

# RELATIONSHIP RESEARCH NEWS

OFFICIAL NEWS JOURNAL OF THE INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR RELATIONSHIP RESEARCH

FALL 2003

VOL 2, NO. 1

## PRESIDENT'S COLUMN

### William R. Cupach

On behalf of the IARR Board of Directors, greeting and salutations! Working out of our virtual office, we have been busy the last few months with important initiatives. One of the most significant developments is the automation of our membership services. Members will now enjoy the convenience of renewing memberships, registering for IARR conferences, and updating their personal profile online via a secure web site. Thanks to Chris Agnew, our Secretary-Treasurer, for thoroughly investigating the details and making this upgrade in membership services a reality!

Earlier in the Spring, the Board voted to invest half of the funds "inherited" from our parent associations to establish a permanent endowment, and place the remainder of the inherited funds into an emergency reserve. These measures help ensure the long term financial stability of IARR. As the endowment grows, it eventually will help expand services for our members. More information about the endowment will be forthcoming from the Finance Committee in the future.

The Board recently approved the nomination of Paul Mongeau of Arizona State University as Editor-Elect for the *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*. Anita Vangelisti and the Publications Committee worked very hard to attract high quality applicants for the position. We wish Paul well, and we are confident that he will continue the tradition of excellence Mark Fine maintained.

This past June, IARR sponsored two highly successful events. More than 100 participants attended the Compassionate Love Conference in Bloomington/Normal, Illinois, which was co-sponsored and financially supported by the Fetzer Institute. Congratulations to Sue Sprecher for

organizing a unique, high quality event that was very affordable. Congratulations are also in order for Scott Christopher, who hosted a workshop at Arizona State University for students and new professionals. Attendees gave high marks to the event and confirmed the value of facilitating the professional development of new scholars.

Arrangements are well underway for our bi-annual conference to be held in Madison, Wisconsin, July 22-25, 2004. Local hosts Linda Roberts and Denise Solomon, along with program planner Scott Christopher, are planning a meeting that promises to quench our scholarly and social thirsts. Plan now to share your best scholarly work and to confabulate with friends and colleagues in Madison. Be sure to check our web site ([www.iarr.org](http://www.iarr.org)) for conference information updates.

You'll notice elsewhere in this newsletter that the Future Conferences Committee is now taking proposals to host mini-conferences or workshops in 2005 and the biannual conference in 2006. As most of you know, we had tentative plans to hold the 2006 conference in Bruges, Belgium. Unfortunately, despite several months of good-faith negotiations, we could not forge an acceptable agreement with the local host. If you have an interest in hosting the 2006 conference, please contact Terri Orbuch for more information. If you have colleagues you think would make good conference hosts, please urge them to submit a proposal. The Future Conferences Committee is especially keen on receiving proposals for a 2006 site outside of North America.

I want to express my deep gratitude to all the wonderful folks I have the pleasure of working with on IARR matters. Board members, committee chairs and committee members are working diligently to promote IARR's growth. As an IARR member, you can help us grow, too. If you know of any colleagues who share our interest in the study of relationships and who are not currently members of IARR (perhaps a colleague in a department or discipline different from yours), please encourage them to join!

## INSIDE THIS ISSUE OF RELATIONSHIP RESEARCH NEWS

<p>Presidents' Column by William R. Cupach ..... 1</p> <p>From the Editors' Desk by Kory Floyd and Kathy Carnelley ..... 3</p> <p><b>FEATURE ARTICLES</b> <i>Remembering Harold H. Kelley (1921 – 2003)</i> Edited by Shelly Gable ..... 3</p> <p><i>Compassion and Love in Relationships – Can They Coexist?</i> Moderated by Sharon Shacham-Dupont ..... 13</p> <p><b>STUDENT &amp; NEW PROFESSIONALS COLUMN:</b> <i>Looking Back, Moving On</i> By Joao Moreira ..... 15</p> <p><b>LIGHTER SIDE OF RELATIONSHIPS:</b> <i>Reading between the Lines</i> By David Kenny ..... 16</p> <p><i>I am a Human Anagram</i> By William Ickes ..... 17</p> <p><b>NET NEWS:</b> By Lisa Baker ..... 17</p> <p>IARR Membership Services Moves On-Line By Christopher R. Agnew ..... 18</p>	<p><b>PR REPORT:</b> By Susan Sprecher.....20</p> <p><b>JSPR REPORT:</b> By Mark Fine .....21</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">New <i>JSPR</i> Editor, Paul Mongeau .....21</p> <p><b>CONTENTS OF UPCOMING JOURNALS:</b> <i>Personal Relationships</i>.....21 <i>Journal of Social and Personal Relationships</i>.....22</p> <p><b>ANNOUNCEMENTS</b> .....23</p> <p><b>MEMBER NEWS &amp; UPDATES</b> .....23</p> <p><b>NEW MEMBERS</b> .....25</p> <p><b>CALL FOR PAPERS</b> .....27</p> <p><b>CONFERENCE ANNOUNCEMENTS</b> .....27</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">Special Topics Conference Success.....27 Future Conferences Committee .....27 Invitation for 2006 Proposals .....28 Invitation for 2005 Proposals .....29 Family and Poverty Conference .....30 IARR Conference, Madison, WI.....30</p> <p><b>LIST OF IARR BOARD OF DIRECTORS &amp; COMMITTEE CHAIRS</b>.....34</p>
--	--

### 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 Maysseless 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 Susan Boon, Department of Psychology, University of Calgary, 2500 University Dr. NW, Calgary, AB T2N 1N4, Canada; sdboon@ucalgary.ca. 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 **Kory Floyd and Kathy Carnelley**  
**Arizona State Univ. Univ. of Southampton**

We are pleased to bring you this expanded edition of *Relationship Research News*. Plans are underway for the 2004 conference, to be held in Madison, Wisconsin next July. In this issue, you will find a number of fun facts about Madison and the basic details of the conference. Registration and housing information will appear on the IARR website in the near future. We certainly hope to see you all next summer!

In January of this year, the field of personal relationships was saddened to lose one of its truly pioneering members, Hal Kelley. Whether we knew him personally or not, each of us benefits from the contributions he made during his long and distinguished career. For this issue of *RRN*, we asked Shelly Gable to compile thoughts and comments from many of the researchers who knew him best, and we are pleased to present these, in unedited form, in remembrance of our friend and colleague.

Members will find many other items of interest in this edition of *RRN*. Sharon Shacham-Dupont and Sue Sprecher both offer reports on IARR's first special topics conference, which took place in May and June of this year and focused on compassion and love in relationships. We are also pleased to report that, through the efforts of our secretary-treasurer, Christopher Agnew, IARR membership services are now available online. Members can pay dues and conference registration fees, have access to membership directories, and update their own contact information, all from the IARR website!

This issue of *Relationship Research News* is a very special one for us, as it is the last that we (Kathy and Kory) will edit together. As most of our members know, this newsletter had its genesis in the merger of INPR and ISSPR, for whom Kory and Kathy were the respective newsletter editors. Working on *RRN* for

the past two years has been a delight, both personally and professionally, and we wish to offer our thanks to our associate editors, the IARR board of directors, and to Blackwell publishers for their much-appreciated assistance. We are leaving *RRN* in the exceedingly capable hands of incoming editor Susan Boon, and we wish her every success in her endeavors.

**FEATURE ARTICLES**

### Remembering Harold H. Kelley (1921-2003)



*On January 29<sup>th</sup>, 2003, the scientific community and in particular the field of close relationships suffered a deep loss when Harold Harding Kelley, Professor Emeritus of Psychology at UCLA, died of cancer at his home in Malibu, California. Hal is survived by his beloved wife and dear companion for 61 years, Dorothy, his son, Sten Kelley, his daughters Ann Kelley and Megan Emory, and five grandchildren.*

**H**al Kelley's scholarly career spanned nearly six decades. He made numerous contributions to the field including the study of the role of reference groups in communication and attitude change, the founding (with John W. Thibaut) of Interdependence Theory, initial and integrative work on what was to become known as Attribution Theory, and pioneering on the

phenomena of close relationships. His many contributions to science have been recently chronicled in a piece by Paul Van Lange in the *European Bulletin of Social Psychology* (2003, 15[1], pp. 41-47) and in a forthcoming piece in the *American Psychologist*. The current piece was intended to be a more informal testimony to a scholar who not only had an incalculable impact on the field of close relationships, but also to a man who intellectually and personally inspired scores of individuals. I had the great pleasure of meeting Hal when I came to UCLA in 2000, and although he retired in 1991, Hal remained fully involved in his scholarly career until the onset of the illness that claimed his life. I will always treasure the brief time that I had to know him; especially his deeply insightful and supportive feedback on intellectual ideas, our regular hallway conversations on what was new in the field of close relationships, and his generous encouragement of my beginning career.

To prepare this piece, we asked some of those that knew Hal Kelley academically and personally to comment on their remembrances of him. Below are short excerpts from John Holmes, Paul Van Lange, Andrew Christensen, Norbert Kerr, Chris Agnew and Ximena Arriaga, and slightly more detailed pieces by Ellen Berscheid, Arie Kruglanski, George Levinger, and Harry Reis. It is remarkable that three terms consistently arise in their separate contributions—Intellectual Giant, Modesty, and Warmth. The loss of Hal Kelley is both professional and personal.

**~Shelly Gable, UCLA**

(Thanks to Harry Reis for providing the photos.)

**John Holmes, University of Waterloo:** I will miss Hal Kelley dearly. I worked closely with him in recent years, both on a collaborative effort with six authors (An atlas of interpersonal situations) and on a theoretical volume the two of us were writing (Interdependence theory: Situations, relationships and personality). He was a brilliant man, an intellectual giant. His razor-sharp mind cut through fuzzy thinking so quickly that it was sometimes intimidating to be on the receiving end of his comments after venturing forth some idea (especially at 700 in the morning, after he had been tuning up his logic for two hours). He was not hesitant to tell you exactly what he thought, a tendency that one eventually tried to interpret optimistically as indicating that he perhaps respected one's ideas enough to consider them. But he really listened, patiently tried to see one's perspective

even when it challenged his, and resisted cognitive closure to a fault. Our discussions were always leavened by his fine sense of humor and warmth. Hal had a genuine interest in others and was extraordinarily well read and current in his opinions. Our "Atlas group" had many a fine evening of lively discussions about almost any topic. He was also a very optimistic presence: his favorite saying was Heider's metaphor of the "friendly spirits," implying that fate had treated him well. I confess that Hal and I ended each long day of work sitting on his porch overlooking the Pacific and taking his saying rather literally.

**Paul Van Lange, Free University, Amsterdam:** *Excerpt from In Memoriam: Harold H. Kelley, The European Bulletin of Social Psychology* (2003, 15[1], pp. 41-47).

Hal Kelley was a warm person, with a genuine interest in others. In addition to intellectual discussions, Hal also appreciated "less serious" discussions and he loved to tease, always with a kind and warm smile on his face. I have very fond memories of the many pleasant discussions we had with him during and after meetings of the Atlas-project. Every now and then Hal would tell a story that he thought might be of interest to some of us, but just as often he was listening, smiling, and enjoying the group discussion. This style also characterized his very pleasant leadership during the Atlas Project. He would be thinking and listening quietly, while respecting and appreciating everybody's contributions. And he never seemed distracted by what seemed to be less relevant discussions, because he knew where we could be going with this project. He would perhaps only be distracted by grandiose language. Whenever one of us used high-flying terms that Hal considered unnecessary and messy, we could almost feel him think: "That logic needs work"!

Last but definitely not least, modesty was definitely one of Hal's most salient qualities. In nearly every presentation, he acknowledged the influence of John Thibaut on his thinking, and his contribution to the development of interdependence theory. He also acknowledged the work of several others, such as Ellen Berscheid, Charles McClintock, and David Messick, as having influenced his theorizing with John Thibaut. More generally, his interpersonal style was one of care, openness and respect. He was alien to anything that was even remotely related to expressions of self-importance.

Hal Kelley was an intellectual giant. He received almost every award there is in psychology (including also some from other disciplines). He was one of the few social psychologists to become elected as a member of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences and the National Academy of Sciences. And even in the last years, at the end of a career of nearly six decades, he was still one of the most cited scholars within social psychology.

Hal Kelley was an exceptional scholar and an exceptional person. He had the unique talent to combine professional and personal qualities in the most natural and perfect of ways: his warmth, generosity and modesty were as much a part of himself as was his incredibly bright and creative mind. Only rarely do we have the good fortune to come across people of such grandeur!

**Andrew Christensen, UCLA:** *From a memorial service at UCLA February 9, 2003.*

Soon after I joined the clinical area of the psychology department at UCLA in the fall of 1976, a pleasant, middle aged social psychologist named Kelley invited me for lunch at the faculty center. We discussed a variety of topics as we got to know each other. He was interested in my research interests and plans and discussed them with me. To reciprocate, I asked him what his research and scholarly interests were. He seemed a little taken aback by my question but began to gamely discuss his work. As he talked, I suddenly realized that this person in front of me was the Kelley of interdependence theory, which I had often cited and which was a foundation of the behavioral approach with which I identified. I made a valiant, albeit belated, attempt at recovery from my faux pas— “yes, of course, there is that work, but do you have any other interests?” As if the work that had made him world famous was not enough. I left our meeting that day feeling as if, in my short time at UCLA, I had already deeply offended one of its leading intellectuals.

But I clearly didn't know Hal Kelley. He was not one to be put off by an unintended social slight.

I really got to know Hal Kelley in the summer of 1978 when he organized a group of nine social and clinical psychologists to write a book summarizing and defining the emerging field of close relationships. This group spent 3 weeks together at UCLA, a week together in Amherst, Massachusetts a year later, and a few days together again at UCLA another year later. In between, Hal Kelley, Anne Peplau and I met many times as a kind of steering committee for the group.

Through those many, many hours of working closely with Hal and other members of the group, I got a first hand experience of Hal's brilliance as a thinker, his good humor and his ability to lead a group of diverse minded psychologists toward a common conceptual framework for viewing a broad and complex field. An unexpected feature of Hal was his striking modesty, so disproportionate to his abilities. He had so little to be modest about, yet was consistently so. For example, he organized our group, got the funding for the group, and was our intellectual leader, yet when it came to determining the authorship of the book that emerged, the group had to convince Hal to be the first author and not just go in alphabetical order. Modesty and brilliance are not usually close companions, but in Hal Kelley they merged in an appealing way. The book that this group published in 1983, *Close Relationships*, was reissued just last year, with a new introduction by Hal and Ellen Berscheid. Its staying power is a tribute to Hal Kelley's thinking and leadership.

In many ways, I was sad to see this book completed in the early 80s because I thought it would end the exciting collaboration with Hal that I had experienced. However, Hal suggested that we form a close relationship group at UCLA. Hal, Anne Peplau, and I started the Close Relationship Interest Group, or CRIG, a group of faculty and graduate students interested in close relationship research. This group has met 2-3 times a quarter for almost 20 years. There have been such wonderful presentations and discussions on these Friday afternoons over drinks and refreshments. This group forms a kind of living legacy to Hal's leadership and inspiration.

Last fall, after it was common knowledge that Hal was battling cancer, he sent a memo to a number of us, indicating that, due a quirk of his personality, he was not really comfortable with sympathy. I talked to him on the phone afterwards and told him I was going to make every effort to avoid sympathy of any kind. Then we talked about his treatment and what he was going through. And at one point he said, “Andy, this is beginning to sound suspiciously like sympathy!” And we both chuckled. He kept his humor and his perspective even as he was dealing with a fatal illness.

I shall always remember him and appreciate him, both for his brilliance and his humanity

**Norbert Kerr, Michigan State University:** We worked together on the Atlas project over the last several years and it was the most gratifying

collaboration of my career. This was partly a matter of intellectual engagement--Hal loved to play with ideas and he played fair (giving respect to others' opinions, listening well, graciously conceding on those [very rare] occasions when someone else had a better one than his). I've had a few chances to hang around brilliant folks, but never one who could make you feel so safe in active intellectual exchange. But it was more than that. Hal was a wonderful person to be around. He was funny, unaffected, curious, gracious, and (as a most central trait) warm. He was as good an example of a true gentleman as we're ever likely to know.

**Chris Agnew and Ximena Arriaga, Purdue University:** "Living legend" aptly captures the high regard that we and our fellow graduate students at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill had for Hal Kelley. The founder of UNC's social program, John Thibaut, developed interdependence theory with Hal in the late 1950s, and the theory has served as the theoretical cornerstone of the program since then. So when we had the opportunity to lunch with Hal at UCLA a few years ago, we jumped at the chance. Expecting a brief visit, our lunch lasted over three hours! We discussed Hal's recent work with John Holmes to extend interdependence theory. He kindly and patiently answered our most vexing questions regarding the theory. All in all, it was among the richest intellectual discussions we have ever had. We were mentally exhausted by the end of our visit, but, consistent with his legend status, it seemed that Hal was just getting going! Undoubtedly, he was on a roll, too, when he wrote "*The situational origins of human tendencies: A further reason for the formal analysis of structure*," a 1983 article that may not be understood by all but speaks to us all, as it does nothing short of bringing together the best ideas of personality research and relationship research into a grand theory about the social bases of personality. In short, Hal Kelley transformed the way we think about social interaction. The loss to relationship science is immense.

**Remembrance of Hal Kelley**  
**Ellen Berscheid**  
**University of Minnesota**

I cannot yet put a fence around my thoughts, feelings, and memories of Hal Kelley. Skittering

around my mind like drops of mercury, they resist being herded into sensible prose. I can but try.

I first met H. H. Kelley when I arrived at the University of Minnesota graduate training program in social psychology, funded by a national research fellowship that permitted me to go to any school that would have me. Duke, my first choice for professional reasons, had made it clear that their graduate program was for "men only" so I went to Minnesota, my second choice, mostly for personal reasons. My first interaction with Professor Kelley was not auspicious. In fact, it was so inauspicious that I was not to see him again for many years.

When I appeared at his office door, he did not seem at all happy to see me. He began the interview by mentioning a female graduate student who recently had "run off" and gotten married. Getting the drift, I asked him directly if I would be discriminated against in graduate school because I was a woman. Hal was an honest man. He replied, with some discomfort, "Yes." "Surely not with respect to grades?", I asked. Again, "Yes" (this was before studies showed that an article signed by "Joe" Smith was more highly regarded than one signed by "Joan" Smith and before I found out for myself the truth of his candid answer).

The interview went downhill from there. Professor Kelley asked me if I had read his book with John Thibaut that had come out the previous year. "Yes," I replied. Silence. Then the dreaded question "What did you think of it?" I was an honest woman. In the course of my reply I mentioned the flaws I had seen in what has become known as Interdependence Theory, dwelling unnecessarily long on my opinion that the theory was too "static"—that it didn't capture the flow of interaction. (For the difficulties still involved in capturing the flow of interaction almost half a century later, one need only read—or attempt to read—*The mathematics of marriage: Dynamic nonlinear models* [2002] recently published by John Gottman and his colleagues.) I was, of course, too ignorant to appreciate what Thibaut and Kelley had accomplished, particularly in comparison to what other psychologists were doing at the time. (Hullian theory was still influential and Skinner's behaviorism was riding high whereas social psychology, many psychologists believed, was "flaky"—one of Hal's words—and belonged anywhere but in the discipline of psychology.)

My critique was not appreciated. Professor Kelley ended the interview quickly by remarking that as I began my graduate studies at Minnesota, it would

be useful if I forgot everything I had previously learned about psychology. I went out the door thinking that would be an easy task because there was precious little for me to forget. When classes started a week later, I simply did not show up. Family matters, including the fragile state of my new marriage and a death in the family, had convinced me that I could not successfully complete graduate studies in addition.

Almost two decades elapsed before I saw Hal Kelley again. John Harvey had invited both of us to speak at a conference he had organized at Vanderbilt University in Nashville. As it happened, some of us were more interested in spending the evening at the Grand Ole Opry than further discussing the principles of social exchange. John magically secured a few scarce tickets and the luck of the draw put Hal and me in adjacent seats, both transfixed by glorious gospel music. Whether Hal remembered me from our previous meeting, I do not know (and never dared ask) but after the performance we talked well into the night. Subsequently, he invited me to join his project, which culminated in *Close Relationships* (1983/2002).

Thus was I given a second chance to know an intellectual giant and a person of extraordinary character, a person whose many kindnesses and generosity one came across only by chance. Exquisitely sensitive to other's feelings, Hal's humility permitted him to perform the most mundane but personally costly acts to help those in need. As I write this, I see Hal's frowning face (à la the Baldwin, Carrell, & Lopez, 1990, experiment). Hal hated sentimentality, especially when directed toward himself. He invariably shrugged off personal praise with a quick, often sarcastic, quip and often referred to my "purple prose" (as in "too much purple prose" or "we need some of your purple prose here"). Nevertheless, Hal himself was capable of sentimentality when speaking of two people: first, and foremost, his beloved wife, Dorothy, and, second, his revered colleague, John Thibaut.

Throughout his professional life and to the very end, Hal revised, refined, and elaborated the original vision he and Thibaut had wrought together. I was always impressed by the supreme confidence, persistence, and single-mindedness with which Hal pursued that vision and, relatedly, struck by the length of time it took for it to make an impact on the field. For example, there was little or no research on the important concepts of Comparison Level and Comparison Level for Alternatives to include in my

chapter on interpersonal attraction for the 1985 *Handbook of Social Psychology*. If one assumes that Thibaut and Kelley's (1959) book was in preparation (in thought at least) in the mid-1950s, it can be seen that it has taken half a century—and Hal's dogged perseverance—for its ideas to achieve their current influence. Hal's email sign-off was "Take it easy" but taking it easy was something Hal never did.

The magnitude of any contemporary psychologist's contribution to the discipline cannot be accurately estimated by those of us still standing deep in the trees and underbrush of psychology. The perspective afforded by time springs surprises, often whittling a contribution down to a dusty footnote. That said, I will venture the prediction that Hal Kelley's influence on psychology today is only a fraction of what it will be a decade from now. That prophesy will be better understood when John Holmes finishes the book—capable of revolutionizing psychology—that he and Hal were working on when Hal became ill and when the recently published *An Atlas of Interpersonal Situations* (Kelley, Holmes, Kerr, Reis, Rusbult, & Van Lange, 2003) reaches its audience.

I was aware that Hal's professional and personal influence on me was profound, as it was on many others, but I was blindsided by the depth of my reaction to his death. I had not realized that although I interacted with Hal infrequently and not for very long when I did, those moments were among the very happiest and most vivid of my life.

**Remembering Hal Kelley**  
**Arie W. Kruglanski**  
**University of Maryland**

With the passing of Harold Kelley earlier this year the field of social psychology has lost one of its greatest intellectual leaders. There was hardly a sub-discipline of our science where Hal Kelley (as he liked to be called) has not made a truly seminal contribution. His collaborative work with Carl Hovland and Irving Janis launched a systematic framework for the study of attitudes and attitude change, his work on the "warm cold" variable in impression formation demonstrated that Solomon Asch's theorizing about the organizing role of traits in person perception has concrete behavioral implications, his theorizing on the two functions of reference group (the normative and the comparative) served on anchor point for subsequent work (by

Deutsch and Gerard) on normative and informational influence. Hal Kelley has made fundamental contributions to the domains of bargaining, negotiation and conflict resolution. He spear-headed the launching of attribution theory in the late 1960s as a major field of research in social cognition that had significant impact on clinical, political and educational psychologies. He similarly played a major role in laying the foundations for the field of close relations and, he developed (initially with John Thibaut, and subsequently with John Holmes, Caryl Rusbult and others) the field of interdependence theory: his greatest passion where he found his true calling. Finally, he recently led a group of major interpersonal relations researchers in developing an atlas of interpersonal situations, a project which he adumbrated in a key note address to a meeting of the Society of Experimental Social psychology in Washington, DC in the Fall of 1995.

These incredibly diverse, numerous and profound contributions earned Hal Kelley the well deserved reputation not only as one of social psychology's most creative minds ever, but also as a founder of several subfields of research that evolved into thriving scientific communities complete with their own journals, annual meetings and learned societies.

Hal Kelley's unprecedented accomplishments did not go unrecognized. In fact, he won almost all the major awards the field of psychology has to offer including APA and SESP Distinguished Scientific Contribution awards, membership in the National Academy of Science, the National Academy of Arts and Sciences, and on and on.

Though pleased at these various tokens of recognition, Hal Kelley was hardly blinded by them or filled with a sense of self importance. His great passion was the intellectual activity itself, and far from "resting on his laurels" he was deeply immersed in writing and theorizing till the very last or nearly so.

Hal Kelley was a truly modest and unassuming man. As one example, he never thought of himself as the progenitor of attribution theory, and he often referred to himself as a mere intellectual "midwife" who helped bring it to life. The field thought otherwise, however, and his considerable contributions in this domain was generally and appropriately acknowledged. The combination of modesty, intellectual excitement, and immense scientific prestige lent Hal Kelley unusual inspirational powers. People were prepared to follow his lead and trust in his visions even before they could fully "see the light" themselves. In retrospect, they

were right to do so for these insights ended up charting the landscape of social psychology and setting up its research agendas.

Last but not least important, Hal Kelley cared a great deal about people, was a devoted husband and family man, and a loyal friend that one could count on through thick and thin. His friendships lasted a lifetime and were independent of the vicissitudes of fame and fortune. For all these reasons Hal Kelley was not only respected and admired but also widely loved. He set standards of excellence and humanity to which all of us should aspire. Our field is indeed fortunate to have had him as one of its greatest leaders, and role models.

**Harold Kelley: Warm Friend and Cool Thinker**  
**George Levinger**  
**University of Massachusetts, Amherst**

Harold Kelley's first well-known publication was entitled "The warm-cold variable in first impressions of persons" (1950). These two polar adjectives embody two contrasting aspects of Hal's own personality – i.e., his wide smile and deep caring for other people, on one hand, and his cool analytic approach to scientific problems on the other. I admired both aspects and am glad our lives became interconnected. Here I'll talk about both Hal's personal and his professional sides.

I got to know Hal Kelley personally after the 1974 Amherst conference on "close relationships" I organized, at which he presented a paper on attributions in close relationships (Kelley, 1977). The morning after the conference he and I met for two hours to discuss each other's work. I relished his inspiring enthusiasm and penetrating thoughts as we talked about our mutual ideas on modeling temporal changes in a pair's relational development. I learned much from his approach to examining partners' conflicting attributions. In turn, he was interested in my ideas about transitions in pair development (Levinger & Snoek, 1972) and our computer modeling of pair interaction (Huesmann & Levinger, 1976), which he later integrated into his own views of pair interdependence through his 1979 formulation of a "transformation process" from the "given" to the "effective" dyadic outcome matrix.

Three years later Hal invited me to visit him in Malibu for several days to work with him on a grant proposal for a working group to explore general theoretical issues in the study of close relationships.

Subsequently, he obtained two NSF grants which paid for five weeks of intensive discussions during three successive summers among the nine co-authors of the ambitious book we later titled *Close relationships* (Kelley, Berscheid, Christensen, Harvey, Huston, Levinger, McClintock, Peplau, & Peterson, 1983). Hal set the tone for the workshops, both personally and professionally. On one hand, he was a wonderfully caring host during the two summers when we met at UCLA. We got well acquainted with each other at meals and on outings, we played games together, and we developed a marvelous collegial atmosphere. On the other hand, he set ambitious goals, posed difficult questions, and expected us to work hard each day. Particularly in our first 3-week meeting, we exerted a mind-boggling influence on each other's conceptualizations. Hal repeatedly jogged our thinking into fruitful directions, but he was also receptive to others' new ideas.

Kelley's professional contributions during the past 55 years were stellar, of course – sufficiently so to earn him a membership in the prestigious National Academy of Sciences and a host of other distinctions (including the Distinguished Career Contribution Award from our own Society). There is little doubt that he ranks among the top three or four theorists in the history of social psychology.

In the 1950s, Kelley's contributions were primarily to the study of group behavior and problem solving. Nevertheless, his 1959 book with John Thibaut – *The social psychology of groups*, one of the most cited books in social psychology – focused primarily on interdependence in the two-person group. Within the context of a dyadic payoff matrix, it analyzed concepts such as comparison level, comparison level for alternatives, rewards and costs, mutual interference and facilitation, relationship formation, power and dependence, norms and roles, tasks, as well as frustration in relationships. Those novel analyses had a major impact on research on the development, maintenance, and stability of personal relationships – including my own work in this realm.

Although until recently few social psychologists fully embraced the implications of his abstract interdependence theorizing, Kelley himself extended it to a number of important areas. We are fortunate that he devoted the second part of his career to the study of close relationships, which began with his interest in attributions and people's conflicts about them. I can here illustrate only a few of his striking contributions.

One instance is the superb chapter on “Conflict in the development of close relationships”

(Braiker & Kelley, 1979) based on Braiker's 1975 doctoral dissertation. It begins with a discussion of three hierarchical levels of mutual dependence – the levels of behaviors, unique pair norms, and personal dispositions – and then analyzes the differing implications of conflict at each of these levels. It then reports two empirical studies grounded in that analysis. The first used case histories of married couples to examine “stages in relationship development,” finding qualitative support for the idea that interdependence grows both in extent and in its “level,” and that this affects the nature of couple conflicts. The second study devised novel scales for measuring love, conflict-negativity, ambivalence, and pair maintenance; its empirical results show dramatic changes in differing dimensions as a couple moves across progressive stages from casual dating to marriage. As interdependence increases, so do love and the opportunities for conflictual interactions, even though couples differ greatly in when, how, and how much conflict occurs.

A second noteworthy offering was his 1979 book, *Personal Relationships*. It further explores two partners' interdependence; it considers both their *given* level of mutual reward based on their similar needs or interests and complementary abilities, and the partners' *dispositions* to transform conflicts or dissimilarities so as to maximize joint outcomes. It is a brilliant use of outcome matrices and transformations thereof to analyze two partners' mutual responsiveness and their attribution of behavior to stable dispositions.

A third example of Kelley's deep thinking occurs in his chapter, “Love and Commitment,” in our 1983 book. He first notes that love and commitment often overlap, but that love essentially refers to “positive conditions” whereas commitment implies “stable conditions” in a relationship; it's quite possible to have love with little commitment, or commitment without love. Next he distinguishes among varying phenomena of love, including thoughts, feelings, behaviors, and sexuality, and he connects this analysis to findings from an ingenious study of care, need, and trust in people's conceptions of love. Throughout he distinguishes carefully among the effects of differing levels of interdependence. Likewise with commitment, which he links to the durability of relationships. He concludes that commitment is based on two causal factors: (1) that the *pros* of continuing a relationship outweigh its *cons*, and (2) that, given a *variability* in partners' feelings toward each other, the “*pro-con*”

balance in a durable relationship must remain stably above zero over time and changing situations.

Throughout his work, Kelley emphasized both the *structures* and the *processes* of pair as well as group interaction. His style was to do a systematic analysis of the essential components of both aspects so as to arrive at basic, sometimes self-evident insights of lasting impact. For a final example, I think Kelley was most responsible for the circular process model in our 1983 book on *Close relationships* which pictured a causal feedback loop between Person-Other interaction -- consisting of behavior, thoughts, and feelings at the micro-level -- and broader causal determinants of individual properties, cumulative pair properties, and the social and physical environments that both affect and are affected by the pair's actions.

Those of us who attended the awards banquet of the 1994 International Conference on Personal Relationships in Groningen will remember Kelley addressing us from the raised pulpit of the converted church while we sat at tables three meters below him. He reminded us that studying the essential features of relationships requires us to focus directly on the partners' "uniquely interpersonal" processes and "patterns of interplay" and "not be distracted by biological, social, and psychological factors .... that impinge on [or are affected by] that interplay" (Kelley, 1994, p. 3). His devotion to a basic *science* of relationships will continue to influence our field long into the future.

### **What Hal Knew about Personal Relationships** **Harry T. Reis,** **The University of Rochester**

Hal Kelley knew a lot about personal relationships. In Dan Perlman's eminence analysis (ICPR, Brisbane, 2000), Hal was the second most-cited personal relationship scholar in the 1990s (surpassed only by Ellen Berscheid). Hal wrote on just about every phenomenon and process that personal relationship researchers care about: for example, love, intimacy, relationship attributions, conflict, conflict resolution, power, physical attractiveness, responsiveness, social support, reciprocity, equity, communal caring. Some members of IARR may not know that Hal played a pivotal role in the field's inception. His address at the 1982 ICPR in Madison, WI, a conference often celebrated as the birthplace of our discipline, spelled out the goals and agenda that still consume us. Hal served as the first president of the organization that emerged from that

conference and its successor. Hal has been honored with every major "career contribution" award in the PR field and in several of its constituent disciplines, and his two major books on the topic are canonical.

To Hal, relationship science was "an essential science." He argued persuasively that the knowledge to be derived from relationship science was fundamental and irreplaceable to the behavioral sciences, a clarion call he first articulated in his moving epilogue to the 1983 Kelley edited volume. Among many ideas, in that chapter Hal pointed out that personal relationships constitute the bridge between society and individuals; that is, personal relationships provide the "causal interface" by which societal norms, conditions, and processes are transmitted to, and exert influence on, individuals.

Hal also believed that because influence within close relationships was typically of long duration, diverse, strong, and usually consistent, and because so much of human activity takes place in interaction with relationship partners -- family, close friends, colleagues -- the accumulated effect of relationships on the individual is likely to be substantial. He felt that over the life course, nothing had more pervasive impact on human development and well-being than the close personal relationships in which a person participated.

Finally -- and this says as much about the man as it does about his scholarship -- Hal felt that satisfying personal relationships were among the best things that life offers. As he wrote in 1979:

"The unavoidable consequence of human social life is a realization of the essentially private and subjective nature of our experience of the world, coupled with a strong wish to break out of that privacy and establish contact with another mind. Personal relationships hold out to their members the possibility, though perhaps rarely realized in full, of establishing such contact." (p. 169).

Perhaps perversely, for a scholar so renowned and widely cited, much of what Hal knew has yet to be "discovered." By this I mean that his writings are so profound in conceptual depth and so rich in analytic detail, that the field has yet to take full advantage of his insights, developing them into empirical research and a widely adopted theoretical model. Re-reading Hal invariably fosters a sort of *déjà vu* experience -- one senses how his elegant concepts can create clarity out of the jumble of thoughts and ideas running around one's mind -- the particulars aren't necessarily new, but their conceptual coherence and integrative complexity are. The brilliance of Hal's approach was, and is, its

comprehensiveness and elegance -- in my opinion, we have no other conceptual models that approach his Interdependence Theory in sophistication, depth, breadth, and validity. And yet they resonate to everyday relationship experience -- "Yes, of course" is frequently uttered when reading Hal. It is not that his analyses are obvious, commonplace, or simple-minded -- if anything, the language and system of Interdependence Theory are among the most complex that our field has to offer -- but rather that his scheme is so incisive that, when mastered, it readily clarifies the seemingly random mumbo-jumbo of empirical findings, casual observations, and loose associations that occupy our thoughts. It's all there, if only we would pay attention.

I'd like to try to elucidate this general notion by describing four central tenets of Hal's theorizing about close relationships. Many other principles might be extrapolated from his work, but these may help illustrate what Hal Kelley knew about relationships, and more importantly, the principles that he felt ought to guide our research and theory.

#### The need for clear, careful description

"Because the phenomena of close relationships have been the subject of common thought and discussion for millennia, their scientific study is permeated with popular ideas and pseudoscientific conceptions. No close-relationship researcher approaches a problem without a deeply ingrained set of ideas and attitudes, and only with great difficulty can these preconceptions be put in their proper place ... As a consequence, scientific analysis must cut through a thicket of popular vocabulary, experiential 'facts,' affective association and lay causal theories before its work of definition and measurement can begin." (Kelley, 1983, pp. xiii-xiv)

But in his remarks in Madison, in 1982, Hal also said:

"Realistically, much of what we learn will amount to refinements and systemizations of popular knowledge, rather than revelations or discoveries. We must learn to explain our enterprise in realistic terms and to avoid feeling inadequate about lack of "discoveries" and communicating to the public only the odd and the sensational."

Like Heider, Hal perceived great wisdom in common sense, not necessarily on its surface but rather in the concepts that it embodies. He felt it imperative to distinguish between common sense and

non-sense. How to do this? Hal felt that the absence of clear terminology, cardinal concepts, and, especially, detailed descriptive data were substantial impediments to progress. In fact he once told me that a major goal of his career was to push the field toward such a framework. Although we sometimes disparage "merely descriptive" research, Hal liked to point out that all good naturalists begin with excruciatingly detailed descriptions (e.g., Darwin's painstaking catalogs of barnacles and, later, finches). Hal once asked me how much time the average American adult spends with close relationship partners. I was embarrassed to say I didn't know.

#### Patterns of Interaction are the Core Phenomena of Relationships

Hal spent a lot of time trying to answer the question, "What is a relationship?" The answer he proposed was "a state of interaction process." By this he meant that a relationship is not something that resides in the minds of either or both partners (i.e., love); not some combination of their individual properties (i.e., attitudes, age, personality traits); and not a societally or biologically defined category (i.e., marriage, siblings). Rather, Hal's theorizing focussed on influence: The extent to which each person's behavior affected the other's subsequent behavior (e.g., Figure 2.1 in Kelley et al., 1983). He liked the example of a string quartet. The musicians' relationship, he argued, is not the instruments or roles that they play within the group, nor the skills that they contribute, nor even the music that they create in concert. Rather, their relationship is the state of "being and playing together" -- in other words, the way in which each person's playing influences the other's playing. Thus to study relationships one must necessarily look for patterns of interplay and interaction: How one individual's behavior, thoughts, or feelings are altered by the behavior of the other.

Fine, you may say, but in this definition several important considerations are not immediately evident. First, Hal felt that analyses that focus exclusively on these "patterns of interaction" are incomplete; researchers must also examine the immediate antecedents and immediate consequences of interactions. Antecedents are the objective properties of the interdependent situation in which partners find themselves (more about this later); social norms; and properties of the individuals -- their personalities, abilities, habits, personal preferences, and especially, their orientations toward each other. Consequences refer to the fruits of their interaction: affects (love, hatred), attributions, or tangible

products (a well-functioning household or a well-written collaborative book).

Second, nothing made Hal more queasy than work that conflated these constructs. For example, he felt that terms like "marriage" and "coworkers" were uninformative since they are silent about the patterns of interaction that take place. He was equally uncomfortable with definitions that fail to distinguish the preexisting situation from the ensuing interaction process; for example, "she is dependent upon him," which conflates the objective characteristics of a situation in which one person has relatively greater power over outcomes with the behaviors that the partners enact, given that the situation is power-asymmetric. Another example: To Hal's way of thinking, the characterization "he loves her" tells us little because it describes the outcome of a complex pattern of interaction, not the situation and behaviors that engendered that affect.

#### Objective reality versus social construction

A hot issue in contemporary relationships research concerns the extent to which relationships are influenced by "actual, objective properties" of interaction or whether influence is based largely on perceptions of a partner's behavior. This issue has been played out in diverse venues; for example, in contrasts between studies of observer-coded videotapes and those that rely on self-reported (motivated) construals. Given the currency of this distinction, it is enlightening to learn that Hal posed it explicitly in 1979:

"Are we to take the participants' assumptions ... as reflecting merely a subjective reality or 'story' that they typically develop about their relationships but that has little to do with the hard realities of their interaction? Or are we to take them as reflecting the real, underlying structure of these relationships and therefore indicative of how *we* should conceptualize it?" (1979, p. 7-8).

Over the years, on this issue Hal found himself more and more at odds with the social-psychological mainstream. Social psychology defines itself as studying the impact of situations, which by prevailing practice is defined according to the individual's perception. This state of affairs annoyed Hal because it clouded what he felt was the conceptual linchpin of Interdependence Theory: That the analysis of behavior must begin with careful description of the objective properties of the situation -- that is, its properties of outcome interdependence -- and then carefully show how the actors' subjective construals derive from the possibilities the situation

affords. In his words, this is "what the individual makes of that situation." This process is termed "transformation of motivation" and Hal delighted in finding examples in everyday language: e.g., "she's making a mountain out of a molehill" and "you think you're so tough; wanna make sumpin' of it?"

This is not an epistemological subtlety. Readers interested in learning more about this concept will appreciate Hal's thoughtful elaboration in the recent "Atlas of Interpersonal Situations" (Kelley et al., 2003). Hal felt deeply that only by explicitly distinguishing the objective features of the situation from subjective reality can we hope to understand interaction process and its consequences. Hal was an iconoclast not merely in believing that objective reality and subjective construal could be distinguished but that their interplay was the essential phenomenon of interest.

#### Attributions are Inferences about a Partner's Responsiveness

In graduate school, when I first became acquainted with Hal's work, I thought that the Kelley of "Kelley's cube" was someone other than the Kelley of "Thibaut and Kelley." Although both models utilized symmetric polygons as rhetorical devices, the two sets of concepts seemed too different to have been the brainchild of a single individual. They certainly did not seem conceptually linked.

Now I know better. Early on, Hal recognized a fundamental human dilemma: Although we are vitally concerned with what our interaction partners might be thinking, especially about ourselves, because we have no direct access to the mental states of others, we must draw inferences from their actions (e.g., overt behavior, self-justificatory statements, and nonverbal expressions of affect). When these inferences pertain to the cause of a partner's behavior, they are called attributions and they are a central and significant source of feelings and beliefs about a relationship. Consider one of Hal's favorite examples: Which movie shall Eamon and Kyoko see on Saturday night? Suppose that Kyoko wants to see "Terminator 3;" Eamon, who prefers "Winged Migration," yields to her preference. Kyoko's inference that Eamon conceded because he wanted her to be happy is likely to spawn considerable affection; in contrast, the attribution that "T3" was less costly, or that Eamon wanted to avoid a fight, or that it was her "turn" to pick a movie, considerably less so. Hal's brilliance was in realizing that the attribution process is a key relationship process and in providing the conceptual tools for examining it.

### Concluding Remarks

Hal Kelley was the kind of scholar who comes along all too rarely. Although I was already in mid-career when I came to know him and his theory, his intellectual acuity, wisdom, and, above all, warmth, have profoundly affected my thinking. When Hal took you under his wing, as was my good fortune, you entered a collegial relationship like none other. It included the opportunity to engage in discourse about ideas at a "deep" level (though one had always to be on the lookout -- Hal loved to "twit" his conversation partners). Hal was eager to hear about new ideas and research, and liked nothing better than applying his theoretical model to new problems and new situations. (I recall one day spent explaining to him my work on intimacy and responsiveness. He came back, a few days later, with a unique and brilliant reanalysis.) Hal listened patiently and intently, considered what he had heard open-mindedly, and then, once he understood the issues, argued passionately and (invariably) convincingly for his beliefs. Rarely have I experienced the sort of "mind expanding" intellectual intensity embodied in the several working sessions we had for the "Atlas of Interpersonal Situations" (a copy of which Hal received just a few days before his death). And yet, even when debating some sticky theoretical distinction to the point of exhaustion, Hal did so with great affection. Hal loved intellectual dialogue both for its own sake and for the great sense of relatedness that it fostered. This is what I will remember about Hal: A modest, soft-spoken man, a scholar without peer who enriched us all with his incisive vision, his passionate commitment to knowledge, and his friendship.

---

## Compassion and Love in Relationships – Can They Coexist?

Sharon Shacham-Dupont  
University of Bristol

The first special topics conference for the International Association for Relationship Research (IARR) was held May 30 – June 2, 2003, in Bloomington/Normal, IL, USA. I would like to thank The Fetzer Institute, and Illinois State University, for making it possible, and to thank all of the committee members for the assistance in planning such a wonderful event.

This conference focused on compassion and love in relationships. Because these are vast topics,

the conference attendees thought it would be useful to try and find commonalities among relationship researchers' perceptions of compassionate love. I have collected 19 definitions from IARR members. Reading through them, one of the first similarities to emerge was altruism (Jean Illsley Clarke: "Compassionate love expects no return. Its expressions are empowering, not patronizing. It is as free of the limits of prejudice and solipsism as possible." Duncan Cramer: "Helping, or willingness to help, someone in distress for no other reason than to help them and in a way that person perceives as helpful." Warren Miller: "An expression of the neural-based bonding system that is characterized by empathy and altruism.")

The Oxford English Dictionary defines altruism as "devotion to the welfare of others, regard for others, as a principle of action; opposed to egoism or selfishness." Indeed, many emphasized the importance of being actively compassionate, in behaviour and intentions (Nancy Briton and Jennifer Leaning: "In war settings, the deliberate insistence on persisting with the peace time normal behaviour be considered a significant indication of compassion or altruism." Paul Yelsma: "A process of converting positive thoughts and feelings one has for others into observable meaningful behaviours that demonstrate concern and care for the welfare of the others"). Lynn G. Underwood: "Compassionate love describes attitudes and actions towards others, motivated primarily by a desire for the good of the other. It includes caring for, valuing and respecting the person." Catalin Mamali: "The vectorial model of love and hate suggests that compassionate love is essentially expressed by the lover's tendency to help those who hate themselves and/or others, and to act for transforming hate into a love force in the relations in which the lover is involved"), although one's underlying cognitions and feelings are not less important (Sue Sprecher, and Beverly Fehr: "compassionate love is an attitude toward other or others, either close others or strangers or all of humanity; containing feelings, cognitions, and behaviours that are focused on caring, concern, tenderness, and an orientation toward supporting and helping the other(s), particularly when the other(s) is/or perceived to be suffering or in need." James M. Honeycutt: "Compassionate love is a type of sharing that is selfless. There's communication and a need to put the needs of others over individuals needs: altercentricity versus egocentricity.")

To fully comprehend one's needs, a person has to possess the capacity to be empathetic towards

another person (Arthur Aron, Stephen Wright, and Tracy McLaughlin-Volpe: "A combination of cognitive predispositions including heightened other-focused attention, empathetic sharing of other's affective experiences such as pride in other's accomplishments and sorrow at their losses, and other-directed behaviour such as generous sharing of resources or protection from harm."), or, as defined by the Oxford English Dictionary, "have the power of projecting one's personality into (and so fully comprehending) the object of contemplation." This point of view is shared and agreed upon by many of you, but what does it all mean?

People can differ in their ability to be compassionate towards others, however, some may agree it is much less demanding to show compassion to strangers, than to show the same level of compassion to close others, about whom one cares tremendously, and whose choices have a crucial effect on his or her life. Indeed, some definitions focused on compassion toward humanity in general (Stacy L. Smith, Sandi W. Smith, Katherine Pieper, Edwards Downs, Jina Yoo, Becka Bowden, and Mathew Butler: "Altruistically loving behaviour is: a generous act that attempts to meet another's need, shows devotion to a higher power/humanity, and other-orientedness that is grounded in deep positive affect"), while another group of researchers mentioned close others (Elaine Hatfield: "The affection and tenderness people feel for those with whom their lives are deeply entwined. Compassionate love is a complex functional whole including appraisals or appreciations, subjective feelings, expressions, patterned physiological processes, action tendencies, and instrumental behaviours". Ben Karney: "Compassionate love is a love that adores the other globally while at the same time understanding and accepting the other's specific strengths and limitations"), and some focused on a dyadic unit (David Bell: "Compassionate love is a dyadic phenomenon, so it always has two sides. Dyadic caregiving is the motivation to nurture and protect a special partner. Dyadic attachment is the active expectation that the partner will meet one's needs". Kim Gatz: "Compassionate love involves empathy, sincerity, and passion by one individual to another in an interpersonal relationship"), nonetheless, being empathetic when one feels strongly about someone, putting their emotions and opinions aside, is possibly a much more challenging task. It is almost as if one has to be "attached to the right extent" to fully offer his or her compassion.

Using an attachment theory perspective, Phil Shaver and Mario Mikulincer suggest that people may differ in their ability to be compassionate based on their adult attachment style. (Shaver and Mikulincer: ". . . compassionate love is, roughly, an emotion akin to empathy, sympathy, pity, and mercy tinged with warm affection or fondness – a form of love similar to God's in being generous and genuinely helpful without needing anything in return. Since we are working from an attachment perspective, we view compassionate love as an emotion related to what Bowlby (1969) called "the caregiving behavioral system," an innate behavioral system that complements the attachment behavioral system. In the prototypical case, a child relies on an attachment figure for protection, comfort, support, and help with distress-regulation, and a "stronger, wiser" caregiver responds to the child's needs and calls for support by providing appropriate protection, comfort, etc. The caregiver, who is often a parent or teacher, does not (ideally) expect anything immediately tangible in return for his or her generous support, beyond merely seeing that a need has been met. Theoretically, a more secure person should be better able than an insecure person (in the attachment sense) to 'read' signs or signals from someone who needs or would benefit from protection, help, or support, and should be more willing and able to provide appropriate care. A number of our recent studies indicate that both dispositional and experimentally induced attachment security do increase a person's tendencies toward empathy, tolerance, forgiveness, and altruism (in both feelings and behavior). Moreover, relatively secure people seem to offer help for less self-serving reasons than insecure people.").

Why is this the case? Sue Johnson suggests that one of the biggest blocks to compassion is difficulty in regulating one's own emotions ("I would define compassionate love as a loving response typified by empathy and tenderness where a person can be a safe haven for another. To feel this, the responder would have to also feel safe and emotionally connected. The biggest block to compassion has to be difficulty regulating and processing your own emotions.") Generally speaking, secure individuals' emotion regulation system is "healthier," than that of insecure individuals. Insecures can have a pattern typified by either deactivation (avoidance) versus hyper-activation (anxiety). Differences in emotion regulation patterns might explain individual differences in the capacity to offer compassion, regardless of who the object of contemplation might be. In the context of personal

relationships, and particularly dyadic units, these differences might be even more crucial to the level of compassion experienced by the couple. Time and accumulation of problems, combined with lack of ability to offer real compassion can have a fundamental effect on the well-being of relationships.

Another component of compassion is feelings of sympathy. Many of your definitions addressed this ability (Susan Toliver: "A strong affection or liking for someone that includes a sympathetic understanding of their plight, suffering, or circumstance." Karen J. Prager: "I first think of 'love and compassion.' A combination of a commitment and feelings of love and feelings of sympathy and/or empathy for the other person's perspective, feelings, plight, etc.")

Again, sympathy is defined by the Oxford English Dictionary as following: "A (real or supposed) affinity between certain things, by virtue of which they are similarly or correspondingly affected by the same influence, affect or influence one another (esp. in some occult way), or attract or tend towards each other." So what are the differences between sympathy and empathy, and how do they affect the capacity to offer real compassionate love?

One possible way to look at it is that sympathy is a stepping stone towards empathy. Falling back onto similar experiences in one's past might help him or her to better relate to the "object of contemplation" in front of them, and to imagine their feelings. In time, even without similar experiences in one's past, their ability to show empathy to others will increase. Doesn't practice make perfect? Or if it doesn't work, we can always prime one with security.

## **STUDENT & NEW PROFESSIONALS COLUMN**

### **Looking Back, Moving On**

**João Moreira  
University of Lisbon, Portugal**

As many of you probably know, I have been a member of both INPR and ISSPR for quite a few years now, and I have been involved both in INPR governance and in the merger process that led to the creation of the IARR. After that, there was a time gap in my involvement, as the duly appointed IARR officers took charge (and while I was completing my doctoral dissertation). So, now that I am back on the front line, it seems like a privileged occasion to look back upon what we have accomplished in the merger process, and to think of the new possibilities that the current status opens to us. I do this, of course, from a peculiar perspective, not only because of my direct participation in the process, but also due to my position in a European country (and a quite small, peripheral and not so wealthy one!) I intend to use this column as a way of sharing with you all (students, new professionals, or otherwise) my thoughts on these matters.

First, as I contemplate the merger process, I am delighted by what we have accomplished. Thanks to the enthusiasm, commitment and skill of all those involved (the first two are valid in my case as well), we have managed to overcome the difficulties that were faced and to establish a single, unified society to represent the field of personal relationships; to keep two outstanding journals and to offer them to the membership at a much reduced cost (compared to what prevailed before the merger for those belonging to both societies); and to do this while sustaining the best qualities of the founding societies: a high level of scholarship, active support for new scholars, an interdisciplinary stance and a truly international coverage. As I took contact with IARR Board of Directors activities, I was thrilled to see all of this happening.

One should never rest on one's laurels, however, and so we must constantly think about ways to build and improve on what we already have. In my particular status as Student/New Professional representative, I consider my task to be that of serving, first, the students and new professionals that are IARR members, second, the Association in its entirety and, third, the field of personal relationships. I also believe that our first broad goal should be that of improving upon and deepening the qualities we already have as a society and, secondly, to find new potential avenues for development. Finally, the main strategic lines we elect to follow must be chosen with regard to the potential contributions of the field, the probable historical evolution of scholarship, and of

society at large, for the next few years, and the resources we have at our disposal.

Considering all of this, I came to a set of four strategic goals I will try to pursue during my term as Student/New Professional Representative in the Board of Directors, undoubtedly with the help of fellow Board members, and of many other IARR members (again, students, new professionals, or otherwise). I will briefly mention these goals here, and I will come back to them in greater detail in my upcoming newsletter columns.

1. Increase the IARR membership size, by making the Association more widely known and by recruiting new members, both students and professionals.

2. Affirm the specificity of the study of relationships, as opposed to the study of individuals, groups, or other entities, mainly through development and training in theoretical and methodological approaches that emphasize the peculiarities of the study of relationships.

3. Support the career development of students and new professionals interested in the study of relationships, through financial support, training opportunities (connect with goal 2 above), networking with potential mentors, involvement in scholarly activities, etc.

4. Increase the representation, awareness and study of cultural diversity. This involves not only encouraging the study of culture as a determinant of relationships, but also (a) supporting development and training in theoretical and methodological approaches that particularly tap cultural issues in relationships, and (b) increasing the cultural diversity of the membership and, if possible, of conference locations.

I understand that many of you will probably think that only goal 3 would be appropriate for a Student/New Professional Representative. However, one must not forget that today's students will be tomorrow's established, prominent scholars. Those we are able to recruit today, and the kind of support we provide them with, will do much to shape the field in the years to come. I firmly believe that our societies' (INPR, ISSPR, IARR) tradition in supporting students and new scholars is one of their most profitable long-term investments.

Well, these are some of my thoughts at the present time. I have little doubt that more will occur to me as my work in the Board of Directors develops. I also remain open to ideas and suggestions, particularly those coming from fellow Students/New Professionals, so please feel free to e-mail me at [joamoreira@clix.pt](mailto:joamoreira@clix.pt). I will soon repay you, by

offering suggestions as to how each of you may help in furthering some of the goals I have outlined above. Be on the lookout for future columns in this newsletter!

## THE LIGHTER SIDE OF RELATIONSHIPS

### Reading between the Lines

By David Kenny

When those of us that are asked to write a letter of recommendation, we sometimes do not quite say exactly what we really mean to say. We often try to avoid saying something negative about the person and we want to put the most positive spin on things. Below I provide the uninitiated some clues about what it is that is really being said in letters of recommendation. You might want to save these for future letters that you will be asked to write:

"I was most impressed by Silva's help in the early stages in the statistical analysis, especially his knowledge of SPSS" really means "The only thing that statistical-novice Silva could do was to enter the raw data."

"Because Abercrombie worked with Professor Smith, I do not feel that I know her as well as my own students" really means "Abercrombie must have a full time job or something, because she only comes in to the department to pick up her paycheck."

"Quigley is full of energy and enthusiasm and the life of the party" really means "Quigley is out of control and is likely visiting the methamphetamine lab too often."

"Bigelow is an enthusiastic teacher and works diligently at perfecting his teaching" really means "Bigelow has no idea about research and will likely never publish a study."

"I am most impressed about the ability of Lee to exploit the full potential of the web" really means "Lee seems to be at the computer all the time downloading MP3s and porn."

"I often found myself totally amazed at the creative responses that Hutchins gave when we discussed his extensive research project" really

means "I was truly amazed at the incredibly bizarre excuses that Hutchins gave for why his projects never got completed."

"Garmin is rather reserved at laboratory meetings and class, but the few times that he does say something it is worthwhile" really means "Garmin is painfully shy, and he would not even speak even if his ass were on fire."

"There have been several times while in my office that I have sought out Merckle for assistance and he has been resourceful in departmental projects" really means "Thank goodness Merckle is so tall that he can reach books on my top shelf and play center on the department's intramural basketball team."

"Oglethorp's real strength shines through in his ability to work with others" really means "Oglethorp is incapable of ever doing anything on his own and so he must freeload to get anything accomplished."

"When Smorch enters the room he always get noticed" really means "Smorch seems to never take a shower or a bath."

"In finishing a recent paper with Farnsworth, she was very resourceful in writing the last part of the paper" really means "Farnsworth cannot compose a meaningful sentence, but we finally found something for Fransworth to do and that was to prepare the bibliography."

"Upson decided to take off two years from graduate school to work in an intensive men's group project" really means "Upson had to spend two years in jail on a drunk driving charge."

"Students come early to class when Kraft is giving a lecture" really means "People get there early so they can find a comfortable enough chair far in the back for a nap."

"Ladupa is quick to volunteer and he has often picked up speakers at the airport" really means "Ladupa has a part time job driving a taxi."

"I see McGuillicudy as someone who would network well at conferences" really means "McGuillicudy will be in a different bed every night of the conference."

"Of late, I have noticed that Fiori seems enthusiastic and full of the joy of life" really means "Finally, the prozac that Fiori started taking has begun to kick in."

## I AM A HUMAN ANAGRAM

I	A	M	A	H	U	M	A
A	M	A	H	U	M	A	N
M	A	H	U	M	A	N	A
A	H	U	M	A	N	A	N
H	U	M	A	N	A	N	A
U	M	A	N	A	N	A	G
M	A	N	A	N	A	G	R
A	N	A	N	A	G	R	A
N	A	N	A	G	R	A	M

—William Ickes



### Net News

**Lisa Baker**  
**Purchase College, SUNY**

The new IARR web site is now up and running at [www.iarr.org](http://www.iarr.org). Current postings include

- Information on the 2004 Madison conference, including the Call for Papers,

- On-line membership renewal (thanks to Chris Agnew),
- An on-line version of this newsletter,
- The 2003 IARR Annual Report, and
- The beginning of an IARR Administrative Handbook, including descriptions and duties of officer positions.

We have a growing **list of members' home pages**, which can be found under "Communicating with Members." Please add your home page to the list by emailing the url to [LBaker@ns.purchase.edu](mailto:LBaker@ns.purchase.edu). The list helps IARR members locate each other's work.

I also created a page that lists **graduate programs with IARR-affiliated faculty** on staff, as a service to prospective grad students who are interested in the study of personal relationships. You can find this page by clicking on "Internet Links." If you'd like your graduate program to be listed here, please send me the url at [LBaker@ns.purchase.edu](mailto:LBaker@ns.purchase.edu).

I am also happy to post items of interest to the general membership; you can email them to the same address. And I am delighted to entertain suggestions for improving the web site—if you see anything that could be improved or added, please let me know. In fact the list of grad programs was a member suggestion (thanks, Tim Loving). Keep 'em coming!

---

## IARR Membership Services Moves On-Line!

**Christopher R. Agnew**  
IARR Secretary-Treasurer

**I** am pleased to report that the IARR Board unanimously approved a recent proposal to move membership services on-line. And move we have: Please go to [www.iarr.org](http://www.iarr.org) and click on "Membership" to see for yourself! Members can now update their own profile, renew their memberships, and (when the time comes) register for IARR conferences. Moreover, credit card payments (VISA and MasterCard) for dues and registration fees are now accepted on-line (via a secure web site).

I proposed moving on-line after discussions with our former Secretary-Treasurer, Bill Dragon, and after discussions with Secretary-Treasurers from other organizations similar in scope and mission to IARR.

Specifically, after some research, I proposed that we hire a company named 123signup.com to assist us in collecting membership enrollments, membership renewals, and conference registrations on-line. In an attempt to summarize the Board's discussion of the proposal, I've provided some of the questions and answers that we considered below:

### Why move membership services on-line?

The primary benefit of going on-line is considerably less hassle for everyone, particularly for our international members. More specifically, here is what we gain:

\* Members can pay their dues or conference registration fees using a credit card, instantly. They can also print out a receipt, instantly. As an organization, we no longer have to deal with credit card processing or the screening of expired credit cards. Anyone wishing to join or to renew will now be directed to our on-line "membership" page, which is linked from the IARR home page ([www.iarr.org](http://www.iarr.org)).

\* Members can update information about themselves on-line, at any time, day or night. When a mailing address is updated, it automatically generates an email to the Secretary-Treasurer which is then collated with others and forwarded to our journal publishers (Blackwell and Sage).

\* We eliminate the expense of mailing out membership directories. The directory, based on entries in each member's profile, will now be available on-line, password-protected, ready for our members to grab whenever they might need it. It will also be easier to update more frequently. The current plan is to update it quarterly rather than annually.

\* We can more easily send out email messages to our members, using the email addresses stored in each member's profile. (Note that we will be sparing in the number of messages that we do send.)

### Why use 123signup.com?

This organization currently manages memberships for a number of other scientific societies (e.g., Society for Experimental Social Psychology) as well as many corporations (e.g., Merrill Lynch). I researched other membership services companies and found that this one provides the most complete array of services at the most competitive prices.

### What will it cost us to do this?

There is an initial setup cost, a monthly maintenance fee, and transaction charges. Bottom line annual cost works out to around \$6 per member per year at our current association size. As an organization, moving on-line is going to cost us more than we currently spend on dues processing and membership record updating. As a result, membership dues will likely be increased. However, the savings in terms of person hours needed to keep IARR functioning is considerable: Without an on-line system, Bill Dragon has estimated that it takes approximately 16 hours PER WEEK on average to handle IARR-related matters. The new on-line system will markedly reduce that time requirement.

Of course, it is important to keep in mind what membership dues are for: to provide services to members. Surely our journals count as services but so, too, should keeping our organization running smoothly and in a manner that is maximally user-friendly to members. Filling out cumbersome forms (in which, each year, you are again asked to detail your research interests, etc.) and mailing them back in, emailing an address change and hoping it is received and processed in a timely fashion, etc., is relatively inefficient. The Board sees its goal as moving IARR ahead on various fronts, including membership services.

**Did you get cost estimates from other companies?**

With every company that I researched, the per-person annual cost changes as a function of the size of the association. If we assume a 500 member association, then 123signup provided the least expensive per-person cost for the services that they provide (membership initiations, renewals, conference registrations, and member profile updates), though most of the services hovered in a similar price range. There was not huge variability in costs.

**Does the move on-line mean that ALL relevant transactions have to be done on-line? Are we safe in assuming that all members have on-line access? Will members still have the option to use regular mail?**

Members will still have the option of mailing a check to the Secretary-Treasurer if they so desire. Regarding on-line access, all but 3 of our approximately 500 paid members have on-line access of some type (as indicated by an email address) and these 3 individuals are all U.S. regular members. These members will be mailed renewal materials at the appropriate time.

**Do members outside of the US commonly have VISA and MasterCard accounts?**

Yes, they do. And they like the exchange rate being computed automatically for them when they use their credit card on-line.

**What procedures will be followed to facilitate membership renewals on-line?**

Membership runs from January 1 to December 31. Payment of dues is requested prior to January 1 of each year. Each October, all current members will be sent an email message asking them to renew their membership for the next year. The email message will contain a web link that, upon clicking, allows the member to login and quickly pay their dues. Members can immediately pay with a credit card or they can indicate that they will be mailing in a check to the Secretary-Treasurer (the mailing address is indicated on-line). Those members who do not renew by mid-November will be sent another email message at that time. Those members who do not renew by mid-December will be sent one final email reminder. Any member who prefers not to renew on-line may contact the Secretary-Treasurer for alternative renewal options.

**How will the new system handle verification of student memberships?**

As part of the enrollment process, student members are told that they must fax proof of their student status to the Secretary-Treasurer within 7 days of their on-line enrollment. A copy of current course registration or a brief letter from a faculty member in their program constitutes proof. As in the past, a student membership will not be considered valid until proof is received.

**What assurances do we have regarding the privacy of member profiles stored on-line? Will this lead to even more spam email than we already receive?**

No email messages will ever be sent to our membership other than IARR-related messages that are generated and sent by the account administrator (i.e., Your faithful Secretary-Treasurer). 123signup.com guarantees the privacy of our email list. Our database will never be sold and email addresses will not be provided to anyone outside of IARR.

**Who owns the membership database? Do we have complete access to it at all times?**

We own and will continue to own the database that is maintained by 123signup.com. It is clearly indicated in their policies. The account administrator has 24-hour, 7-day-a-week access to the database and can download it (into Excel, for example) at any time. And whenever anyone changes their profile, an email is automatically sent to the account administrators regarding the change.

I hope that members will enjoy this new membership benefit. Please contact me ([agnew@purdue.edu](mailto:agnew@purdue.edu)) should you have any questions, suggestions, or concerns. And thanks to all those members who have helped to make this new system a reality.

## JOURNALS UPDATE

### A Report on *Personal Relationships*

Submitted by the Editor, Susan Sprecher

**B**elow is a summary of the operation and new developments for *Personal Relationships*, one of the two journals associated with the International Association for Relationship Research. For those unfamiliar with the journal, it's a quarterly journal that is published by Blackwell publishers. For more information, go to the journal's website at: <http://ilt.ilstu.edu/personalrelationships/>

Current Editor: Susan Sprecher (Sociology, Illinois State University, USA)

Current Associate Editors:

Walid Afifi (Communication, Pennsylvania State University, USA)

Graham Allan (Sociology, Keele University, England)

Ximena Arriaga (Psychology, Purdue University, USA)

Julie Fitness (Psychology, Macquarie University, Australia)

Leanne Lamke (Family Studies, Auburn University, USA)

Dan Perlman (Family Studies & Social Work, University of British Columbia, Canada)

*Number of Submissions*: The number of submissions

to *PR* has been increasing. The number of regular submissions by around Sept. 1 (the time this report is written) was 50 in 2001, 60 in 2002, and 70 in 2003! We are expecting to receive 100 or more regular submissions for 2003. We have also had a record number of submissions to our two special issues. The Context special issue (co-edited by Dan Perlman and Cathy Surra; Vol 10, issue 3) received 36 submissions and the Emotions special (co-edited by Julie Fitness and Sally Planalp, still being processed and likely to be Vol. 12, issue 2) received 42 submissions. We have negotiated with Blackwell an increase in the number of pages of the journal to accommodate the greater number of articles likely to be accepted for publication.

*Acceptance Rates and Other Statistics*: Similar to prior years, the acceptance rate for *PR* has remained about 25%. The average lag between submission of an article and receiving initial editorial feedback has averaged about 3 months. In many cases, we are able to send feedback sooner because of the willingness of reviewers to receive the manuscript over e-mail. We strive to return editorial decisions as quickly as we can. The acceptance-to-publication lags for papers currently being accepted at *PR* is relatively low, averaging 9-12 months, which is very good for a quarterly journal.

*Transitions in our Editorial Team*: As we announced in the report of the Spring newsletter, Steve Wilson ended his term as Associate Editor and Ximena Arriaga and Walid Afifi began terms as Associate Editors. We also rotated some members off the *PR*'s editorial board and added new members. The current 54-member board consists of (those in bold are new as of this summer):

Rebecca G. Adams, Christopher R. Agnew, Paul R. Amato, Peter A. Andersen, **Art Aron**, **Jeff Aspelmeier**, Victoria H. Bedford, Susan Boon, Katherine Carnelley, Rodney Cate, **John Caughlin**, W. Andrew Collins, Duncan Cramer, **John Cunningham**, Michael R. Cunningham, Joanne Davila, **Val Derlega**, Judith A. Feeney, Beverley Fehr, **Diane Felmlee**, Catrin Finkenauer, Judith Fischer, **William Graziano**, Nancy K. Grote, **Laura Guerrero**, W. Kim Halford, **Manfred Hassebrauck**, Susan S. Hendrick, **Jon Hess**, John G. Holmes, **Marinus van Ijzendoorn**, **Esther Kluwer**, **Leanne Knobloch**, Larry Kurdek, **Benjamin Le**, Sally A. Lloyd, **Tim Loving**, **John Lydon**, Sandra Metts, Mario Mikulincer, Rowland Miller, Sandra Murray,

Patricia Noller, Joe F. Pittman, Sally Planalp, **Harry Reis**, Linda J. Roberts, **Angela Rowe**, Elaine Scharfe, Chris Segrin, **Todd Shackelford**, **Phillip Shaver**, Donna L. Sollie, Anita L. Vangelisti

*New Scholar Reviewers:* As we have announced in the past, we usually include at least one new scholar reviewer for each manuscript. We have an ever-evolving list of graduate students, post-doc students, and assistant professors who have been willing to serve *PR* in this capacity (for a list of the names see the website). Everyone wins with the new scholar reviewers. The authors gain additional useful comments (beyond the typical 3 reviews), the new scholar gains experience in the reviewing/publishing process, and the journal benefits because the articles that are ultimately accepted are stronger because of their insightful comments. **A big thank you to the new scholar reviewers!** If you are a new scholar who would like to review a manuscript, please contact me: [Sprecher@ilstu.edu](mailto:Sprecher@ilstu.edu)

*We look forward to continuing to serve you at  
Personal Relationships!*

*Please submit your best work and let us obtain  
excellent reviews for you in a timely fashion.*

---

## **A Report on *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships***

**Submitted by the Editor,  
Mark Fine**

**T**he big news for *JSPR* is that it has a new Editor, Paul Mongeau of Arizona State University. Paul has sterling credentials and has considerable editorial experience. He will begin receiving new manuscripts on January 1, 2004 and I will finish processing all papers that were submitted by December 31, 2003. More information will be forthcoming about the manuscript submission process under Paul's editorship. I and everyone associated with *JSPR* wish Paul the very best in this new role. Thanks to Anita Vangelisti and the search committee, who worked tirelessly to secure a new editor.

A reminder that the last special issue during my term will be on Health in Personal Relationships and Families, guest-edited by Carma Bylund and Steve Duck of the University of Iowa. The articles for this special issue have been sent to Sage and will be published in the February, 2004 issue.

Please keep submitting your very best scholarly work to *JSPR*. Paul and I have agreed that, if I accept more papers than are needed to fill the 2004 issue, these accepted articles will appear in the 2005 issue. So, authors should experience a seamless transition to Paul's editorship.

---

## **New *JSPR* Editor, Paul Mongeau**

**P**aul Mongeau has been named the incoming editor of *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*. Paul is professor of human communication at Arizona State University, where he is currently the director of doctoral studies. He received his PhD in communication from Michigan State in 1988. Before coming to Arizona State University, he spent 15 years at Miami University in Oxford, Ohio, where he co-hosted an INPR conference with Sally Lloyd. Paul was editor of *Communication Studies* for its 1998-2000 issues, during which time he produced three years of the journal in two years!

Paul will begin receiving manuscripts for *JSPR* in January 2004, and will put out his first issue in January 2005. Authors interested in submitting articles for publication will be asked first to email only the abstract and title page to Paul, at: [paul.mongeau@asu.edu](mailto:paul.mongeau@asu.edu). Paul will respond with the name and email address of an associate editor to whom the full manuscript should be emailed.

---

## **Contents of Upcoming Journals**

### ***Personal Relationships***

#### **Volume 10, Number 4, December 2003**

DANIEL J. WEIGEL, KYMBERLEY K. BENNETT,  
AND DEBORAH S. BALLARD-REISCH

Family Influences on Commitment: Examining the Family of Origin Correlates of Relationship Commitment Attitudes

JUDITH FEENEY, RICHARD ALEXANDER,  
PATRICIA NOLLER, AND LYDIA HOHAUS

Attachment Insecurity, Depression, and the Transition to Parenthood

MARIAN M. MORRY

Perceived Locus of Control and Satisfaction in Same-Sex Friendships

LAWRENCE A. KURDEK

Negative Representations of the Self/Spouse and Marital Distress

FLEUR THOMESE, THEO VAN TILBURG, AND KEES C.P.M. KNIPSCHER

Continuation of Exchange with Neighbors in Later Life: The Importance of the Neighborhood Context

REVIEWER ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

VOLUME 10, 2003, INDEX

**Volume 11, Number 1, March 2004**  
ARTICLES

DISTINGUISHED SCHOLAR ARTICLE

LESLIE A. BAXTER  
Relationships as Dialogues

JAMES A. CRANFORD

Stress-Buffering or Stress-Exacerbation? Social Support and Social Undermining as Moderators of the Relationship Between Perceived Stress and Depressive Symptoms Among Married People

EUN JUNG SUH, D. S. MOSKOWITZ, MARC A. FOURNIER, AND DAVID C. ZUROFF  
Gender and Relationships: Influences on Agentic and Communal Behaviors

BARBARA FRALEY AND ARTHUR ARON  
The Effect of a Shared Humorous Experience on Closeness in Initial Encounters

NANCY E. FRYE AND BENJAMIN R. KARNEY  
Revision in Memories of Relationship Development: Do Biases Persist Over Time?

HEIDI R. RIGGIO  
Parental Marital Conflict and Divorce, Parent-Child Relationships, Social Support and Relationship Anxiety in Young Adulthood

LEANNE K. KNOBLOCH AND DENISE HAUNANI SOLOMON  
Interference and Facilitations from Partners in the Development of Interdependence within Romantic Relationships

Jane M. Richards, Emily A. Butler, & James J. Gross  
Emotion regulation in romantic relationships: The cognitive consequences of concealing feelings

Luis E. Oliver & Valerie E. Whiffen  
Perceptions of parents and partners and men's depressive symptoms

V.J. Willan & Paul Pollard  
Likelihood of acquaintance rape as a function of males' sexual expectations, disappointment, and adherence to rape conducive attitudes

Brief Articles:

Kimberly J. O'Farrell, Eve N. Rosenthal, & Edgar C. O'Neal  
Relationship satisfaction and responsiveness to nonmates' flirtation: Testing an evolutionary explanation

Gilad Hirschberger, Victor Florian, & Mario Mikulincer  
Strivings for romantic intimacy following partner complain or partner criticism: A terror management perspective

Katherine M. Kitzmann & Robert Cohen  
Parents' vs. children's perceptions of interparental conflict as predictors of children's friendship quality

Book Reviews

**December, 2003 (Vol. 20, 6)**

A. Michele Lease, Richard M. McFall, Teresa A. Treat, & Richard J. Viken  
Assessing children's representations of their peer group using a multidimensional scaling technique

Tamara D. Afifi  
"Feeling caught" in stepfamilies: Managing boundary turbulence through appropriate communication privacy rules

Mark Whisman  
Correlates of depression and marital dissatisfaction: Perceptions of marital communication style

Sharon Manne, Jamie Ostroff, Marne Sherman, Marc Glassman, Stephanie Ross, Lori Goldstein, & Kevin Fox  
Buffering effects of family and friend support on associations between partner unsupportive behaviors and coping among women with breast cancer

Pehr Granqvist & Berit Hagekull  
Longitudinal predictions of religious change in adolescence: Contributions from the interaction of attachment and relationship status

Joanne Doucet & Robert H. Aseltine, Jr.  
Childhood family adversity and the quality of marital relationships in young adulthood

Shannon Weaver & Lawrence H. Ganong  
The Factor Structure of the Romantic Beliefs Scale for African Americans and European Americans

---

*Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*

**October, 2003 (Vol. 20, 5)**

Eriko Maeda & L. David Ritchie  
The concept of shinyuu in Japan: A replication of and comparison to Cole and Bradac's study on U.S. friendship

Brief Article:

Miri Scharf and Rachel Hertz-Lazarowitz Social networks in the school context: Effects of culture and gender

Book Reviews

Laboratory, 310 Strickler Hall, University of Louisville, Louisville, KY 40292, USA, phone 502-852-5953, [michael.cunningham@louisville.edu](mailto:michael.cunningham@louisville.edu).

## ANNOUNCEMENT

Itziar Alonso-Arbiol, lecturer at the Psychology Department of the University of the Basque Country (Spain), is looking for **European colleagues** from other countries wishing to promote the **exchange** of undergraduate or postgraduate **students within the Socrates Program**. She believes this sort of agreement would be an excellent opportunity to settle an **European network** for the study of relationships. Contact her for any further information at the following email address: [itzi@ss.ehu.es](mailto:itzi@ss.ehu.es)

## JOB ANNOUNCEMENT

**POST-DOC.** New or recent Ph.D. in Social Psychology or Interpersonal Communication sought for NIH-supported multi-disciplinary study of mate selection dynamics. Candidates should be familiar with both evolutionary and interpersonal research on romantic attraction, and have demonstrated skills in experimental and survey research methods, and statistical analysis. Interpersonal skills, conscientiousness, and flexibility are essential; experience in grant writing, project coordination and computer programming are desirable. Salary and benefits are competitive. Position is for one year, but potentially renewable. Louisville is a very livable city with excellent arts, amenities and low housing costs. Candidate review begins immediately and will continue until the position is filled. Please send statement of interests and qualifications, vita, publications, and 3 letters of recommendation to Michael Cunningham, Ph.D., Social Communication

## MEMBER NEWS & UPDATES

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

**Jeffrey Adams** has been promoted to Associate Professor of Psychology with tenure in the Department of Behavioral Sciences at High Point University in High Point, North Carolina.

**Krystyna Aune** has been promoted to full Professor of Communication at the University of Hawaii, has received the 2003 Board of Regents Excellence in Teaching Award, and recently gave birth to her third son, Kenneth Ikaika Aune.

**John Birtchnell** has a new book, entitled *The two of me: The rational outer me and the emotional inner me*, forthcoming from Routledge London.

**Rosemary Blieszner** and **Karen Roberto** have received a two-year grant entitled *Caregivers of persons with mild cognitive impairment: Information and support needs* from the Alzheimer's Association.

**Leah Bryant** received her PhD from the University of Nebraska and is now Assistant Professor of Communication Studies at DePaul University.

**Amy Busboom**, of the University of Arizona Family Studies and Human Development Department, has married and changed her name to **Amy Reesing**.

**Joyce Catlett**, along with **Robert Firestone** and **Lisa Firestone**, has a new book entitled *Creating a life of meaning and compassion: The wisdom of psychotherapy*, published by APA books.

**Nancy Collins** was promoted to Associate Professor with tenure in the Department of Psychology at the University of California, Santa Barbara. She also

received the 2002 Harold J. Plous Memorial Award from UCSB for outstanding contributions to the intellectual life of the campus community through research and teaching. Finally, and best of all, she gave birth to Lily Collins Purvis on October 27, 2002

**Meliksah Demir**, of the Department of Psychology at Wayne State University, was awarded a travel award and selected as an international positive psychology fellow for the 2003 International Positive Psychology meeting, to be held in Washington, DC, in October.

**Valerian Derlega** and **Sandra Petronio**, along with **Kathryn Greene** and **Gust Yep**, have a new book entitled *Privacy and disclosure of HIV in interpersonal relationships: A sourcebook for researchers and practitioners*, published by Erlbaum.

**Eli Finkel** has been appointed Assistant Professor of Social Psychology at Northwestern University.

**Regan Gurung** has received tenure in the Dept of Psychology at University of Wisconsin, Green Bay.

**Raeann Hamon** has a new book entitled *Mate selection across cultures*, published by Sage.

**Michael Hecht**, Department of Communication Arts and Sciences at Penn State, was awarded a 5-year, \$4,063,286 grant from NIDA for a drug resistance strategies project. Funding will support longitudinal research into the relationships among acculturation, ethnic identity, communication development, and adolescent drug use, as well as to develop and evaluate a multicultural intervention.

**Vicki Helgeson** has received a grant entitled *Adolescent adjustment to Type I IDDM*.

**Jon Hess** has been promoted to Associate Professor with tenure in the Department of Communication at University of Missouri—Columbia.

**James Honeycutt** has a new book entitled *Imagined interactions: Daydreaming about communication*, published by Hampton Press. He also recently was married to Elizabeth Stout in Gulf Shores, Alabama.

**William Ickes** has a new book entitled *Everyday mind reading: Understanding what other people think and feel*, forthcoming from Prometheus Books.

**Sue Johnson** and **Valerie Whiffen** have recently edited a book entitled *Attachment processes in couple and family therapy*, published by Guilford. Details about an upcoming conference on attachment will soon be on their website: [www.eft.ca](http://www.eft.ca)

**Pamela Kalbfleisch** has recently been appointed Director of the School of Communication at the University of North Dakota in Grand Forks.

**Shelley Kilpatrick** is Assistant Professor of Psychology at Southwest Baptist University.

**Robin Kowalski** has started a new job at Clemson University and has recently published two books: *Complaining, teasing, and other annoying behaviors* (Yale University Press); and, *Key readings in social psychology: The interface of social and clinical psychology* (Psychology Press).

**Adrienne Kunkel** has received the Graduate Faculty Mentorship Award from the Department of Communication Studies at University of Kansas; the Outstanding Woman Educator Award from the Commission on the Status of Women and Emily Taylor Women's Resource Center at University of Kansas; a \$20,000 grant from the Health Resources and Services Administration for the Telehealth for Kansas project; and a grant from the University of Kansas General Research Fund for a study of social support for breast cancer survivors. Way to go!

**Brian Lakey** has received the Outstanding Graduate Mentor Award from Wayne State University.

**Frieder Lang** and **Karen Fingerman** have a new book entitled *Growing together: Personal relationships across the life span*, published by Cambridge University Press.

**Tim Loving** has begun a tenure-track position in the Department of Human Ecology, Division of Human Development and Family Sciences, at the University of Texas at Austin.

**Stacey Nairn** has received the University of Calgary Department of Psychology service award for work on the undergraduate committee and the student research conference. She has a new article entitled *At the core of introductory psychology: A content analysis*.

**Franz Neyer** and **Jens Asendorpf**, of Humboldt University in Berlin, have received a grant from the

German Research Foundation for a study on personality-relationship transaction in young adulthood.

**Pamela Regan** has been promoted to full Professor in the Department of Psychology at California State University, Los Angeles, and has a new book entitled *The mating game: A primer on love, sex, and marriage*, published by Sage.

**David Reid** has received the annual Teaching Award from the Northeastern Association of Graduate Schools. He had received the York University Faculty of Graduate Studies Graduate Teaching Award earlier this year.

**Suzanna Rose** has a new book entitled *Lesbian love and relationships*, published by Harrington Park Press. She has also received the Women of Distinction Award from the City of Miami Commission on the Status of Women, and the Thelma Gibson Award of Excellence from the Women's Chamber of Commerce of Miami-Dade County.

**Wade Rowatt** has received tenure in the Department of Psychology and Neuroscience at Baylor University.

**Paul Schrod** is Assistant Professor of Communication Studies at University of Texas at Arlington. He received the Graduate Teaching Award from the Central States Communication Association.

**Pepper Schwartz** has been elected President-elect of the Pacific Sociological Association.

**Jackie Weinstock** has a new book entitled *Lesbian ex-lovers: The really long-term relationship*, published by Harrington Park Press, and an in-press chapter entitled *Lesbian FLEX-ibility: Friend and/or family connections among lesbian EX-lovers*. She recently received tenure.

**Gail Williamson's** Family Relationships in Late Life Project has been re-funded for another five years for \$2,700,000 by the National Institute on Aging.

**Jan Yager** has had the sixth foreign publisher, in Korea, buy translation rights to her book *Friendships: The power of friendship and how it shapes our lives*, published by Hannacroix Creek Books.

**Julie Yingling** has a book in press entitled *A lifetime of communication*. She began serving as Chair of the

Department of Communication at Humboldt State University (California) in August 2003.

## NEW MEMBERS

**We are pleased to welcome the following new members to IARR:**

**Jennifer Becker** is based at the University of Oklahoma. Her research interests centre on interpersonal communication in personal relationships and in organizational and mental health contexts.

**Wade Bettis** is a practicing lawyer based in Oregon that represents parents and children in dependency cases. His interests include abuse/aggression/bullying, attachment, and divorce.

**Guy Cunningham** researches psychology and family studies at Grand View College, Iowa. His interests include relationship development/partner selection, marriage and work.

**Rena Franiuk** researches several different areas of romantic relationship (e.g., implicit theories, domestic violence) at the University of Wisconsin.

**Stéphane Guay** is based at the University of Montreal, Canada. Her research interests include mental health, social support and stress.

**Diane Holmberg** works in the Department of Psychology at Acadia University, Canada. Her interests include cognition, memory in relationships, and retrospective reports.

**Ruthellen Josselson** researches psychology in Baltimore with research interests covering life events/lifespan, intimacy, retrospective reports and relationship types.

**Beth Kirsner** is a student at the University of Arizona. Her research concerns the impact of affective disorders and symptoms on mate selection and sexual behaviour.

**Kudo Kazuhiro** is at the Department of English at Dokkyo University, Japan. Research interests are the

intersection of international student adjustment, intercultural friendship, and communication.

**Li-Wen Lin** is int Lincoln, Nebraska and researches love styles and couple relationships.

**Brent Mallinckrodt** is at the University of Missouri, Columbia and researches attachment theory and psychotherapy; health enhancing properties of close relationships, and social competencies.

**Marian Morry** is at the Psychology Department at the University of Manitoba in Canada. Her research involves perceptions within relationships; how perceptions of another influence satisfaction, and how attraction leads to perceptions of similarity.

**Kimberly O'Farrell** teaches at the Psychology Department at Minnesota State University in Mankato. She researches relational devaluation and self-motivations in close relationships, and relationship satisfaction and l protection.

**Carla Alexandra Dos Santos Paiva** is a student at the University of Minho in Portugal who researches attachment as a predictor of relationship quality, abuse towards partner and health symptoms.

**Beth Paul** is based in the Psychology Department at the College of New Jersey. Her research interests include gender, intimacy, and qualitative methods.

**Edwin Ramos-Soto** is based in San Francisco and is currently involved in Developing and Testing Model of HIV Risk for Gay Male Couples with the Centre for AIDS Prevention Studies, UCSF.

**Karen Nunez** is currently researching cognitive orientations among adult intimate partners with regard to issues of justice in intimate relationships.

**Stephanie Rollie** is a student at the University of Iowa. She is interested in studying relational expectations, roles, blended families, divorce, and identity management.

**Richard Sabatino** coaches individuals and groups who are committed to bringing the best out in others and making a difference in the world. Of particular interest is the role of fear in relationships and fulfilment and ways in which individuals communicate their wants and needs.

**Stephanie Schneider** is a student whose research and teaching focuses on evolutionary explanations of friendship and other non-sexual social relationships in humans and non-human primates.

**Michael Searcy** is a student at the University of Iowa whose research concerns the detection of deception communication and nonverbal communication.

**Sharon Shacham** is a student at the University of Bristol. Her research is concerned with marital conflicts as affected by social perception processes.

**Alan Sillars** is based in the Department of Communication Studies at the University of Montana. His research interests include cognition, conflict, and social interaction.

**Sunwolf** is Assistant Professor of Communication at Santa Clara University, where she is completing post-doctoral studies in counselling psychology. She is a former trial attorney and training director for Colorado's Public Defender System who researches jury deliberations, creativity processes in groups, and social influence during group decision-making.

**Susan Toliver** is at Iona College in New Rochelle, NY and researches friendship across the divides of gender, race, class, age, and sexual orientation.

**Manfred Dulmen** is at the University of Minnesota and researches relationship processes and antisocial behavior during adolescence/ young adulthood, measurement issues, and international perspectives on developmental/relationship research.

**C. Arthur VanLear** is based in the Department of Communication sciences at the University of Connecticut. He studies relationships in alcoholism and addiction recovery and relationship emergence.

**Violeta Vidacek-Hains** is at the University of Zagreb in Croatia. Her research interests include communication, personality, and social skills.

**Laura Winn** is based at Wayne State University in Detroit. Her research interests include language and social cognition, attraction and intimacy.

**Alaina Winters** is based at Heartland Community College in Illinois. Her research interests include relationship types, language, and flirtation.

**Paul Yarab** is at Mercy College of Northwest Ohio. He is primarily a teaching professional, teaching introductory, social, lifespan, abnormal psychology, introductory sociology, and cultural diversity.

## CALL FOR PAPERS

### *Western Journal of Communication* Call for Papers

#### Special Issue on *Non-normative Relationships*

An upcoming special issue of the *Western Journal of Communication* (Spring 2005) will focus on “non-normative relationships,” broadly defined. Relational contexts appropriate for this special issue include, but are not limited to, long-distance relationships, online relationships, parent- adult child relationships, single parent and step family relationships, interracial relationships, sexually diverse relationships, and other relationship types that are significant yet understudied. Both theoretical and empirical examinations will be considered using a blind review process. Submissions must be received by *March 15, 2004* and should conform to *WJC*’s editorial policy. Send submissions to Tara Emmers-Sommer at the following address:

Dr. Tara Emmers-Sommer  
Guest Editor, *Western Journal of Communication*  
Department of Communication, Bldg. #25  
University of Arizona  
Tucson, AZ 85721  
USA

## CONFERENCE ANNOUNCEMENTS

### First Special Topics Conference was a Success!

#### Susan Sprecher, Chair of the Conference Planning Committee

The first special topics conference co-sponsored by IARR was a success. It was held May 30 - June 2, 2003 at the Chateau Hotel and Conference Center in Bloomington/Normal, Illinois, USA, and was attended by approximately 135 people. Although a large number of the participants came from Illinois and other states in the Midwest United States, people also came from all over the United States and from five other countries (England, Canada, Australia, Israel, and Mexico).

The keynote speakers were Phillip R. Shaver and Mario Mikulincer (*Attachment and Altruism*), Benjamin Karney (*Knowing and Adoring: A Cognitive/Motivational Model of Compassionate Love*), Susan S. Hendrick and Clyde Hendrick (*Keeping the Passion in Compassionate Love*) and Lynn Underwood (*Compassionate Love Research – An Adventure?*).

The program also consisted of 42 oral presentations, 12 roundtable discussions, and 22 poster sessions. The conference was co-sponsored by the Fetzer Institute, who provided a grant to help keep the costs of the conference low. By all accounts, the participants enjoyed the presentations, the food, and the social opportunities/ entertainment which included an awards ceremony (with fun awards provided by Brian Spitzberg and Ann Weber) and a “sockhop”.

I wish to thank all of the following people who served on the conference planning committee: Dawn Braithwaite, Beverley Fehr, Frank Keefe, Kathleen McKinney, Pat Noller, Terri Orbuch, and Maria Schmeekle. Most of all, I want to thank all of you who attended and helped make this conference a success.

#### Future Conferences Committee

##### Terri Orbuch

In the IARR spring newsletter, I announced (as FCC Chair) that Bruges, Belgium (Local Host: Patrick Hunout) would be the site for the 2006 IARR conference. Patrick is president of TSCF (The Social Capital Foundation), and he submitted a proposal to FCC to host the 2006 conference. FCC and the IARR

Board were pleased with the conference site and the local host. After the announcement, Patrick and I (in collaboration with Bill Cupach and Bob Milardo) set out to negotiate an agreeable contract between IARR and TSCF. We have been working several months to forge an agreement for a conference in Bruges.

Both TSCF and IARR have made good faith efforts in trying to forge an agreement/contract. At this point however, we cannot come to a mutually agreed upon contract/understanding. We remain too far apart on several important issues. IARR's concerns stemmed from: 1) not wanting to break from previous traditions that have most lunches and some dinners as a group, which are included in the registration fee; 2) wanting the IARR Board to examine and approve a detailed budget before and after the conference (from TSCF), and 3) wanting to maintain primary control and management of the content of the conference program, opening reception, and the awards dinner. I appreciate all the efforts that both sides have made in these negotiation processes, but in the end, the two organizations had different goals and desires for the conference.

Consequently, the primary goal of the FCC in the next several months will be to accept and review new proposals for the 2006 IARR conference. We are still committed to a Non-North American site for the 2006 IARR conference. Please encourage proposal submissions from any of your contacts, colleagues and friends. The deadline for submissions is October 15, 2003.

---

## Invitation for 2006 Conference Preliminary Proposals

**Terri Orbuch**

**T**he IARR Future Conferences Committee invites **preliminary proposals** to host the 2006 IARR conference. **Deadline: October 15, 2003.** We are especially interested in Non-North American locations.

Proposals to host an IARR conference are typically brought forward by an individual, or group of individuals, that will act as Local Arrangements Chair (or Co-Chairs) for the conference. The Local Arrangements Committee is distinct from the Program Planning Committee, the latter of which has the responsibility for developing the conference

program. Hence, although the Local Arrangements Chair will ultimately need to work closely with the Program Chair, those developing proposals to host an IARR conference need not focus attention on program planning.

The Future Conferences Committee (FCC) will initially receive preliminary proposals. The preliminary proposal contains only the most essential information needed to evaluate potential conference sites. After screening preliminary proposals, the FCC may solicit a full proposal. The full proposal contains the detailed information needed by the FCC and IARR Board to make final decisions about conference locations. We hope the conference site/chair will be selected by January 2004. The information for the preliminary proposal to host the 2006 IARR conference is listed below.

Please send all preliminary proposals to Terri Orbuch (Chair, Future Conferences Committee) ([Orbuch@Umich.edu](mailto:Orbuch@Umich.edu)) via email by **October 15, 2003**. If you have any questions or concerns (or want to discuss the possibility), please contact Terri Orbuch.

A preliminary proposal to host an IARR conference 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. Include an indication of willingness to serve as Local Arrangements Chair.
2. 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. (Appropriate and successful sites can vary widely but university settings and small, attractive conference centers are preferred.) Conferences have been growing steadily, but we expect 300-350 participants.
3. The planned date of the conference (usually a 4-5 day period in July, which seems to be a reasonably convenient time for most IARR members).
4. A description of major venues for the conference. This should include descriptions of:
  - a. Meeting places, including auditoriums for plenary sessions, a central area for breaks between sessions, large rooms for symposia,

- book exhibits, registration, and poster sessions (with the potential to have upwards to 60 posters); and smaller rooms for paper sessions and interest groups.
- b. Presentation equipment, including access to overhead projectors, computers for power point presentations, proximas or similar projectors, and poster stands for poster sessions.
  - c. Eating facilities, including cafeterias, dining rooms, and banquet halls. Meals are typically included in the “conference fee” thus encouraging participants’ meeting and interacting.
  - d. Lodging facilities, including possible dormitories, and other on-site housing, as well as near-by local hotels.
5. A rough budget projection and estimates of costs of attending the conference, including:
- a. current airfares to the site from major “gateway” cities (e.g., Montreal, Chicago, Los Angeles, London, Sydney).
  - b. lodging costs for major options (dormitories, hotels)
  - c. projected conference registration fee (which typically includes costs of meeting facilities and services, meal package, and social events package). We understand that this will be a rough estimate given the preliminary proposal format and deadline.

---

## Invitation for 2005 Conference Preliminary Proposals

**Terri Orbuch**

**T**he 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., 2005, 2007). At this time, the Future Conferences Committee (FCC) invites proposals to host 2005 IARR workshops, mini-conferences, graduate student conferences and/or regional

conferences. The FCC will begin to review proposals starting **October 1, 2003**.

The Future Conferences Committee (FCC) will initially receive preliminary proposals. The preliminary proposal contains only the most essential information needed to evaluate potential mini-conferences. After screening preliminary proposals, the FCC may solicit a full proposal. The full proposal contains the detailed information needed by the FCC and IARR Board to make final decisions about conference locations.

Proposals to host an IARR 2005 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.

A proposal to host a 2005 mini-conference or workshop should contain the following information:

6. Names and contact information (addresses, office and home telephone numbers, fax numbers, email addresses) of those making the proposal.
  7. Major theme and/or focus of the conference.
  8. 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.
  9. The planned date of the conference.
  10. Projected number of participants at the conference.
  11. Any possible co-sponsors of the conference (besides IARR), and their degree of involvement (financial, participants, etc.).
  12. A description of major venues for the conference. This should include descriptions of: meeting places, eating facilities, and lodging facilities (dormitories, local hotels).
  13. Any stipends that will be provided to students and/or invited speakers.
  14. 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
-

## Families and Poverty Research Conference Call for Papers

The Family Studies Center (FSC) in the School of Family Life at Brigham Young University is sponsoring a research conference on Families and Poverty, **March 10-12, 2004**. The conference covers a broad range of topics including: parenting, health care for poor families, how family processes influence families experiencing economic hardship, consequences of welfare reform in the United States, economic status of ethnically diverse elderly, micro-entrepreneurship in developing countries and others.

Submit a two page proposal for a paper or poster to D. Russell Crane, Director of the FSC ([russ-crane@byu.edu](mailto:russ-crane@byu.edu)). Offers to serve as panel chairs and discussants are also welcome. Submissions are due November 30, 2003.

More details on the conference may be found at: <http://familiesandpoverty.byu.edu>

---

### THE INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR RELATIONSHIP RESEARCH CONFERENCE (IARRC) MADISON, WISCONSIN, USA JULY 22 - JULY 25, 2004



Nestled between two lakes, and thriving on its twin foundations as both the State Capitol and home of the University of Wisconsin-Madison, Madison will be the site for the 2004 IARR Conference.

Plans are well underway for the 2004 IARR Conference in Madison, Wisconsin, USA next July. The centerpiece of the conference will be the program of panels, posters, and round table discussions that organize our scholarly conversations. You can also look forward to a host of activities that showcase the city of Madison and commemorate the 20 years since relationship scholars first gathered on the shores of Lake Mendota. Madison provides a variety of wonderful restaurants, the diversions of the State Street pedestrian mall, and numerous gathering spots to continue the conversations sparked by the day. Plan your summer vacation around this Midwest destination!

### MADISON, WI FUN FACTS

- Site of the first Personal Relationship Conference in 1982.
- Original home of the Onion and its creators.
- Situated around four lakes with more than 18,000 acres of total lake surface in the greater Madison area.
- Ranked the #1 place to live in the country (*Money*, 1996), the friendliest city in the Midwest (*Midwest Living*, 2003), the best small city for women (*Ladies Home Journal*, 2002), and the most wired city in the country (*The Media Audit*, 2002).
- Ranked #5 in Campus Scenes That Rock by *Rolling Stone Magazine*.
- Adjacent to Mount Horeb, home of the internationally known Mustard Museum boasting the world's largest collection of mustards (more than 3,500 varieties).
- Close to America's largest waterpark, Noah's Ark located in Wisconsin Dells, just North of Madison.
- Home of a world class university, the University of Wisconsin-Madison, which among other top accolades, can boast that it has more alumni serving in the Peace Corps than any other college or university in the country.

- Former stomping grounds of Frank Lloyd Wright and located within an hour of his headquarters at Taliesin.
- State capitol of Wisconsin, which is first in the nation in total cheese production; its 1.3 million dairy cows produce a year's supply of milk for nearly 42 million people, butter for 68 million, and cheese for 86 million.
- And, of course, the polka is the official state dance here.

### IARRC 2004 FUN FACTS

- Registration and opening festivities begin Thursday afternoon July 22.
- The Madison Concourse Hotel, adjacent to the State Capitol, will be Conference Headquarters.
- Keynote speakers include Anita Vangelisti, Laura Guerrero, Harry Reis, Michael Cunningham, and Robert Milardo.
- Friday evening, we will gather at the Monona Terrace Community and Convention Center, a landmark building 60 years in the making. First designed by Wisconsin native and internationally renowned architect Frank Lloyd Wright in 1938, Wright reworked the design several times before signing off on the final plans seven weeks before his death in 1959. In 1992, Madison voters approved referenda to construct Monona Terrace on the same site Wright had originally proposed, and the new Wright designed building opened its doors in 1997.
- From our hotel windows on Saturday morning, we will be able to see one of the largest and most colorful Farmer's Markets in the country.
- We will return to UW's Memorial Union on Lake Mendota, site of the 1982 and 1984 Relationship conferences, for an Awards banquet and dance on Sunday July 25.

Watch for an upcoming membership mailing with more information and registration materials. In the meantime, visit the IARR website for further details on the IARR Conference and breaking news as it becomes available: [www.iarr.org](http://www.iarr.org)



**On behalf of the International Association of Relationship Research**, the Conference Organizing Committee, and the University of Wisconsin – Madison, we extend an invitation to you to experience cutting edge research in the field of personal relationships in Madison, Wisconsin (USA) July 22 – 25, 2004. World class relationship scholars representing a broad range of disciplines will gather at the conference to present and discuss the latest research on personal relationships. Those who attend will find others with similar interests and will participate in sessions relevant to their areas of interest and expertise. Leading researchers from around the world will come together for four days of symposia, papers, posters, round tables, interest groups, key note speakers, and networking in the unique combination of natural beauty and vibrant urban culture that characterizes Madison.

**Invited speakers** will be Michael Cunningham, Laura Guerrero, Robert Milardo, Harry Reis, and Anita Vangelisti.

**THE INTERNATIONAL  
ASSOCIATION FOR  
RELATIONSHIP  
RESEARCH CONFERENCE  
2004  
July 22 – 25  
Madison, Wisconsin USA**

The conference begins **late in the afternoon of Thursday, July 22, and ends with the Awards Banquet on Sunday, July 25.**

**Program & Local Arrangements:** Scott Christopher, Program Committee Chair, can answer your questions about the Program. Linda Roberts or Denise Solomon, the Local Arrangement Co-Chairs, can address questions about local arrangements.

Scott: [Scott.Christopher@asu.edu](mailto:Scott.Christopher@asu.edu)

Linda: [ljrober1@wisc.edu](mailto:ljrober1@wisc.edu)

Denise: [dsolomon@wisc.edu](mailto:dsolomon@wisc.edu)

**Submissions:** The Program Committee Invites Proposals for Symposia, Papers, Posters Roundtables, & Interest Groups on topics relating to interpersonal relationships.

Detailed information about the conference, how to submit, and how to register (*forthcoming*) is available on the IARR web site ([www.iarr.org](http://www.iarr.org)). The deadline for submissions is **December 1, 2003**. Submission should be sent electronically to: [IARRConference@asu.edu](mailto:IARRConference@asu.edu).

## IARRC CALL FOR PAPERS

**July 22 – 25, 2004**

**Madison, Wisconsin USA**

### Submission Formats

Submissions related to interpersonal relationships (broadly defined) are due **December 1, 2003**. Reviewers will evaluate the submissions for quality. A description of the types of submissions and the procedure for submitting is presented below:

**Paper:** An oral presentation (about 10-15 minutes) that investigates a topic from an empirical or theoretical perspective.

**Symposia:** A collection of presentations that focus on a related topic, problem or theme, from an empirical and/or theoretical perspective. The symposium could include a discussant who integrates and critiques the presentations.

**Posters:** A visual presentation (on a 4' by 8' poster) illustrating research from an empirical or theoretical perspective.

**Roundtables:** A one-hour discussion led by one or two speakers on specific themes or issues. The speaker(s) could begin with a 10-15 minute presentation that introduces the topic and/or provide(s) materials that help define the issues. Those present will have opportunities to participate.

**Interest Groups:** An opportunity for scholars with common interests and questions to share advances with each other for the purpose of building networks.

### Submission Requirements

1. For **papers**, **posters**, and **round tables** submit a 1000 word summary and a 100-150 word abstract. For **symposia**, submit a 500-word overview, plus a 500-1000 word summary and a 100-150 word abstract for each paper. For **interest groups**, submit a proposed agenda for the meeting and a 100-150 word abstract (must be proposed by at least three individuals).

2. Submissions must be sent electronically by December 1, 2003 to [IARRConference@asu.edu](mailto:IARRConference@asu.edu). In addition, please send one paper copy of your submission postmarked by December 1 to: IARR Conference, c/o F. Scott Christopher, Department of Family & Human Development, Arizona State University, Tempe, AZ, USA, 85287-2502.

3. Electronic submissions must be in the form of an attachment using Word or WordPerfect (RFT submissions are also acceptable). *The file should be labeled with the last name of the principal author or organizer. Individuals with common last names should also include their initials.* If you submit more than one proposal, please send each in a separate email and number each proposal (i.e. SmithMS1, SmithMS2).

4. Include the following information in the e-mail message in addition to the attachments:

1. Name, address, e-mail address, and affiliation of principal organizer or author
2. Title of paper or proposal
3. Names, affiliations, and e-mail addresses for all other authors
4. Number of authors likely to attend the conference
5. First and second choices for format (paper, poster, symposia – individuals may not get their first choice due to the number of submissions)
6. Three numbers for keyword descriptors of the submission (see following page).

## *Keyword Descriptions*

1 Abuse	2 Accounts	3 Acquaintance	4 Affinity	5 AIDS
6 Alcoholism	7 Appearance	8 Attachment	9 Attribution	10 Children
11 Cognition	12 Commitment	13 Commun. Apprehension	14 Commun. Competence	15 Commun. Style
16 Competence	17 Compliance	18 Conflict	19 Conversation	20 Courtship
21 Cultures	22 Dating	23 Deception	24 Decisions in Personal Relations	25 Depression
26 Deviance	27 Diaries	28 Disability	29 Dissolution	30 Divorce
31 Embarrassment	32 Emotions	33 Epidemiology	34 Families	35 Flirtation
36 Friendship	37 Gay/Lesbian Relations	38 Gender	39 Gerontology	40 Health
41 Hostility	42 Idioms	43 Intimacy	44 Jealousy	45 Language
46 Lifespan	47 Loneliness	48 Love	49 Kinship	50 Marriage
51 Marital Commun.	52 Marital Satisfaction	53 Marital Stability	54 Relationship Memory	55 Mental Health
56 Networks	57 Nonverbal Commun.	58 Organizations	59 Parent-Child Relationships	60 Parenthood
61 Parenting	62 Peer Relationships	63 Personality	64 Persuasion	65 Power
66 Pregnancy	67 Proxemics	68 Qualitative Methods	69 Quantitative Methods	70 Recruitment
71 Rehabilitation	72 Relationship Types	73 Religion	74 Repair of Personal Relationships	75 Retro. Report
76 Reticence	77 Roles	78 Rules	79 Ruminations	80 Self Discloser
81 Sex	82 Shyness	83 Social Anxiety	84 Social Class	85 Social Mobility
86 Social Participation	87 Social Skills	88 Social Support	89 Speech Status	90 Strategies
91 Stress	92 Trajectories	93 Uncertainty	94 Unpopularity	95 Other....

## IARR BOARD

### OFFICERS:

#### Past President:

Robert Milardo  
rhd360@maine.edu

#### President:

William Cupach  
wrcupac@ilstu.edu

#### Vice President:

Terri Orbuch  
orbuch@umich.edu

#### Secretary-Treasurer:

Chris Agnew  
agnew@purdue.edu

### MEMBERS AT LARGE:

Larry Kurdek  
Larry.Kurdek@wright.edu

Barbara Winstead  
Bwinstea@odu.edu

### NEW PROFESSIONAL REPRESENTATIVE:

Joao Moreira  
joaomoreira@clix.pt

### JOURNAL EDITORS:

Mark A. Fine (*JSPR, Dec. 2003*)  
finem@missouri.edu

Paul Mongeau (*JSPR, Jan. 2004*)  
[paul.mongeau@asu.edu](mailto:paul.mongeau@asu.edu)

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

### NEWSLETTER EDITOR:

Susan Boon  
sdboon@ucalgary.ca

### COMMITTEE CHAIRS:

Chris Agnew (Finance Chair)  
agnew@purdue.edu

Lisa Baker (Website Chair)  
Lbaker@ns.purchase.edu

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

Linda Roberts (Local Conference Co-Chair, 2004)  
LJRober1@facstaff.wisc.edu

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

Denise Solomon (Local Conference Co-Chair, 2004)  
DSolomon@wisc.edu

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

**IARR Members:  
Update address, phone, and  
email changes via our website:**

**Please go to [www.iarr.org](http://www.iarr.org) and  
click on "Membership"**