one of these areas. Faculty are expected to conduct research, teach 4-5 courses during a three-quarter academic year, and supervise graduate students at the master's and doctoral levels. Applicants must demonstrate a potential for excellence in research and teaching and the ability to contribute to the Department's new curriculum as well as new interdisciplinary programs arrayed among communication, political science, and technical communication. Candidates must have earned or be close to completion of a Ph.D. by September 2003, in a field related to the positions offered. Candidates should send a letter of application, curriculum vitae, statement of research and teaching interests, copies of teaching evaluations, and three letters of recommendation.

The start date for these positions is September 16, 2003. Applications will be reviewed beginning November 1, 2002, and until the positions are filled. Send application material to Professor Gerald Baldasty, Chair, Department of Communication, Box 353740, University of Washington, Seattle WA 98195-3740. Send inquiries to Valerie Manusov ([manusov@u.washington.edu](mailto:manusov@u.washington.edu)), who is the search chair and the Department's Associate Chair. The University of Washington is the largest and most active research institution in the Northwest with several extensive libraries and substantial computing and support facilities. The Department of Communication is committed to building a culturally diverse faculty and strongly encourages applications from women, minorities, individuals with disabilities, and covered veterans. The University of Washington is an affirmative action, equal opportunity employer.

## MEMBER NEWS & UPDATES

**Congratulations to the following members for their outstanding recent accomplishments:**

**Dawn Braithwaite** has won the University of Nebraska College of Arts & Sciences award for outstanding research and creative achievement in social sciences.

**Valerie Cole** has received promotion and tenure at St. John Fisher College and is now an associate professor of psychology. This fall, she will be on sabbatical in Merida, Mexico, teaching abnormal psychology from a cross-cultural perspective, and studying curanderismo, the indigenous Mexican folk system of healing.

**Harold H. Kelley, Ellen Berscheid, Andrew Christensen, John H. Harvey, Ted L. Huston, George Levinger, Evie McClintock, Letitia Anne Peplau, and Donald R. Peterson** will have a reprint of their classic text, *Close Relationships*, published by Percheron Press.

**Michelle Miller-Day** has been awarded a \$388,000, two-year grant from the William T. Grant Foundation to fund a multi-method research project to examine the experiences of working poor African American mothers and their adolescent children. The research will examine the ways maternal work experiences of low-income African American mothers living in high-risk urban neighborhoods influence the mother-youth relationship and the consequent impact on the development and adjustment of their adolescent offspring.

**Greg Morrow** has been appointed director of the MA clinical program in psychology at Edinboro University of Pennsylvania.

**Todd Shackelford** has been promoted to associate professor of psychology at Florida Atlantic University and has been appointed co-coordinator of the graduate program.

From **Phil Shaver**: I would like to thank IARR, and especially everyone directly responsible for my selection, for granting me IARR's Distinguished Career Award. No one told me before the meeting that I would receive the award, or even that I *might* receive an award. After having made plans to attend the meeting simply out of my own interest in the people and presentations, I was invited by Everett Waters and Chris Fraley to attend a small meeting of attachment researchers funded by a private benefactor. That meeting was held the week before IARR's conference, and having a workaholic wife and 6-year-old twin daughters, I didn't think I could be away from home two weeks in a row, so I sadly cancelled my plans to attend IARR. In any case, I'm deeply honored by the award and terribly sorry I wasn't present in person to thank everyone for it.

## IARR BOARD

### OFFICERS:

#### Past Presidents:

Michael Cunningham  
michael.cunningham@louisville.edu

Harry Reis  
reis@scp.rochester.edu

#### President:

Robert Milardo  
rhd360@maine.edu

#### Vice President:

William Cupach  
wrcupac@ilstu.edu

#### Secretary-Treasurer:

William Dragon  
wdragon@cornellcollege.edu

### MEMBERS AT LARGE:

Beth Emery  
bemery@mtsu.edu

Terri Orbuch  
orbuch@umich.edu

### NEW PROFESSIONAL REPRESENTATIVE:

Caroline Rankin  
ctrankin@mail.utexas.edu

### JOURNAL EDITORS:

Mark A. Fine (*JSPR*)  
finem@missouri.edu

Susan Sprecher (*PR*)  
sprecher@ilstu.edu

### NEWSLETTER EDITORS:

Kathy Carnelley  
kc6@soton.ac.uk

Kory Floyd  
kory@asu.edu

### COMMITTEE CHAIRS:

Dawn Braithwaite (Awards Chair)  
dbraithwaite@unl.edu

Scott Christopher (Program Chair)  
scott.christopher@asu.edu

Michael Cunningham (Elections Co-Chair)  
michael.cunningham@louisville.edu

Sandra Metts (Membership Chair)  
smmetts@ilstu.edu

Terri Orbuch (Future Conferences Chair)  
orbuch@umich.edu

Harry Reis (Elections Co-Chair)  
reis@scp.rochester.edu

Ruth Sharabany (Mentoring Chair)  
rsps603@uvm.haifa.ac.il

Anita Vangelisti (Publications Chair)  
a.vangelisti@mail.utexas.edu

## CALL FOR NOMINATIONS

The IARR Publications Committee is soliciting nominations for editor of the *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships* to succeed Mark Fine, whose term ends at the end of December, 2004. Self-nominations are welcomed. A completed nomination package should include the candidate's vita, a letter from the candidate describing his or her goals for the journal and editing philosophy (i.e., how he or she would run the journal, work with associate editors, select an editorial board), three letters of support from publishing scholars familiar with the candidate's work and experience, and a letter of institutional support from the candidate's home institution. Queries may be directed to any of the members of the Publications Committee: Julie Fitness, Heather Helms-Erikson, Mike Johnson, Jeff Simpson, or Anita Vangelisti (Chair).

All nomination materials should be received by March 1, 2003. Nominations should be addressed to:

Anita L. Vangelisti  
 IARR Publications Committee  
 Department of Communication Studies, #A1105  
 University of Texas at Austin  
 Austin, TX 78712  
 phone: 512-471-1921  
 fax: 512-471-3504  
 email: a.vangelisti@mail.utexas.edu

Clara Mulder  
 University of Amsterdam

Fieldwork for an extensive face-to-face interview survey among a large random sample of the Dutch population: the *Netherlands Kinship Panel Study* (NKPS) started August 2002 and will continue until June 2003. The NKPS has four special features: (a) it is large (N = 10,000, with an oversampling of respondents from ethnic minorities, and an undersampling of respondents who are in their first marriage to ensure adequate representation of respondents in non-standard living arrangements), (b) it is a panel (data from respondents and family members will be collected at more than one point in time, yielding a prospective longitudinal design), (c) it is multi-method (both structured interviews and in-depth open interviews will be conducted), and (d) it is multi-actor (data from individual respondents will be collected as well as from family members). The combination of these features makes the NKPS highly innovative. In the Netherlands, existing surveys (with the exception of those carried out for statistical purposes by Statistics Netherlands) are smaller, they seldom have a prospective design, they only occasionally gather data from residential kin (and hardly ever from non-residential kin) and rarely combine qualitative and quantitative methods.

## VOLUNTEERS WANTED

A brief history of ISSPR is now available and we would like to see a similar document for INPR developed. These sorts of materials are very useful to current boards, particularly in planning future conferences. If interested, please contact Bob Milardo.

One or more volunteers are also needed to assemble an Administrative Handbook for IARR. The Handbook would include separate sections detailing the essential responsibilities of officers and committees. A model Handbook is available to help in initiating this project. Once completed, copies of the Handbook would then be available to all officers, board members, and committees. If interested, please contact Bob Milardo.

## RESEARCH NEWS: Netherlands Kinship Panel Study

### A Multi-Actor, Multi-Method Panel Study (2001 – 2006) on Solidarity in Family Relationships

Pearl Dykstra (Director)  
 Netherlands Interdisciplinary Demographic Institute

Matthijs Kalmijn  
 Tilburg University

Trudie Knijn  
 Utrecht University

Aafke Komter  
 Utrecht University

Aart Liefbroer  
 Netherlands Interdisciplinary Demographic Institute

**Content:** Family and kinship will be examined from a dynamic multi-actor perspective. Three types of relationships will be investigated: those between (un)married cohabiting partners, between parents and their (co-residing) children, and between family members who do not share a residence. The underlying research questions revolve around the theme of solidarity. Solidarity is defined as 'feelings of connectedness in family relationships and how these are expressed in behavioural terms'. Three dimensions are distinguished: instrumental, social, and emotional solidarity. The research goals are (a) to describe the nature and strength of solidarity in family and kin relationships, (b) to explain variations in solidarity across individuals and social categories, and (c) to examine the consequences of solidarity for individual well-being.

**Data-collection:** Within NKPS several complementary data-collection strategies will be used. Structured face-to-face interviews will be conducted with 10,000 so-called 'Anchors', on five broad topics: (a) Anchor's life course and current circumstances, (b) behavioural aspects of the relationships of Anchor with relevant family members, (c) attitudinal and emotional aspects of the relationships of Anchor with relevant family members, (d) Anchor's general attitudes towards family relationships, and (e)

Anchor's well being and life-satisfaction. Self-completion questionnaires will be sent to family members, and more specifically to the partner –either inside or outside the household– one of the parents, a sibling, and a maximum of two children. Thirdly, in-depth interviews will be conducted with so-called mini-panels, on five subject areas that have been identified as being most likely to benefit from an integration of quantitative and qualitative research methodologies: (a) exceptionally high and low levels of solidarity, (b) conflicts within family relationships and solidarity, (c) changes in solidarity, (d) non-standard living arrangements and solidarity, and (e) gender, age, ethnicity and solidarity.

**Motivation:** The programme is motivated by both scientific and societal considerations. In the Netherlands, research in family sociology has been losing ground during a time in which family relationships have been changing rapidly. The increasingly complex nature of contemporary family relationships has posed society and policymakers with a series of new and challenging questions. Family sociology has the potential to help find answers, but the lack of institutional and scientific growth in this discipline leaves this potential unrealised. The scarcity of high-quality databases affects the competitiveness of Dutch family sociology in the international academic community. Leading countries have been developing better quality data, which has resulted in rising methodological standards in the top academic journals. The development of a large-scale, multi-actor, multi-method panel survey which is highly accessible to the wider research community will be a collective investment that will help Dutch family sociology meet the top international academic standards. This kind of an investment clearly surpasses the financial means of individual institutions, a situation which was acknowledged by the Dutch Research Council, NWO. Funding for the NKPS was obtained through their 'Large Investments' program.

**Organization:** A team of six researchers (Pearl Dykstra, Matthijs Kalmijn, Trudie Knijn, Aafke Komter, Aart Liefbroer and Clara Mulder) is in charge of managing and coordinating the NKPS. The project team is supplemented by a fieldwork coordinator (Sylvia Commandeur) and an automations specialist (Mathieu Starink). The Scientific Advisory Council (SAC) advises and supports the project team in designing and implementing the NKPS. The Dutch members of the SAC are: Manuela Du Bois-Reymond (Leiden University), Christien Brinkgreve (Utrecht University), Harry Ganzeboom (Free University Amsterdam), Jenny Gierveld (Netherlands Institute for Advanced Studies in the Humanities and Social Sciences, NIAS), Paul de Graaf (Nijmegen University), Jacques Hagendoorn (Utrecht University),

Pieter Hooimeijer (Utrecht University), Cees de Hoog (Wageningen University), Kees Knipscheer (Free University Amsterdam), Sako Musterd (University of Amsterdam), Wim van Oorschoot (Tilburg University), Tom Snijders (Groningen University), Justus Veenman (Erasmus University Rotterdam) and Wilma Vollebergh (Nijmegen University). The international members of the SAC are: Sara Arber (University of Surrey), Gunhild Hagestad (Kristiansand College), Martin Kohli (Free University Berlin), Eva Lelièvre (French Demographic Institute, INED), Judith Seltzer (University of California at Los Angeles), Elizabeth Thomson (University of Wisconsin at Madison) and Alan Walker (University Sheffield).

**Context:** Employment of the data will be secured in three different ways. First, the Netherlands Interdisciplinary Demographic Institute, Utrecht University, Tilburg University and the University of Amsterdam and have committed themselves to invest research capacity to carry out this line of research. Second, funding for junior researchers who would employ the data can be obtained through a separate programme (*Family Relationships: The Ties That Bind*) at the Dutch Research Council, NWO. Third, the data will be made available to the broader research community both in- and outside the Netherlands. To encourage interested academic researchers to use the survey, the data will be made available free of cost, accessible codebooks and user guides will be developed, and workshops will be organised.

For additional information, visit [www.nkps.nl](http://www.nkps.nl) or contact Pearl Dykstra ([dykstra@nidi.nl](mailto:dykstra@nidi.nl)).

## CONFERENCE ANNOUNCEMENTS & CALLS

### Special Topics Conference, Summer 2003

By Susan Sprecher, Chair of the Planning Committee  
for a Conference on *COMPASSIONATE LOVE*

In response to the IARR Future Conferences Committee's (FCC) request for proposals for smaller regional or thematic conferences for 2003 and beyond, I submitted a proposal to host a special topics conference in Normal, Illinois in summer of 2003. At the same time, I submitted a proposal to the Fetzer

Institute (a nonprofit private operating foundation in Kalamazoo, Michigan) to help support the conference. This conference has been approved by IARR, and the Fetzer Institute has agreed to provide support for some of the costs of the conference. My university (Illinois State University) will also be a co-sponsor.

Although some details are yet to be worked out, we do know the following:

- The conference themes will be compassionate love, altruistic love, other-centered love, or related phenomena including but not limited to social support, care-giving, understanding, and forgiveness. Submissions should be related to these topics or other issues focused on the good of others, and the context may be either relational (e.g., marriage, friendship, families) or non-relational (e.g., compassion for strangers, love for humanity).
- The conference will be held at The Chateau Hotel and Conference Center in Normal/Bloomington, IL (USA) May 30 - June 2, 2003. (For those of you who have been around for a while, you may recall that this was the site of the 1991 INPR conference.)
- Deadline for submissions will be January 8, 2003. Submissions must be sent both electronically and through regular mail. Submission requirements are located on a flyer inserted with this newsletter.
- Because of the nature of the conference (a focus on a special topic), attendance is expected not to exceed approximately 100 people.
- Registration information (including registration fee) will be made available in February after the deadline for submissions. Support from the Fetzer Institute will allow the planning committee to set a lower than usual registration fee.
- Normal/Bloomington is centrally located in the U.S. and relatively easy to get to by Amtrak, air, and interstate travel. It is only two driving hours from Chicago,

and has a regional airport with flights daily to and from Chicago and other cities. Also, a bus to and from Chicago O'Hare airport runs several times a day.

- Other information, including announcements of invited speakers, will be forthcoming later this fall. For inquiries, please contact Susan Sprecher at: [loveconf@ilstu.edu](mailto:loveconf@ilstu.edu)

On behalf of the planning committee, I extend a warm encouragement to those of you engaged in research on compassionate love or other attitudes and behaviors centered on the good of others to submit a proposal to the conference. We hope to see you in Normal May 30 - June 2!

---

### **IARR's First New Scholars' Workshop, Summer 2003**

By Scott Christopher, Program Chair

I am pleased to announce IARR's first New Scholars' Workshop to be held at **Arizona State University** June 13-15, 2003. The workshop will give developing scholars the opportunity to interact with established scholars in one-on-one consultations. Featured speakers include Sue Sprecher, who will present on *Integrating Research and Teaching: Tips for Research Success While at the University that Emphasizes Teaching*, and Kory Floyd, whose talk is entitled *Grant Writing for Young Scholars*. Additional speakers will be announced.

For those New Scholars who are interested in attending, applications are to include: (a) a title page with the applicant's name, address, university affiliation, email address, phone number, fax number (if available), and status in graduate program (e.g., first-year, completed comprehensives, proposed dissertation, new assistant professor); (b) a one-page abstract of a personal research project to be presented at a poster session – the project can be at any level of completion, including initial conceptualization, measurement of variables, data analysis, or completed project, and the abstract should include a paragraph that details two issues the new scholar would like to work on with the established scholars conducting the workshop; (c) a second page that details two-issues the new scholar would like to see address for each of the

following areas: teaching in the area of personal relationships, publishing relationship research, applying for grants.

Enrollment is limited to 25 new scholars. The cost of the workshop is \$70. Housing at an ASU dorm is available for an additional \$45 (based on double occupancy). Workshop co-sponsors include the Department of Family and Human Development and the Hugh Downs School of Human Communication, Arizona State University. For more information, contact Scott Christopher (email: [scott.christopher@asu.edu](mailto:scott.christopher@asu.edu); phone: 480-965-0354).

Send four copies of the application, postmarked by **December 15**, to IARR New Scholars' Workshop, c/o Dr. F. Scott Christopher, Department of Family and Human Development, Arizona State University, Tempe AZ 85287-2502, USA.

Please let your students know about the workshop!

## CALL FOR CONFERENCE PROPOSALS

The International Association for Relationship Research (IARR) would like to sponsor or co-sponsor smaller regional, thematic, or graduate student conferences and workshops in the non-conference years (e.g., 2003, 2005). At this time, the Future Conferences Committee (FCC) invites proposals to host 2003 IARR workshops, mini-conferences, graduate student conferences and/or regional conferences. The FCC will begin to review proposals starting **September 1, 2002**. **The committee will review proposals through December 31, 2002.**

Proposals to host an IARR 2003 mini-conference or workshop can be brought forward by an individual, or group of individuals. Please send all preliminary proposals to Terri Orbuch (Chair, Future Conferences Committee) ([Orbuch@Umich.edu](mailto:Orbuch@Umich.edu)) via email. If you have any questions or concerns (or want to discuss the possibility), please contact Terri Orbuch. All proposals will be reviewed by the FCC and the IARR Board.

A proposal to host a 2003 mini-conference or workshop should contain the following information:

1. **Names and contact information** (addresses, office and home telephone numbers, fax

numbers, email addresses) of those making the proposal.

2. **Major theme** and/or focus of the conference.
3. **Site of the conference**, including city, state or province, and country. Include the actual physical site of the conference, such as a particular university or conference center. Also, provide a brief description of the site's ambience.
4. **The planned date** of the conference.
5. Projected **number of participants** at the conference.
6. **Any possible co-sponsors** of the conference (besides IARR), and their degree of involvement (financial, participants, etc.).
7. A description of major venues for the conference. This should include descriptions of: meeting places, eating facilities, and lodging facilities (dormitories, local hotels).
8. **Any stipends** that will be provided to students and/or invited speakers.
9. **A rough budget** projection and estimates of costs of attending the conference, including:
  - a. current airfares from major cities.
  - b. lodging costs for major options (dormitories, hotels)
  - c. projected conference registration fee

**IARR Members:  
Contact Bill Dragon with address,  
phone, and email changes:**

**[wdragon@cornellcollege.edu](mailto:wdragon@cornellcollege.edu)**

Attached to this newsletter is a copy of the IARR membership form. Please share it with a friend, colleague, or student and feel free to make and distribute several copies to encourage more to join.

Please note that this form is for THIS YEAR (January 1, 2002 to December 31, 2002). Members will receive a new form in the mail for the 2003 membership year.

### **The International Association for Relationship Research (IARR)**

Membership runs from January 1 to December 31 each year. People who join during the year will receive that year's back copy(ies) of journals (*Personal Relationships* and *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*), newsletters, a membership directory, and other mailings.

#### **Member information:**

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Business Address:

---

---

---

---

---

Mailing Address (leave blank if the same as your business address):

---

---

---

---

---

---

Phone numbers/work: \_\_\_\_\_ home (optional): \_\_\_\_\_

FAX number: \_\_\_\_\_ E-mail: \_\_\_\_\_

Web Page URL: \_\_\_\_\_

If you are interested in serving on a committee (e.g., membership, publications, conference planning, awards, nominations) or able to volunteer your talents to the organization (e.g., officer, newsletter, on-site conference assistance), please indicate in what capacity you would be able to help:

**Disciplinary Affiliations**

Because elections and committee roles are based in part discipline diversity, please write the number of your primary affiliation from the list below: \_\_\_\_\_

Please indicate any other affiliations you might have in addition to your primary affiliation listed above:

01 Child Development

02 Communication

03 Family Studies

04 Gerontology

05 Health Studies

06 Lifespan

07 Psychology

08 Sociology

Other: \_\_\_\_\_

One goal of our organization is to provide a medium for liked minded personal relationship scholars to meet and engage in discourse that advances the science of relationships. To aid in this process, please **circle up to seven** Scholarly Interests -- Keyword Descriptors from the set below.

01 Abuse/aggression/bullying	35 Epidemiology	69 Qualitative Methods
02 Accounts	36 Families	70 Recruitment
03 Acquaintance	37 Flirtation	71 Rehabilitation
04 Affinity	38 Friendship	72 Rel. Maintenance
05 AIDS	39 Gay/Lesbian Rels.	73 Relationship Types
06 Alcoholism/ACOAs	40 Gender	74 Religion
07 Appearance	41 Gerontology	75 Repair of PRs
08 Attachment	42 Grief/Loss	76 Retrospective Reports
09 Attraction	43 Health	77 Reticence
10 Attribution	44 Hostility	78 Roles
11 Children	45 Humor	79 Rules
12 Cognition	46 Idioms	80 Ruminations
13 Commitment	47 Intimacy	81 Self-Disclosure
14 Comm. Apprehension	48 Jealousy	82 Sex
15 Comm. Competence	49 Language	83 Shyness
16 Communication Style	50 Life-events/Lifespan	84 Social Anxiety
17 Competence	51 Loneliness	85 Social Class
18 Compliance	52 Love	86 Social Interaction
19 Conflict	53 Kinship	87 Social Mobility
20 Conversation	54 Marital Health	88 Social Participation
21 Courtship	55 Marital Satisfaction	89 Social Skills
22 Culture/ethnicity	56 Marriage	90 Social Support
23 Dating	57 Memory in Relationships	91 Speech
24 Deception	58 Mental Health	92 Status
25 Decisions in PRs	59 Mind Processes	93 Strategies
26 Depression	60 Networks	94 Stress
27 Deviance	61 Nonverbal Comm.	95 Surveys
28 Dialectics	62 Organizations	96 Trajectories
29 Diaries	63 Parenthood	97 Uncertainty
30 Disability	64 Personality	98 Unpopularity
31 Disengagement/Dissolution	65 Persuasion	100 Other
32 Divorce	66 Power	
33 Embarrassment	67 Pregnancy	
34 Emotions	68 Proxemics	

**Membership Categories**

**Regular** and **student** membership includes the following: 6 issues of the *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships* starting with the February 2002 issue, 4 issues of the journal *Personal Relationships*; newsletters, discounts on conference registration fees, a membership directory (printed or electronic), publisher discounts, and other professional mailings (both print and electronic). **Student members** must send in proof of their status (e.g., a letter from an advisor or copies of student i.d. and current enrollment form). **Domestic partner** membership includes all of the above except the journals. This is only for people whose partner is also a member (regular or student). **Associate membership** also includes all of the regular membership rewards, except the journals.

Please check one:

- Regular membership (\$75)  
 Student membership (\$44)  
 Domestic partner (\$30) \_\_\_\_\_ (name of partner)  
 Associate membership (\$30)

Please check here if you are a new member (i.e., not a current member of either INPR or ISSPR)

New Members Only: (Please give a brief description of your research/teaching interests and one or two representative articles/conference papers.)

---



---



---



---

Make checks payable to INPR/ISSPR. If you are a non-U.S. member, please write the check using the U.S. dollar figures above. Personal checks are acceptable. If you wish to pay with a credit card, the association can accept VISA or Master Card. Please provide the following information if you select this option:

Name on the Card: \_\_\_\_\_

Type of Card (VISA or Master Card only): \_\_\_\_\_

Card Number: \_\_\_\_\_

Expiration Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

Send this membership form and payment to the Secretary and Treasurer of IARR:

Prof. William Dragon  
 Department of Psychology  
 Cornell College  
 600 First Street West  
 Mt. Vernon, IA 52314-1098

Fax: 319-895-4478  
 Email: wdragon@cornellcollege.edu  
 Phone: 319-895-4281