

RELATIONSHIP RESEARCH NEWS

OFFICIAL NEWS JOURNAL OF THE INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR RELATIONSHIP RESEARCH

Fall 2007

VOL 6, NO. 1

PRESIDENT'S COLUMN

Greetings from the President

by Sandra Petronio

Although it seems like I just started as the IARR President, my term has ended. The first order of business is to congratulate Phil Shaver, the new IARR President. From everything we know about Phil, we move on to an excellent leader for this tremendous association.

One thing IARR Presidents learn quickly is the extent to which the leadership of this association is unable to function without the allegiance of many people. Organizations like IARR are built on the dedication and good will of committed members who voluntarily give of their time, energy, and resources. In many ways, it is easy to forget that we depend on a special kind of philanthropy many of our members are willing to contribute. During my tenure as IARR President, I have seen how fortunate we are to have individuals who understand the value of donating to this association. Therefore, it is most fitting that I recognize the many contributions and tell you about the accomplishments our association made this year through the efforts of our officers, committee chairs, and committee members.

Each accomplishment I mention has a number of individuals who made it happen. As I tell you about the activities, I will stop along the path to tell you too about the people. One of the exciting changes on the horizon is our website. We have contracted a web designer who is working with Ben Le to revamp the site giving us a more useful and dynamic representation on the web. As you know, Ben Le has been the chair of our website committee for several years. He is responsible for maintaining the flow of news through the web to our members. Ben is an

excellent choice for this position because he has a significant working knowledge of web issues and is talented in helping us sustain the flow of communication to the membership. He has agreed to take on this new task and has worked hard to locate an expert web designer. Terri Orbuch, in working with Ben, has offered many interesting and novel ways of using the web. Terri's activities in the media translating our relationships research into news columns, radio, and talk shows has lent a new way of thinking about our potentials on the web. We hope to attract new members, keep our current ones, and communicate our research enterprise to many more who might visit our site.

One of the more energizing events this summer was the New Scholars Workshop. Ashley Duggan, the Chair of our Mentorship Committee, was extraordinary at organizing and implementing this Workshop. We had 35 participants who represented a wide range of diverse IARR members in both cultural backgrounds and disciplinary homes. Boston College hosted our Workshop and financially supported a significant amount of its needs. They contributed space, food, time, and resources to make this Workshop an excellent intellectual playground for our New Scholars and some of us older ones too! Dan Perlman, Peter Andersen, Terri Orbuch, and I had the pleasure of learning from the new scholars and contributing to the conversations. We owe Ashley Duggan, particularly, and her committee members, Laura Brumariu and Edina Brown a very big debt of gratitude for her efforts.

As we assessed the needs that were identified by individuals responsible for the 2006 conference in Crete, it was clear that several recommendations needed to be addressed that John Caughlin, the 2006 Program Planning Chair, suggested. In particular, he proposed that we dedicate funds to implement on-line submissions and registration for our conferences. As a result, Lisa Diamond, the 2008 Conference Program Planning Chair, devoted considerable effort to locating the very best type of service we could find at the most reasonable price. Given Lisa's thoughtful analysis, we took her suggestion and the Board voted to approve using Oxford Abstracts as the on-line

submission and registration vendor. We thank Lisa not only for all her hard work as the Chair, but for this additional task that will help us all enjoy the upcoming and future IARR conferences.

This seems a natural place to talk about the upcoming 2008 conference in Providence, Rhode Island (from July 17, 2008-July 20, 2008). As mentioned, Lisa Diamond is the Conference Planning Committee Chair and her committee members include, Wendy Samter, Ruth Sharabany, James Coan, Gary Lewandowski, Michael Johnson, and Mary Claire Morr Serewicz. Lisa and her committee have been hard at work setting the stage for our conference. They have developed the call for papers and identified special invited speakers, as well as considered alternative formats for some of the programs. This committee has also worked on launching the on-line submission and registration process. Thus, this committee is not only functioning in their role as planners, but they are learning a new system and articulating the way this system works within the needs of the association for the conference. Consequently, we owe them big thanks for spending time getting the kinks out of implementing this new process.

In addition to all of the effort of the planning committee, Wendy Samter is functioning as the local host of this conference. Along with her committee Kevin Pearce, Traci Anderson, and Kristen Berkos and with the assistance of Bryant College in Providence, Rhode Island we can expect an excellent conference. Wendy and her committee have done an exceptional job of seeking outside sponsorships for the IARR conference, locating and negotiating the hotel contract with the Westin for a rate of \$179 single or double. She has also arranged several wonderful activities for us while we are in Providence. For example, we will have a special treat in store. We will experience Providence's world renowned WaterFire, an art instillation if bonfires set to music that snake along the rivers. WaterFire was selected by the National Geographic Traveler as one of the "Top 20 Events in the US" so we have lots to look forward to in 2008.

Securing our future conferences has been in the able hands of Leanne Knobloch for the last couple of years. She has agreed to stay in place as Chair of the Future Conference Committee and we are grateful.

Her committee this year includes, Traci L. Anderson, Hoda Badr, Lynne Cooper, Rolando Diaz-Loving, Jennifer L. Harman, Sophia Jowett, Masahiro Masuda, Melanie Mitchell, Lauren Papp, Terri Orbuch, and Sterling K. Wall. This committee has worked to develop the call for our 2009 mini-conference that typically focuses a related theme and they also have submitted the call for the 2010 main IARR conference. The call has been posted and once the submissions are received, the committee will be hard at work evaluating the proposals that our membership submits. We thank Leanne Knobloch and this committee for constructing and developing the call and especially for their upcoming efforts in assessing, as well as working with those individuals submitting proposals to arrive at the best set of options for IARR.

In preparing for the 2008 IARR conference, the awards committee chaired by Denise Solomon with her committee members, John Caughlin, Cathy Surra, and Mario Mikulincer, are preparing to announce the calls for our nine IARR awards. These include, the IARR article award, the book award, the dissertation award, the Steve Duck New Scholars Award, the IARR teaching award, the mentoring award, the Gerald R. Miller Award for Early Career Achievement, the Berschied-Hatfield Award for Distinguished Mid-Career Achievement, and the Distinguished Career Award. We are certain that this committee will be as contemplative and thorough as previous committees. We hope that you think about nominating someone you believe is an excellent candidate for one of these distinguished awards. Thanks, in advance, to this committee.

We turn next to the publications committee led by Dan Perlman. His committee was comprised of Duncan Cramer, Kathryn Dindia, Julie Fitness, Claire M. Kamp Dush, and Sue Sprecher. This team had many things to address during the last year and accomplished each task with much thoughtfulness and careful consideration. For example, they were very successful in selecting the new *Relationship Research News* editor, Lesley Verhofstadt. As this edition and previous ones since her editorship began illustrate, Dan and his committee did an excellent job of seeking out excellent talent to bring us a viable and interesting outlet for information about our association and the field of relationship research. In their annual report, the committee tells us that both

JSPR and PR, our premiere journals, have reached their highest impact ratings yet in the last year for which there are data available (2006). In addition, the committee has been at work developing a call for the new editor of PR as you have seen in our announcements. We should thank Dan and his committee for the commitment to our publications and the energy they have devoted to contributing to the success of our editors, Rebecca Adams (PR) and Paul Mongeau (JSPR). Both of these editors, their associate editors, and their editorial boards should be praised and recognized for their professionalism, thoroughness, keen eye toward shaping our field of relationships research, and devotion to making these journals the very best possible.

One of the more challenging yet enormously important positions we have in the IARR organization is that of Secretary/Treasurer. Our new Secretary/Treasurer, Michael Cunningham has had to quickly gain an in-depth knowledge of all aspects of IARR and its structure. This is no small task and he has managed to accomplish a level of working knowledge in a very short time span. This is an extremely difficult position and one that is often unforgiving because it is the association's financial health he protects. My personal experience with Michael has been extremely positive and I know that he was an exceptional choice for the position. His report indicates that we are in good financial shape but we also need to be mindful of remembering to renew our membership in IARR to keep the association moving forward. As charged by the Board, since we now have a federal and state tax-exempt status (thanks to the considerable efforts of Chris Agnew, the former secretary/treasurer), he has invested funds and will continue to do so to secure our future as a financially viable association.

Finally, we turn to the elections committee, chaired by our immediate past president, Beverly Fehr and her committee including, Patricia Noller, Terri Orbuch, Harry Reis, Jeffrey Simpson, and Susan Sprecher. This committee had a critical charge, nominations for key board positions. Bev's leadership has been vital to the success of the slate and the way the elections were realized. We thank her and the committee members for performing the needed tasks with attention to the criteria established by the association and completing the elections in a timely fashion. Because of their efforts, we can

welcome Vice President/President elect, Frank Fincham, Kostas Kafetsios as our new Member-at-Large, and Andrea Lambert as our New Professional Representative.

As you can see, there have been many things happening this year. What you might also note is that IARR continues to grow from its roots upward, outward, and across the seas to stretch into a more international, cross-disciplinary organization that can be very proud of the membership and all they have to offer. It has been my sincerest honor to have served IARR.

IARR Members:

**Submission deadline for
Spring issue of RRN**

April 1, 2008

INSIDE THIS ISSUE OF RELATIONSHIP RESEARCH NEWS

PRESIDENT'S COLUMN

by Sandra Petronio 1

FROM THE EDITOR'S DESK

by Lesley Verhofstadt 4

FEATURE ARTICLES

Where's the Money? Relationship Research Funding in a Globalized world
edited by João Moreira5

THE LIGHTER SIDE OF RELATIONSHIPS

Monosexuality: Defining and Operationalizing a New Relationship Construct
by Dan Canary 12

Research-Inspired Wedding Vows
by Anne-Liese Juge Fox 14

RETIRED PROFESSIONALS COLUMN

On Rummaging in the Attic
by Paul Wright 15

NET NEWS

by Ben Le 18

NEW PROFESSIONALS COLUMN

Mentorship in Interdisciplinary Relationship Research: A Report on the 2007 New Scholar's Workshop
by Ashley Duggan 18

BOOK REVIEW

"Mating in Captivity: Reconciling the Erotic and the Domestic" written by Esther Perel
reviewed by Gian Gonzaga..... 20

JOURNALS UPDATE

JSPR Report
by Paul Mongeau 22

PR Report
by Rebecca Adams 23

Contents of upcoming journals 25

MEMBER NEWS & UPDATES 26

UPCOMING CONFERENCES..... 28

ANNOUNCEMENTS..... 29

IARR BOARD..... 33

RELATIONSHIP RESEARCH NEWS

Editor

Lesley Verhofstadt
Ghent University

Associate Editors

Kristin Beals
California State University, Fullerton

João Moreira
University of Lisbon

Inge Devoldre
Ghent University

Jeffrey Wickersham
University of Connecticut

Relationship Research News is published twice a year. 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 Lesley Verhofstadt, Department of Experimental-Clinical and Health Psychology, Ghent University, BELGIUM; lesley.verhofstadt@ugent.be. 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 EDITOR'S DESK

**by Lesley Verhofstadt
Ghent University, Belgium**

We are pleased to bring you the Fall 2007 issue of *Relationship Research News*.

This issue, we have an interesting special feature, “*Where’s the money? Relationship research funding in a globalized world*”. For this special feature, João Moreira has collected different perspectives regarding how resources for supporting research on relationships come through in different parts of the world. Researchers from Brazil (Agnaldo Garcia), the United Kingdom (Robin Goodwin), and Turkey (Nebi Sümer) write about the impact of the resources provided (or not) upon the kind of research that gets done in their institution.

This issue we have two columns in our Lighter Side section for your reading pleasure. In his column, Dan Canary elaborates on the definition and operationalization of *monosexuality*, or the relationships we have with ourselves. In addition, Anne-Liese Juge Fox captured highlights of the research on psychophysiology in marital interaction by writing research-inspired *wedding vows* that reflect the “lighter side” of relationships.

In his Retired Professionals column Paul Wright tries to achieve insight into his urge to “*rummage in the attic*.” In this column, he writes about how reviewing his academic archive and looking around for past threads to pick up is his way of trying to stay involved in the field of PR.

In the Web News section of this issue, Ben Le discusses plans for changes to the IARR website. Send Ben your thoughts and suggestions concerning what you’d like to see the new site look like, and take a look at how the new site might look at <http://www.iarr.org/newlook.jpg>.

In our New Professionals section, Ashley Duggan offers a report on the 2007 *IARR New Scholars’ Workshop* that focused on mentorship in interdisciplinary relationship research.

Also in this issue, you will find a book review by Gian Gonzaga, discussing a book authored by Esther Perel, “*Mating in Captivity: Reconciling the Erotic and the Domestic*”. If you have a book you would like to see reviewed in a future edition of the newsletter, please contact us.

Paul Mongeau and Rebecca Adams both offer reports on IARR’s journals, including the contents of upcoming journals.

You’ll also find a *call for papers for the 2008 IARR Conference* that will be held July 17-20 in Providence, Rhode Island.

Finally, don’t forget to read the member news and announcements sections.

Thanks to all the authors who have contributed to the special feature of this issue of RRN and special thanks to all those people who write columns for us issue after issue. In addition, thanks to all the IARR members who have sent us items for the Member News and Updates section.

My editorial team and I are still seeking contributions on teaching, and we would like to ask for your help in writing a Teaching Tips column for upcoming issues of the bulletin. If you have tips for teaching that you’d like to share with your IARR colleagues, please send us a message.

Finally, I’d like to thank my editorial team for all their help in pulling this issue of the newsletter together. We hope you enjoy it!

FEATURE ARTICLES

Where's the Money? Relationship Research Funding in a Globalized World

**Edited by
João M. Moreira
Faculty of Psychology and Education
University of Lisbon, Portugal**

Introduction

*R*esearch is becoming more and more like big business. Ways of going about work once found only in private business settings are now increasingly expected of researchers, not only in countries with more established research communities like in North America, but also in emerging regions. Competitiveness, efficiency and productivity are words one sees increasingly applied to academic research contexts. Research teams are supposed to be built up, preferably in the form of cross-institutional and international partnerships, and research projects tend to become larger and more complex. Recruitment of students and other types of collaborators is encouraged, and the individual scholar is quickly becoming a thing of the past.

All of this, however, is occurring at a time when growing questions are being raised regarding the type of support that is provided for research work. In many countries throughout the world, the increasing demand for larger research projects goes together with pressure to obtain funding from outside the university, again a familiar panorama for researchers in more advanced countries, but a new experience for emerging regions.

For this special feature, I tried to collect different perspectives regarding how resources for supporting research on relationships come through in different parts of the world. The issue of funding has a considerable influence on what kinds of research get carried out and how (e.g., design and other methodological options). Therefore, I invited contributors to address some issues in what regards their experience in their particular context (e.g., country or type of institution).

These included (1) what are the major providers of resources for research in that context? Public, government-run institutions? Universities themselves? Private funds? (2) How have the origins, amounts and conditions of such resource provisions changed lately, and how are they expected to change in the future? (3) What conditions do these provisions impose? Methodological or grant size requirements? Are selection criteria those of the professional research community, or are interest, ideological, or political issues also involved? In broader terms, what is the impact of the resources provided (or not) upon the kind of research that gets done? How does it shape the local research environment?

These are obviously important questions to consider by relationship researchers, as funding shortages hit, at the same time that the ever increasing competitiveness in publishing and the growing technological complexity of research methodologies impose new demands on researchers' resources. Three leading researchers from three major regions of the world have generously agreed to share their experience with us, giving us a global perspective on how the world is changing in this regard.

Financing Relationship Research in Brazil

**by Agnaldo Garcia
Federal University of Espírito Santo,
Vitória, Brazil**

Scientific research in Brazil is conducted, mainly, at federal and state universities. These are also responsible for most scientific publications in Brazil. Historically, in our country, private universities usually pay no attention to research. This situation, however, seems to be changing slowly.

Financing research in Brazil is largely restricted to governmental agencies. Federal, state, and local agencies are responsible for financing almost all research conducted in the country. The most important Brazilian financing agency is the National Council for Scientific and Technological Development (CNPq), which belongs to the Ministry of Science and Technology. Several states also have state foundations to support scientific activity with governmental funding (usually subordinated to the Secretary for Science and Technology). In some cases, it is possible to find local government agencies, as in Vitoria.

Federal and state universities, our main research centers, unfortunately, have no special funds for research and they depend on official, mainly federal and state financing agencies. Sometimes, they are recruited by governmental financing agencies to select projects to be financed (with governmental funding). There is no special agency for supplying resources for relationship research. Usually, these agencies are responsible for financing equipment (from basic equipment, like computers) and for remunerating people involved in research (grants), including undergraduate students and other professionals. Sometimes the university is responsible for distributing this money, as in the case of grants for undergraduates. Fortunately, grants for undergraduate and graduate students are common.

Consequently, funds are administered according to national and state political and governmental interests, which decide research priorities and even the budget for financing scientific research. Researchers have to wait for adequate calls for proposals, usually for specific areas and even specific themes (such as Nanotechnology). As usual, technology and medical sciences are priorities. Financial resources for human and social sciences are much more limited. Due to the few financing agencies and limited funds, there is a strong competition to get funds involving scholars from all over the country. All proposals are peer-reviewed and all financing cycle, from submitting a proposal to preparing the final report, is carefully controlled.

Even after a strong competition, amounts are restricted, especially for human and social sciences. So, huge efforts may result in small amounts of money. Financing is also extremely specific: even if you have funding for a specific project, if you want to present the results in an international congress, for instance, you have to start all again from the very beginning (submitting a new proposal). Even with all competition, relationship research has been contemplated (in the last four years, for instance, I have submitted nine proposals regarding personal relationships to CNPq and all nine have been approved and received financial support, including the IARR Mini-Conference in Brazil).

On the other hand, private foundations or companies have no tradition in financing research in Brazil. This situation is also changing slowly. In the last years, Petrobras (the huge Brazilian petroleum company, also a government-run entity, by far the biggest Brazilian company) has invested in research, at least in Espírito Santo, where large resources of petroleum have been discovered. Negotiations between Petrobras and the Federal University of Espírito Santo have resulted in some important agreements and the company has invested in the university and provided grants for students at all levels, contributing to raise our scientific production.

In order to obtain resources (and increase funds) for relationship research in Brazil we have to think about cooperation. National and especially international cooperation are highly valued by Brazilian financing agencies. The development and financing of relationship research in the country is associated with higher levels of organization, national and international cooperation, and professional associations may make the difference in this process. Institutional support to research centers and projects may increase the possibility of getting resources.

Ideally, larger projects involving researchers from several states and even countries possibly will have more chances to get funding. In the last years, we have concentrated our efforts to transform relationship research in Brazil in a joint effort, with the participation of scholars from different Brazilian states and from other countries as well. We have worked to involve other universities in Brazil in order to have a national relationship research group, trying to have a national (and international) structure, which may increase the chances to obtain larger amounts of money, to enable the development of new and larger research projects. Fortunately, each year we know more people eager to cooperate in relationship research and we have received (in Vitoria) several doctoral candidates coming from other states, interested in investigating relationships. At present, we have partners in other states and in the future we intend to have more scholars from other states participating. We have also, more recently, started cooperating with scholars from other countries. All this is a complex and slow process.

As research funding is a political issue, we have also tried to expand our visibility to society in general and we are planning several courses to prepare students and professionals to deal with personal relationships (in their professions and in their organizations). This way, we will contribute to our society needs and increase our research possibilities. All this requires hard work by a lot of people and it takes time and money to advance.

Even our research projects have been expanded to national or international scales. Our last projects included data collection in all five Brazilian regions (North, Northeast, South, Southeast and Central-West), something that was only possible due to the presence of cooperating partners in these regions. The personal involvement and support from the central administration of my university in these projects are also remarkable and, at present, the university president (or rector) himself has endorsed our contacts with universities abroad.

Undoubtedly, competitiveness, efficiency and productivity are part of our reality in academic research. In Brazil, as in other countries throughout the world, research has become a big business, with an increasing demand for larger research projects and larger research groups involving national (cross-institutional) and international partnerships, and student participation at all levels. The image of the individual scholar belongs to the past.

Research Funding in the UK

**by Robin Goodwin
Brunel University, London, UK**

*R*esearch funding has been a major topic of concern for academics in the UK, as in other countries. Most of our universities aspire to be 'research driven', which in practice means that funding for the University comes primarily from external grants rather than from student fees, although in reality most universities here rely on income primarily from students. In addition, every department in our 100+ universities is subject to a major Research Assessment Exercise around every six years. Each department is ranked and scored by an external review panel, and this has major funding and prestige implications for the institution. 70% of this score is derived from academic publications but a substantial portion of the remainder is based on research income from grants. Finally, the overheads paid by many grant bodies are far

in excess to those normally obtained in US institutions. A research assistant that costs £25,000 for their basic wage will attract an overhead of more than 100% on their salaries, which means potentially considerable income to the university. Therefore there is considerable pressure to attain external grant income as part of our normal academic activities.

In the UK, the major research councils such as the Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC) have provided *some* support for relationships research, but this has not been a major focus of their funding in recent years. Instead, many relationships researchers may feel the need to ‘fit in’ their research within topics that have received more funding from these councils (e.g. inter-group relations). However, there are other sources of funding that exist for the relationship researcher, although much of this would fall within the more ‘applied’ field. For example, the Rowntree Foundation (<http://www.jrf.org.uk/>) funds policy related research but has a keen interest in ethnicity and relationships; the Nuffield Foundation has a programme of research dedicated to child protection and family justice (www.nuffieldfoundation.org). In addition, there are opportunities to work on international collaborative projects funded by large external bodies such as the Gates Foundation (for work on sexual health) or the European Union. Thus more ‘applied’ work is probably much more likely to be funded.

The effect of this on the research output of the UK is a moot point. Certainly there has been the traditional heavy use of undergraduate students in research, which of course requires relatively little funding. The work that has been done with broader samples has tended to be applied work that might have only a more limited theoretical emphasis. This also means that the journals in which British relationships researchers publish their work are often these more applied journals, rather than those sponsored by IARR....

Relationship Research Funding in Turkey

by Nebi Sümer
Department of Psychology
Middle East Technical University
Ankara, Turkey

When João Moreira asked me to write something about how relationship research is funded in Turkey, I was puzzled a little at first, since research and funding agencies in social and behavioral sciences do not specify relationship research as a separate domain. I’m not sure how much I can respond to what João really wanted me to do, but let me begin with a couple words about the short history of relationship research in Turkey. Scientific study in psychology started in the early 1930s in Turkish universities. However, not until after the 1960s did psychology gain widespread acceptance, with a strong American influence on the methods and topics studied. Relationship research grew, especially within the areas of developmental, clinical, and social psychology.

In 1970s and 1980s, popular measures were translated into Turkish, and topics such as relationship attributions, parental attitudes and behaviors, and other issues on child socialization processes were investigated in numerous studies. In these years, widespread acceptance of so-called “western-based theories” and adaptation of related measures into Turkish, energized psychological studies in universities and research institutes. However, considering that both geographically and culturally Turkey is a bridge between the individualized West and the collectivist East, transference of Western theories instantaneously brought up the debate of “cultural relevance” or “conceptual equivalence” of the major psychological models and theories. In the late 1980s and the early 1990s, there were well-thought attempts to develop culturally sensitive theories that would take into account the idiosyncratic characteristics of relationships in the Turkish culture. In an extensive review on the history of Turkish psychology published in

1990, Başaran and Şahin pointed out this debate and stated that;

“To cite an example, the typical Turkish family, on the basis of its size and spatial living arrangements, can be classified as a “nuclear family.” In terms of intrafamilial and extrafamilial relations, however, it has functional similarities with the “extended” family. The personality theories, models of healthy behavior and development, procedures in psychotherapy, parental attitude dimensions, etc., we borrowed from the West; assume that the “ideal” and “healthy” individual is a self-sufficient and independent person. The application of these models and practices might give a seriously distorted picture of the Turkish individual (Kağıtçıbaşı, 1986; Fişek, 1987). In child socialization practices and interpersonal relations, instead of an independence model, an “interdependence model” seems to be more appropriate to describe the dominant pattern in the Turkish society (İmamoğlu, 1987). These observations and findings might be taken as evidence of an emerging well-integrated model in Turkish research.”

In the following years, both indigenous theories of relationships, such as Kağıtçıbaşı's (1996) family model of emotional and psychological interdependence, were developed and different aspects of relationships were studied with an eye on the culture. Currently, relationship research is popular within both psychological sciences and other disciplines, such as sociology, in Turkey. Although the family dynamics, especially the bond between parents and children, is still the most prevalent relationship topic, studies on couple satisfaction, friendship, and family therapy have gained increased attention in recent years, with more indigenous tools in the country (see Bolak-Boratav, 2004, for a recent review).

Regarding the sources of funding to relationship research, Turkey had experienced two different periods. Most of the research on relationships was conducted with the limited supports of universities' internal funds and with researchers' own resources until the late 1980s. Relationships research seemed to be carried out mostly within the context of master's and Ph.D. theses, having

no formal financial support in the early period. Starting in the mid 1990s, researchers have had access to sources other than their own or limited university funds. First, major state research funding agencies, such as the *Scientific and Technological Research Council of Turkey*, which used to support natural sciences only, began funding social science research, and in the year 2000 the piece of the pie devoted to social sciences increased considerably. In the last five years, many researchers (including myself with a project titled “The impact of attachment, care giving, and family dynamics on child's development in infancy and middle childhood”) received ample support from this institution.

Second, several centers and graduate programs on family and women studies were founded within universities and research institutes, and these centers and programs receive support from both international and national organizations. Third, the Family Research Institute of Turkey, which was founded as a state research institute in 1989, had a specific program to financially support research on family and marital relationships. This institution has supported and published studies on different aspects of family relationships, conducted mostly from sociological, anthropological, demographic, and forensic perspective. Finally, similar to the trends in North American and European countries, graduate and post graduate work are central to the sustainable effort in relationship research. There are certain state funding institutes that give scholarships and awards to successful graduate students, and there are many grantees working on the relationship arena and benefiting from these sources.

There is no systematic study or argument about how research funding policies have influenced what relationship research is carried out in Turkey. However, given that Turkish society traditionally gives priority to keeping family intact, as evidenced by the low divorce rate (about 6%) and also that relational autonomy is favored over independence in child rearing practices, studies on family relationships are attractive for both researchers and funding agencies in Turkey.

References

Başaran, F., & Şahin, N. (1990). Psychology in Turkey: Country Status Report. In G. Shouksmith, & E. A. Shouksmith (Eds.), *Social and Human Sciences and Pacific RUSHAP Series, Psychology in Asia and Pacific 34*. Bangkok: UNESCO,

Bolak-Boratav, H (2004). Psychology at the Cross-Roads: The View from Turkey. In M. J. Stevens and D. Wedding (Eds.) *Handbook of International Psychology* (pp. 311-330). Brunner-Routledge: New York.

Kagitcibasi, C. (1996). *Family and human development across cultures: A view from the other side*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

**Where's it All Leading?
Some Concluding Thoughts on
Relationship Funding at an
International Level**

by **João M. Moreira**
Faculty of Psychology and Education
University of Lisbon, Portugal

Upon reading the diverse contributions received for this feature, my first impression was of how much I could relate to the experiences in trends and issues they reported, and how similar they were to the situation in Portugal. In addition, similarities between what is reported from different countries also make a persuasive argument for a global trend in a world growing smaller by the day.

Briefly putting together my impressions and thoughts on these matters, the first trend I notice is for a growing integration of newly emerging countries, especially those of what was formerly known as the “third-world”, into the global enterprise of research. It is certainly for this reason, most likely because of the idea that

social scientific research in these countries was too often isolated and idiosyncratic, that major national funding agencies strongly favor projects involving international collaborations. This is a trend researchers in emerging countries are certainly aware of, but those in regions with more established research systems should pay close attention to it as well, as it may open interesting ways to help fund their own work through international partnerships.

Associated with this, however, is a parallel trend (also felt in Portugal) to prefer funding larger, instead of smaller, research projects. I am not sure what this implies in terms of the development of research ideas, as most of the really innovative theories seem to result from very small projects, often connected to dissertations and theses by new scholars. (I do not have any actual data to substantiate this belief, but it seems to be supported by my knowledge of the history of psychology.) On the other hand, smaller, local projects may be, on average, weaker in terms of scientific quality. Anyway, this should be a concern mostly for scientific policy bodies and funding agencies, although societies like IARR should probably be attentive to it too. It is reassuring to read that, in addition to funding major projects, at least governmental agencies also seem to follow a policy of giving grants to support masters' and doctoral level students' projects. Let's just hope that potentially fruitful, though small-scale, researcher-led projects do not end up falling through the cracks of the funding system.

Another relevant point is the extent to which research funding is dependent upon social and political issues. Government-run institutions seem to be the major sources of funding in the countries surveyed, and the same is evidently true in Portugal as well. These will be obviously committed to governmental policies regarding what should be the research priorities. But even when support is coming from other institutions, like private foundations, it is obvious that they connect their investment to the fulfillment of their own goals, social, political, or ideological.

This has, at the very least, two important (and related) implications for relationship research.

First, there is a growing need for visibility in research, clearly manifested in press conferences from major universities announcing new discoveries, especially in the priority areas of technologies and health sciences. This is an important route to insure future funding, as mentioned by Agnaldo Garcia, and the recent establishment of a media relations committee by IARR is a potentially very useful step in that direction. Relationship scholars need, however, to find innovative ways to take their work both to the general public and to social and political decision makers, so as to make them understand its social value. This is a fundamental step in ensuring the survival and growth of the field in the increasingly competitive scientific landscape. Second, it is equally perceptible that most of the funding institutions, especially private ones, value applied research, seemingly able to make a difference in society in accordance with their goals and values. This may be problematic for a society like IARR, whose members traditionally have valued mostly the “basic” kind of research, and sometimes even express suspicion of applied approaches to relationships. Such an attitude is worthy of reconsideration, as it is evident that applied contexts may be quite valuable in terms of the funding opportunities they provide, and we have at IARR many examples of outstanding researchers who have collaborated in applied endeavors. The maintenance of scientific and methodological standards, as well as the avoidance of an excessive influence of political or ideological interests, are of course worrisome issues that need to be dealt with skilfully. But, at the same time, these applied settings represent an avenue for the obtaining of both resources and societal influence which should not go unexplored.

But even without diving into applied issues, there are relevant policy matters that could be considered. A good example is that of how relationship research can try to address the social and cultural needs of a changing society. Nebi Sumer’s piece clearly expresses this concern, and how it may open ways for the attraction of further resources and visibility, but that it is a global issue can be clearly seen in Robin

Goodwin’s mention of foundations particularly committed to supporting research on such socially hot topics as ethnicity, child protection or family issues.

It is clear that, when we talk about diversity (as I did in some previous features of this newsletter), it should be understood not merely in terms of the people we engage as colleagues or participants in our research. The public consuming the results of our work has grown, and needs to grow further, diverse in its interests, roles, and capacities. Ensuring a healthy development for relationship science implies that researchers think about these issues in an increasingly strategic way, and go about diversifying their sources of support, as much as their research approaches and their targeted audiences.

THE LIGHTER SIDE OF RELATIONSHIPS

Monosexuality: Defining and Operationalizing a New Relationship Construct

by Dan Canary

Several issues ago, I wrote about my college monosexual experience in a fleeting manner and then proposed that we examine the idea that a person can have a rich, fulfilling relationship with himself or herself. The enthusiasm and requests to write more about monosexuality from IARR members are both humbling and challenging—humbling because no one has shown more interest in any of my other research ideas and challenging because the sustained request has forced me to contemplate doing more work than I want on a given weekend. But because my research to date goes largely unnoticed and because I often don't recall my weekends anyway, the time is ripe to pick this potato.

Defining Monosexuality

Perhaps no idea is less understood than *monosexuality*. Adolescents might hoot and reviewers might holler at the notion that a person can have a genuine relationship with oneself. But chaos has never deterred my mind from seeking clarity before. So with bifocal perspective, I want to offer a working definition of the phenomenon accordingly:

Monosexuality refers to the complex of attitudes, affect, and actions that constitute developing and maintaining a relationship with oneself.

Key terms here are “refers to the complex of,” “attitudes, affect, and actions that constitute,” and “developing and maintaining a relationship with oneself.” Each is briefly elaborated here,

though this is not the first time these ideas have been thought (see, Canary, personal conversation to self, 2007).

Monosexuality reflects a *complex* issue, which reminds me of that film genre where time can be somehow altered to prevent a tragic ending. For example, in *The Lake House*, Keanu Reeves and Sandra Bullock fall in love despite the fact they are separated in time by two years. They communicate through a magic mailbox, where the red flag instantly rises when the other person has written a message two years ago or in the future. Then he dies, but she saves him by writing a message after he dies, and they instantly meet in real time at the lake house. The point is that this is all very confusing and complex, much like monosexuality.

Monosexuality also entails “attitudes, affect, and actions” which interestingly refer to thoughts, emotions, and behaviors. The important word in the above quote is “and,” because it is a conjunction that links other words. This is not to say that a person cannot be a monosexual in thoughts only, or in feelings only, or in behavior only. But my personal experience suggests that thoughts, feelings, and behaviors tend to occur in real time, unlike as portrayed in films such as *The Lake House*.

Finally, monosexuality concerns relational development and maintenance. The astute reader will see that the definition excludes relational termination, because such termination would *ipso facto, post hoc ergo propter hoc*, and *willy nilly* indicate that the person has shunned the only possible relationship that, *ad nauseam*, qualifies as a monosexual one. Such denial constitutes the denial of a true gift that one person can offer to the same person. In monosexual relationships, to give is to receive.

Operationalizing Monosexuality: The Monosexual Indicator Nine-item Evaluation (MINE).

Using both top-down and bottom-up techniques and photographs, the MINE scale provides a personally reliable instrument, which has been widely used among adolescents and certain

monks living in California. It has a test-retest reliability coefficient and predictive validity among those registered as independent voters. The response categories are 1 = never to 5 = yes. The mean is really not that bad and the standard deviation is rather normative.

Instructions: *Please write the number that first comes to mind here: ____.* Now forget that number and respond to each item by yourself, away from any mirrors. To obtain an age appropriate value, simply add the numbers and divide by your age (in years).

1. I use a mirror to brush my hair.
2. My _____ interpersonal conflicts usually involve other people.
3. My body is in good shape, given its proportions. _____
4. I read books alone. _____
5. Sometimes, I think the funniest things. _____
6. Sometimes, I want to stay home and not work. _____
7. I like to spend time by myself, especially when it rains. _____
8. I floss. _____
9. Pain is not fun. _____

Of course, the above scale can be used for clinical self-assessment purposes as well. The following ranges indicate the level of your own monosexuality. (Add the numbers to place yourself in one of the following categories, where the possible range is 9 – 45.)

- 9-20: Woefully underdeveloped relationship with self (these people make me sad);
 21-30: Low monosexual (feeble self-love, hardly worth a handshake);
 31- 32: Ambivalent (understandable but still falls short of self-love)
 33-45: Certifiable monosexual (self-actualized and well adjusted most of the time).

In addition, the above measure can be complemented by an additional standardized item specific to each individual. For example,

my own individualized standardized item reads, “I used to be younger looking,” and it constitutes a realistic indicator. Each person should create a standardized item that is unique to that person.

Future Directions in Theory and Research

Now that the construct of monosexuality has been conceptually and operationally defined, future directions merit dedicated research and funding from interested agencies. But I can’t continue to do this research alone. So I call on the readers of this column to help (especially those who are certifiably monosexual).

First, you need to generate theories that are appropriate to the inclusion (not exclusion) of monosexuals. For example, dialectical theory with all its tensions appears to be obsolete (finally). Asking how a monosexual balances the opposing needs of autonomy and interdependence, for instance, is like asking a vegetarian whether he or she prefers a steak well done or rare. The answer just might be “spaghetti.”

As a theoretic start, we can simply tweak existing theories to accommodate monosexuals. For example, in place of Attachment Theory, I propose “Detachment Theory.” Detachment Theory is based on individual processes that help the person extricate him/herself from the confines of dyadic involvements to the freedom of monosexuality. Some people have a secure detachment style—meaning they can spend a weekend by themselves but are not threatened when a different person walks into the room. And other styles exist, of course, such as an “ambivalent detachment” style, which includes individuals who simply do not know when to leave a party.

Second, in terms of future directions, we need to make sure that the unit of analysis remains the individual. Too much relationship research has recently started using the couple as the unit of analysis, which implies that the individual is somehow deficient. In reality, however, relationship issues are best examined by keeping people apart from other people. If one person is

not good enough, then two people are probably worse.

In conclusion, this exciting new relationship construct is not meant to exclude any alternative relationship forms—especially those still practicing heterosexuality. The old axiom, “you can’t love someone else until you love yourself” is certainly true. But “if you love yourself you don’t have to love others” is equally true.

Anyone interested in this new relationship construct should contact Susan Boon (the previous editor of *RRN*), Stacey Nairn (her editorial assistant), Jeffrey Wickersham (the current editorial assistant), because this particular column is their fault. I accept no responsibility—none in fact—for its offensive content. Naturally, however, I will accept any positive comments. Now, if you will please forgive, I need to get back to my reading.

Research-Inspired Wedding Vows

*James Honeycutt of LSU was leading a seminar on communicating emotions in interpersonal relationships. One section of the seminar deals with physiology and couple interaction. The students were assigned various readings from Gottman and Kiecolt-Glaser among others, on psychophysiology during marital discussions, imagined interactions and heart-rate variability, and effects of biofeedback on physiological reactivity as well as cardiovascular reactivity during marital interaction of pleasing and displeasing topics. A creative doctoral student, Anne-Liese Juge Fox captured highlights of the research by writing research-inspired, wedding vows that reflect the "lighter side" of relationships. These "wedding vows" will also be in the physiology chapter of James Honeycutt and Suzette Bryan's book, *SCRIPTS and COMMUNICATION for RELATIONSHIPS* that is being produced for Hampton Press.*

Wedding Vows by Anne-Liese Juge Fox

Based on studies of Gottman, Honeycutt, Kiecolt-Glaser, Moss, Harris, and Smiths.

GROOM: I _____ take you _____ to be my wife. I promise to buffer you from environmental stress thus promoting your health. I honor your communibiology and emotionality, which influence you to escalate conflict and your place a higher value on talking things over. While it is debated in the literature, I understand that my diffuse physiological arousal during conflict lowers constructive behavior and leads to behavioral escalations. When my ANS is aroused, I will use HRV biofeedback techniques to balance my PNS and SNS in order to optimize my ability to problem solve and implement higher order planning and counteract my greater excitability to negative affect. When your EEG readings show more activity in the right frontal region of the brain, I will use conciliatory, rational, and withdrawal tactics in order to reduce my risk of CHD and premature mortality and protect you from poor health due to distress in marriage. I promise to play a de-escalating role in low conflict discussions and will practice imagined interactions in order to anticipate your issues and find solutions to our conflicts. I will minimize situations where I release catecholamines and cortisol. I understand that your longevity is related to your connections to friends and will support your friendships outside of our marriage. I will avoid attempting to influence you as it negatively impacts my cardiovascular response but rather to disagree with you and will recognize when I perceive your resistance as an attempt to challenge my status, dominance, or control.

BRIDE: I _____ take you _____ to be my husband. I promise to buffer you from environmental stress thus promoting your health. I understand that your longevity is dependent on being married and marital satisfaction and that heightened physical arousal before and during marital conflict contributes to decline in marital satisfaction. I will avoid Gottman's four horsemen of the apocalypse: criticism,

defensiveness, withdrawal, and contempt. I will attempt to recognize and reduce my participation in conflict linkage and encourage high levels of positive behaviors for decreases in your adrenocorticotrophic hormone and cortisol. While it is debated in the literature, I honor that you are not as resilient, tough, or as adaptive as I am to a climate of negative effect. That you have heightened physiological reactivity and are less equipped for recovery from upset than I and that you are less resistant to infectious diseases and environmental stresses than myself. In order to avoid marital dissatisfaction and emotional withdrawal on your part, I will do my best to ensure that we spend no more than 16 hours per year in conflict with heated conflicts occurring only 1.3 times per month and lasting no more than .52 hours on each occasion. I promise to play a de-escalating role in high conflict discussions in order to better ensure a high level of marital satisfaction.

**RETIRED
PROFESSIONALS
COLUMN**

On Rummaging in the Attic

by Paul Wright

As reluctant as I am to admit this, it seems that the further I get into retirement (timewise) the more likely I am to rummage in the attic—figuratively speaking. The “attic” I have in view is not a musty room with all sorts of once-valuable and/or useful artifacts that have been stored away, probably never to be used again. It is, rather, a collection of notebooks, file-folders, computer discs, etc. from bygone days in academia. These so-called storage media contain such things as research notes, data files, manuscripts that were either rejected or never submitted, study proposals that were either

changed or abandoned, projects that were well along but never completed, and so on. You get the idea. Various and sundry documents that have long since outlived their usefulness but that I could never bring myself to throw away—just in case. Just in case what? I don’t know. I never really answered that question for myself. I suppose I thought there might be some threads I would want to pick up again some day.

Please do not get the idea that this rummaging is a major preoccupation with me. I do it only occasionally. And I have learned fairly recently that I am not the only retired faculty member who does it. Each month I join a semiformal group of 20 to 25 other retired professors from various disciplines to discuss an assigned topic and to chat amiably about whatever. Spouse Katy affectionately(?) calls this gathering the “Geezer Group.” A number of these fellow retirees unapologetically acknowledge that they, too, rummage in the attic, but they call it something different. They call it “reviewing my archive,” an expression first coined, I believe, by a retired history professor. I’ll admit their way of saying it sounds more elegant, but I think my way is a little closer to the truth.

Truthfully, though, the issue is not whether I spend a lot or a little time rummaging, or whether others do it, too. The point is that for the first seven or so years of my retirement I didn’t do it at all. So why the change in the past three years? I think it might have something to do with the aforementioned possibility of picking up a thread from the past. And why would I want to do this?

Some readers may recall from past columns that I am acquainted with three kinds of PR retirees: 1) those who make a clean break, leave the field and start doing completely different things, 2) those who remain active and productive and continue to make contributions at the cutting edge of PR work, and 3) those (like me) who stick around, stay connected and try to keep generally aware of what’s going on. Perhaps rummaging in the attic and looking around for past threads to pick up is my way of trying to stay involved in the field without expending the time and effort it takes to do anything new.

Regardless of my reason(s) for rummaging, I have decided it is not a productive thing to do and I am determined to curtail it. What I have found is that such rummaging results in introspective trips that are, at best, useless or, at worst, a bit unhealthy. I have noticed three different kinds of “trips,” that differ according to the kind of “archival material” I happen to be concentrating on at the moment.

The first kind of such material consists of those occasional times when I ventured out of the PR field, and sometimes even out of my “parent” field of social psychology, and took on limited projects in different areas. Some of these were very stimulating and I seemed to be pretty good at them. This often prompted a reaction on my part summarized in the question, “Did I take a wrong turn somewhere?” Or, alternatively, “Should I have changed directions here?” This, however, was never a really serious issue for me. After briefly considering either of these questions, I always thought “Nah.” In other words, I have been and still am pretty gratified with my virtually overweening involvement in PR work.

The second kind of material consists of notes and memos closely related to my ongoing work concerning elaborations that were not crucial to what I was doing, but that could have expanded the work in potentially productive ways. These possible elaborations were sometimes conceptual, sometimes methodological, and often a combination of the two. But I delayed giving them serious attention while I attended to “more urgent” matters and hence never got around to them. I call this the “could have, should have, but didn’t” effect. There was one issue in particular that I still have regrets about. It was a measurement issue that was “non-fatal,” but one with definite conceptual implications. I am considering getting this off my chest by making it the subject of my next retiree column. If this piques your interest, please be patient. I’ll probably get to it in a few months.

The third kind of material related to projects that involved heavy investments of time and effort but that came to naught. There were very few of these, and only one that I now consider of any

genuine importance. In 1992, I started work on a book. I had submitted an outline and a full proposal, had received the recommendation of the series editor, signed a contract and completed an introduction and three chapters. After the completion of the third chapter, the book bogged down for several reasons and was never finished. The publisher graciously let me out of the contract (with a few reasonable stipulations). So the unfinished book was relegated to the attic and that was that. I didn’t seem to have any problem with closure and soon forgot all about it.

Then, a couple of years ago, I went rummaging in the attic and found it. All of a sudden the issue of closure was re-kindled for me. I started thinking that, back in ’92, I should have done more with it like, perhaps, starting over and correcting all the things that led to its abandonment (if, indeed, I could figure out what they were). But what about now, over 12 years later? Should I try to do anything with the manuscript? Nope. Too late. Too “dated.” My feeling was that there might be some PR aficionados who would be interested in some parts of the book, but no one interested in the whole thing. So I decided to outgrow my lack of closure, or learn to live with it.

Then, guess what. My number three daughter, who also happens to be my internet guru, seemed to think it would be a good idea to link the manuscript to my website. That way, anyone either interested or curious enough to check it out could skip and skim and focus on what they liked, if anything.

So we did.

By way of brief overview, the title is A theory of self and personal relationships. The introduction gives a detailed and perhaps over-personalized account of my “growing into” the field of personal relationships, including an insider view of my emergent “modus operandi.” Chapter 1, “Orientation,” recounts my view of what the PR field was like and how it “really worked” in 1992. Please note: my views on this matter have not changed since then, and may even have crystallized a bit. The title of Chapter 2,

“Conceptions of the Person in Personal Relationships,” is probably self-explanatory. Just let me say that my “colloquial” way of summarizing different ways of incorporating person variables (e.g., exchange theory and its derivatives) into relationship research was meant to be “chatty,” not disrespectful. Chapter 3, “A Perspective on the Psychology of Self,” is an excruciatingly detailed overview of self psychology (including some ancient history) and the perspective I developed in using it as the basis for my relationship work. And there the manuscript abruptly ends.

And why was the book abandoned. Well, several reasons. I think it was Voltaire who said, “It is far better to remain silent than merely to increase the quantity of bad books.” Let me summarize my impression by saying that what I was writing did not add up to a uniformly good book. The problem was that I believe different people would like different --and limited-- parts of the book but that very few would like all of it, or even significant portions of it.

Having said all that, there is one issue I discussed in Chapter 1 (Orientation) that I think may be of interest to a fairly wide range of PR scholars. The first major section of that chapter is labeled “The ‘Field’ of Personal Relationships: A View from the Trenches.” This section runs from page 5 through page 13. The position I took then, and still maintain today (perhaps even more strongly), runs counter to the occasional impassioned call for PR scholars to work toward an interdisciplinary science. Let me summarize that position by quoting from page nine: “Against this backdrop, I find the call to work toward a ‘science’ of personal relationships more fanciful than inspiring. Moreover, I believe that pronouncements about what such a science should look like, including tentative causal models, are not useful and sometimes appear to be prescriptive and doctrinaire.”

If any of this whets your curiosity concerning the details of my rationale for the stance I take, please take time to visit www.paulwright.com and click on the links to the unfinished book.

And now, for a final suggestion to RRN readers who are recently retired or nearing that status: If you feel the urge to rummage in your attic (or review your archive), go ahead. It may be interesting and fun. But please do not take it too seriously.

Please submit to Relationship Research News. We are putting together the next issue and would like to receive any member news or updates:

Have you received an award or other professional honor? (specify)

Have you found a new job, received tenure or been promoted? (specify)

Do you have any other announcements to share with IARR members? For example, do you know of an upcoming conference, funding opportunity, special issue of a journal, or new world wide web source? Or, perhaps you have some personal news.

Please submit your news via email to Lesley Verhofstadt [Lesley.Verhofstadt @ugent.be](mailto:Lesley.Verhofstadt@ugent.be)

NET NEWS

by Ben Le

We are in the process of overhauling the IARR website. I'd love to get members' feedback about the current and future incarnations of the site:

1. What does the current site do well? What content from the current version of the website do you think is essential to carry over to the new site? What current content areas should be expanded? Is there anything on the current site that is not useful and that should not be included on the new site?
2. What does the current site *not* do well? What new features are absolutely essential? What new features would be desirable, if possible?
3. A mock-up of how the new site might look is posted here: <http://www.iarr.org/newlook.jpg>
Comments, suggestions, questions etc. are appreciated.

The new IARR website is still in the planning phase, and won't be unveiled for several months or longer. Until the new site is up and running the current version of the website will be maintained as usual. Please send any announcements you'd like posted on the website, edits to specific pages, or other suggestions or comments regarding the website, to me at (ble@haverford.edu). I'll make any changes immediately, and carry these edits over to the new site when it is launched.

In other news, as you start thinking about next summer, information about the 2008 IARR conference in Providence will be posted on the website in the next few weeks. Travel details and submission procedures should be available soon.

NEW PROFESSIONALS COLUMN

Mentorship in Interdisciplinary Relationship Research: A Report on the 2007 New Scholars' Workshop

by Ashley Duggan
Assistant Professor in the Communication
Department at Boston College

Graduate students and pre-tenure scholars met in Boston in July with four of IARR's distinguished scholars for the IARR New Scholars' Workshop. The following column describes the focus of the New Scholars Workshop, the focus of this year's workshop, and mentorship opportunities at the 2008 international conference in Providence.

Graduate work and pre-tenure years set us on a particular path in our academic pursuits. In our first years as academics, we work through completing dissertations, find jobs that feel like the right "fit," connect with students, and explore our writing muses. As interdisciplinary scholars, we also look for ways to balance a primary discipline with interdisciplinary research. The interdisciplinary nature of our work may open additional doors and bring creative possibilities we had not previously considered. We may find a range of ways to approach relational research that are different from the experiences we originally anticipated. IARR is committed to the formation of new scholars and to continued conversation between new and established scholars.

A primary opportunity for mentorship within IARR is through the New Scholars' Workshop. This year, the workshop was held at Boston College in July and was sponsored by the Boston College Communication Department and

IARR. The theme was “Applied Issues in Relationship Research.” Thirty five new scholars participated, and four of our most visible leaders served as mentors. The mentors this year were **Sandra Petronio, Terri Orbuch, Dan Perlman, and Peter Andersen**. Of the new scholars, about 1/3 had already completed PhDs, 1/3 were in qualifying exams or dissertation writing, and 1/3 were in graduate studies but not yet taking qualifying exams.

The workshop provided an opportunity for emerging scholars (pre-tenure scholars and graduate students) to form mentorship relationships with established scholars, to share our work, to learn from others’ experiences, and to develop working relationships with other emerging scholars and with senior mentors. The multi-disciplinary nature of IARR encourages the integration of perspectives, theory, practical implications, and professional innovation. This year’s theme focused on applied issues in relationship research in addition to core issues of mentorship and academic development. Areas of focus for participants included such areas as love, counseling, nonverbal behavior, health issues, group decision making, inter-group/intercultural issues, marriage, divorce, conflict, and relationship maintenance. We focused on theoretical approaches to applied relationship issues and integrating conceptual background with practical implications. Consistent with the relational focus of IARR, we also developed relationships with other participants and experienced a taste of Boston.

I would especially like to thank the established scholars: Sandra Petronio, Terri Orbuch, Dan Perlman, and Peter Andersen. They were generous with their time, their comments, their collective wisdom, and their willingness to explore our paths with us. Applicants consistently reported the visibility and reputations of the established scholars was a big attraction. Established scholars answered our (many) questions and led discussion about finding our paths, integrating research, teaching, and service, and implications for applied issues. They shared their own experiences with finding their paths, exploring creative options, and listening to their passion. They challenged us

with questions to consider as we explore our own options and find our initial paths. They offered helpful comments on our research areas and the ways our decisions shape our professional and personal lives. They guided discussion about finding our own paths, getting involved with colleagues with similar interests, and traveling down the road to publication. They shared conversation, laughter, and wisdom for our journeys.

I would also like to commend the participants for what they brought to the workshop. Participants’ questions and concerns largely determined the direction of our time. In addition to questions about research content and academic direction, questions prompted discussions about such things as disseminating research findings via mainstream media, balancing institutional and individual goals, flexible work schedules and family, data analysis, integrating multiple projects and disciplines, and publication strategies. Participants described the conversations as helpful, encouraging, and fun.

My experience with planning this workshop has clarified my sense of IARR as a unique organization committed to the formation of new scholars. The four participating senior scholars were thoughtful and helpful in their advise and planning. They were instrumental in the re-conceptualization and early description of this year’s workshop in ways that focus on continued formation beyond graduate studies. They made helpful suggestions to provide multiple opportunities for questions and conversation to unfold beyond the organized sessions. They helped advertise the workshop across disciplines. They shared their experiences with IARR publications and history. They were thoughtful and intentional about the ways the sessions unfolded. The high profile senior scholars were an attraction for the participants in the application process and during the workshop. I am certain these scholars’ wisdom, experience, and commitment to formation served as a solid foundation for professional and personal growth for the participants.

Boston was an attractive place for the workshop; it is accessible through most cities by direct

flight, offers multiple options for exploration within a relatively small area, and Boston College is on the subway line. Still, the letters of application, number of applicants, and conversation with numerous IARR members all suggest the senior scholars are the primary attraction.

Planning the workshop has been a pleasure, and the committee also looks forward to implementing opportunities for continued conversation among new scholars and between new and established scholars. The committee is currently solidifying opportunities for new scholars for the 2008 Providence conference. Several established scholars have enthusiastically committed to participate in these conversations. Look for opportunities at next year's conference in Providence and throughout the year. IARR has decided to hold the New Scholars Workshop on alternate years from the international conference, so next year we will include new scholar mentorship opportunities as part of the Providence conference instead of holding a separate New Scholars Workshop.

The mentorship committee and Workshop participants thank IARR for your continued support of new scholars. We would be glad to hear your comments or suggestions on continued opportunities for mentorship. The current mentorship committee includes Ashley Duggan (chair), Laura Brumariu, and Edna Brown.

**IARR Members:
Update address, phone, and
email changes via our website:
Please go to www.iarr.org and
click on "Membership"**

BOOK REVIEW

Mating in Captivity: Reconciling the Erotic and the Domestic

**Written by Esther Perel. Harper Collins
Publishers**

**Reviewed by Gian Gonzaga, Ph.D. Senior
Research Scientist eHarmony Labs**

*J*oni's lament goes something like this: 'Ray thinks I don't like sex. But I do like sex, or at least I used to, I just don't like it so much with him. He just doesn't get me sexually, and I can't seem to let him in on it, either. It feels hopeless. I'm only twenty-nine. That's too young to stop having sex.'

The stories that Esther Perel highlights in her book 'Mating in Captivity: Reconciling the Erotic and the Domestic' (Harper Collins, 2006) are both riveting and challenging. Gathered from her years of clinical practice, these tales engage the reader with the individuals and couples she counsels. Their problems carry a ring of truth for all who study relationships and a vague sense of unease for those already in one.

The premise Perel defends is simple: the qualities we associate with successful long-term relationships are antithetical to desire, eroticism, and hot sex. She challenges our sensibilities by proposing that much of what clinical practice and research believes will improve relationships also make a satisfying sex life less likely. Relationships are built on equality. Desire is driven by power differences. Relationships are strengthened by intimacy and self-disclosure. Desire is flamed by mystery. Relationships are sustained by emphasizing the "we" over the "I." Desire is heightened by differences between "me" and "you."

Relationship research is not obvious in this book, but the themes of the science are pervasive and the questions that arise are provocative. In Chapter 3, “The Pitfalls of Modern Intimacy” Elizabeth, an organized and competent school counselor, reveals that she likes to be submissive in her sex life with her husband Vito. “When he comes on to me forcefully, it makes me feel sexy.” Those who understand the research on power differences and abuse in relationships may be wary of such a story. Power differences in the bedroom may lead to power differences in the relationship, increasing the chance of abuse. The logical conclusion of the research would be to discourage women from being submissive in any aspect of their relationship. The tale of Elizabeth and Vito highlights the differences between the subtle nuances that make up sexual satisfaction for individual couples and the concrete findings of relationship science. Discouraging submissiveness in relationships may decrease intimate violence *on average* but it may also lead some couples to less satisfying sex lives.

On other occasions the tales in the book fall in line with what relationship science purports. In Chapter 6, “Sex is Dirty; Save it for Someone You Love” Ratu, a twenty-two year ivy league university student, describes her world of relationships: hook-ups, booty calls, and ‘friends-with-benefits’. It is what many expect and experience in college life. Ratu is upfront about the nature of sexuality in college. With little time to date students go to parties, get drunk, hook-up for the weekend, and then casually share their stories over lunch on Monday. Her ideal of a college relationship is a close male friend who you can call when you feel like “hooking up.” Commitment is avoided: “We see commitment as a life sentence. I know especially for many of my male friends it’s a terrifying thought.” Romance is rare: “The few couples here at college stand out as almost weird, like they’re married or something.” Intimacy and sex are separate, “There is a deliberate attempt to keep emotions out of sex, and not just for the boys...The girls as well as the boys speak of love on one hand and sex on the other, as though they have nothing to do with each other.” In relationship science, researchers

are starting to uncover the distinctions between love and desire. These tales offer jarring support for the hypothesis that love and desire are separate; sometimes linked, sometimes not.

The stories are engaging, and yet one senses a missing perspective. Perel after all, is a clinician, and sees only couples who struggle. In Chapter 2 “More Intimacy, Less Sex” John speaks of his deepening relationship with Beatrice, “Things are going well. We’ve moved in together. We get along great. She’s beautiful, she’s funny, she’s smart. I really love her. We don’t have sex.” The paragraph ends and the title of the next section proclaims, in bold font “**Intimacy Begets Sexuality...or Does it?**” The tale of John and Beatrice does not ring false. Examples of couples who lose the passion as the relationship strengthens are common and the course of passion and intimacy are woven into our theories of love. Researchers often find that passion and intimacy are interrelated.

What is lacking are the tales of couples where intimacy opened up a new world of sexuality, where the deepening of the relationship lead to exploration of each other physically. Perel occasionally touches on but is generally dismissive of this idea. She proclaims in Chapter 1, “Unfortunately, too many love stories develop in such a way that we sacrifice passion so as to achieve stability.” Is it really true that most couples develop this way? It is impossible to know without the solid methodology of science.

Perel’s own stories of successful couples occasionally belie her claims of the distinction between intimacy and passion. The story of James and Stella in Chapter 7 “Erotic Blueprints” is revealing on this point. Married for thirty-one years they have struggled with sex for years. Stella complains, “I’m the one who thinks about it, who wants it, who makes it happen, and who complains when it doesn’t. If I left it up to James, our erotic life would be a desert.” Perel works with James on his lack of confidence in the bedroom and with Stella on her resentment of James’ caution when initiating sex. The couple hits a turning point during an argument when, instead of retreating James

engages with Stella by embracing her, leading to a session of “wonderful lovemaking.” After this, the couple seems reborn in the bedroom. They speak of how new understanding of each others desires has unleashed their long dormant passion. At least in this example a new found sense of intimacy and understanding seemed to cause a turning point in the bedroom.

In the end these issues are a minor distraction. While Perel may not bring a sharp analysis of research findings (or indeed any analysis of the research findings) the book adds flesh and bone to papers and theories that are sometimes dry and bare. In Chapter 8 “Parenthood” Stephanie, an energetic and dedicated mother casually states her indifference to the missing sexual connection with her partner: “I keep thinking it will come back, but I can’t say I miss it.” It is easy to hear an evolutionary psychologist speaking about how women should redirect their efforts from mating to parenting upon having children or the marriage researcher speaking about how the birth of a child often leads to sharp decreases in relationship satisfaction. However, these findings, while interesting and important, miss something fundamental about the moment-to-moment experiences of relationships that exist in couples’ stories.

As researchers we are occasionally cavalier about our findings, applying them broadly and loosely. Yet these tales give pause; one cannot help but be affected when reading the story of Doug in Chapter 10 “The Shadow of the Third.” He is having an affair with Naomi and yet does not want to lose his wife Zoë. It is easy to dismiss an adulterer as hurtful and cruel when he is merely a statistic, but their tales show the complexity of life and relationships. Perel’s stories bring into sharp relief the psychology we all seek to understand. “Mating in Captivity” may not stand among the great tomes of relationship science, but it is an excellent reminder of why we all do relationship science.

JOURNALS UPDATE

Editor’s Report on the *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*

by Paul A. Mongeau, Editor

Things are busy at the palatial JSPR editorial offices. The summer brought a large number of manuscripts. A summer surge is somewhat unusual in a non-IARR conference year. At this point, it looks as though 2007 will bring a record number of new submissions. The SageTrack system has helped handle the surge.

The good news for this report is that JSPR’s ‘impact rating’ in the 2006 Journal Citation Reports has taken a significant step up. Our impact rating (put simply, a ratio of the number of times a journal is cited divided by the number of articles it produces) increased to 0.988. This places us 13th in the rankings among Communication journals and 28th in Social Psychology. This compares to a 2005 impact rating of 0.718 (21st in Communication and 31st in Social Psychology). [If JSPR was included in the Family Studies category, it would rank 15th.] Trying to explain these year-to-year changes is difficult, so I will simply attribute the improvement to the hard work of all involved here. Credit goes to authors, reviewers, the Advisory Board, Associate Editors, the editorial assistant, book review editor, and the production team at Sage London. Thanks so very much for all your help.

Speaking of the editorial team...it continues to evolve. Laura Stafford has stepped down to take over as editor of a journal that cannot be named. I am confident that JACR will be in very good hands. To make up for this loss, John Caughlin and Tammy Afifi will both be on board as

Associate Editors by the time you read this. I am always looking for potential Associate Editors. Right now, the greatest needs are in Family Studies and Sociology, though having an additional person in Social and/or Clinical Psychology would be helpful as well. If this is something that you are considering (even if you feel that you are a year or two away) feel free to contact me (Mongeau@ASU.edu) and I can put you on the list of individuals I bother occasionally to gauge their interest.

Finally, one of the interesting aspects of being editor is how far one has to look ahead. For example, as I type these words in early September, I am correcting the October proofs, getting the February 2008 issue ready to send to Sage, and I have the April 2008 issue about half-filled. I am also considering a special issue to appear late in 2009 or early in 2010. Stan Gaines recently did a fine job in editing a special issue (August 2007) on personality and relationships. I can't thank him enough for his help. If you have any ideas for something that would make for an interesting special issue, again, feel free to contact me. Special issues should be of interest to a variety of JSPR readers (as well as draw new ones), draw from a variety of disciplines, and present scholarship that will be widely read and cited.

Editor's Report on *Personal Relationships*

by Rebecca G. Adams, Editor

By now you should have received the first three issues of *Personal Relationships* (Volume 14, Issues 1, 2, and 3) produced by my editorial team (Associate Editors: Susan Boon, Psychology, University of Calgary, Canada; Mario Mikulincer, Psychology, Bar-Ilan University, Israel; Denise Solomon, Communication Studies, Pennsylvania State University, United States; Rodney Cate, *Emeritus*, Family Studies, University of Arizona, United States; Catrin Finkenauer,

Social Psychology, VU University, Amsterdam, The Netherlands; and Susan Branje, Adolescent Development, Utrecht University, The Netherlands and Editorial Assistant: Brandi McCullough). Note that in my editor's prefaces to the first two of these issues, I discuss how we are working to achieve my editorial team's goal for *PR* to become more international and interdisciplinary and the importance of placing personal relationships in structural and cultural context. I would urge potential authors to read these prefaces, because they provide insight into the types of issues that might be raised as a manuscript is reviewed. Associate Editor Mario Mikulincer authored the Editor's Preface to the third of these issues and discussed the importance of building personal relationships theory, raising issues relevant for the future of our field. At the time of this writing, our fourth issue is all-but-finalized. The tentative table of contents is included in this issue.

The Editorial Board will probably remain fairly stable for the rest of our term. Eighty-three scholars, who represent twelve countries (USA, Canada, The Netherlands, England, Mexico, Australia, New Zealand, Israel, Brazil, Greece, Austria, and Portugal) and eight disciplines (Communication Studies, Sociology, Psychology, Gerontology, Management Information Systems, Family Studies, Philosophy, and Women's Studies), serve as members of the Editorial Board. The representatives from Psychology include Social, Developmental, Applied, and Counseling Psychologists.

My editorial team and I try to have each manuscript reviewed by three scholars from two countries and two disciplines, including at least one member of the Editorial Board and sometimes including a fourth reviewer who is a new scholar. For this reason, we are always interested in hearing from new reviewers, especially volunteers who are from outside the United States or non-Psychologists. Two hundred and ninety-six established scholars and 93 new scholars have each reviewed one or more of the 313 manuscripts which were submitted to *PR* between June 1, 2005 and May 31, 2007 (note these reviewers' names and affiliations

will be listed in *Personal Relationships*, Vol. 14, Number 4, December, 2007). Thirty-one established scholars and sixteen new scholars who have not yet reviewed for *PR* have expressed interest in doing so. Together our 327 ad hoc reviewers and 109 new scholar reviewers add considerable diversity to our editorial team, including scholars from France, Spain, Ireland, Wales, Turkey, Belgium, Germany, Japan, and Finland and scholars representing the disciplines of Nursing, Consumer Sciences, Statistics, Demography, Neuroscience, Mass Communications, Marriage and Family Therapy, Psychiatry, Geriatrics, Public Health, and Media, Clinical, Evolutionary, Cultural, Health, Family, Educational, and Personality Psychology.

We are constantly striving to increase the international and interdisciplinary diversity of our submitting authors. If you hear a good paper about personal relationships at a conference, especially by a scholar from outside the United States or from an under-represented discipline, please suggest the author submit the paper to *PR*. The first authors of the 137 submissions (June 1, 2006-May 31, 2007) represent 19 countries (US=59.1, Canada=8.8%, UK=6.6%, The Netherlands and Australia=4.4% each, Israel=2.9%, Italy=2.2%, Portugal, China, and Turkey=1.5% each, and 1 manuscript each from Iran, Japan, Denmark, Switzerland, Belgium, Taiwan, Sweden, Columbia, and Norway). They represent many disciplines including: Psychology=61.3%, Communication=14.6%, Family Studies/HDFS/Child Development/Adolescent Development/Life Course Development=5.1%, Sociology=4.4%, Behavioral Science/Social Sciences/Human Ecology=4.4%, Social Work=2.9%, Psychiatry=1.5%, and nine other disciplines=one manuscript each. Approximately a third of the first authors of the submitted papers are graduate students (33.5%).

The Editorial Office calculates statistics for each half year period. The acceptance rate for the first year of our term (June 1, 2005-May 31, 2006) will probably be between 20 and 24%, which is what Sue Sprecher estimated the acceptance rate was during her team's term. It is too early to predict the range of the possible acceptance rate

for the submissions we received between June 1, 2006, and May 31, 2007. We received fewer submissions the second year (137) than the first year (176), however, so the acceptance rate will probably be higher. It takes us about 4 months on the average from the time of submission to reach an initial decision. It takes the authors who receive invitations to revise and resubmit about 3 months on the average to do so. Note that it is important that authors who have received invitations to revise and resubmit do so in a timely way, because this team's last issue will be submitted to Blackwell in August of 2009. There is a wide variation in the time from submission to acceptance, but on average it takes about 17 months from submission to acceptance and about 4 months more until publication. Thus far this has meant that as soon as a manuscript is accepted it is submitted as part of the next issue, but we are finally working a bit ahead of deadline and so in the future authors will experience bit more of a delay.

It has been a delight to work with now Past-President Sandra Petronio, the IARR Board, Treasurer Michael Cunningham, Publications Chair Dan Perlman (now conveniently in residence at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro), the Editorial Board, the reviewers, and the authors. I would also like to give special thanks to the Associate Editors and Brandi McCullough, *PR*'s Former Editorial Assistant, for their hard work. Please join me in welcoming Sarah Hosman, who will replace Brandi as *PR*'s Editorial Assistant. Brandi has been busily training her and assures me Sarah is going to do a terrific job. She will now be responding to the Predasst@uncg.edu email address our reviewers and authors know so well. The Associate Editors, my new editorial assistant, and I look forward to the remainder of our term.

Contents of Upcoming Journals

Journal of Social and Personal Relationships

Volume 24, Number 6, December 2007

TERRA SCHMOOKLER AND KRISANNE BURSIK

The Value of Monogamy in Emerging Adulthood: A Gendered Perspective

RICHARD P. BOESCH, RENATA CERQUEIRA, MARTIN A. SAFER, AND THOMAS L. WRIGHT

Relationship Satisfaction and Commitment in Long-Term Male Couples: Individual and Dyadic Effects

SHIRI COHEN, DANIEL N. KLEIN AND K. DANIEL O'LEARY

The Role of Separation/Divorce in Relapse into and Recovery from Major Depression

SUSAN M. HENNEY, SUSAN AYERS-LOPEZ RUTH G. MCROY, AND HAROLD D. GROTEVANT

Evolution and Resolution: Birthmothers' Experience of Grief and Loss at Different Levels of Adoption Openness

AYSE K. USKUL, RICHARD N. LALONDE, AND LYNDA CHENG

Views on Interracial Dating among Chinese and European Canadians: The Roles of Culture, Gender, and Mainstream Cultural Identity

GEORGE YANCEY

Homogamy over the Net: Using Internet Advertisements to Discover who Interracially Dates.

LISA K. HODGSON AND ELEANOR H. WERTHEIM

Does Good Emotion Management Aid Forgiving? Multiple Dimensions of Empathy,

Emotion Management and Forgiveness of Self and Others

TERESA J. MARIN, SUSAN HOLTZMAN, ANITA DELONGIS, AND LYNNE ROBINSON

Coping and the Response of Others

NEILL KOROBV AND AVRIL THORNE

How Late Adolescent Friends Share Stories about Relationships: The Importance of Mitigating the Seriousness of Romantic Problems

Personal Relationships

Volume 14, Number 4, December 2007

EDITOR'S PREFACE

REBECCA G. ADAMS

Celebrating Personal Relationships

ARTICLES

AMY J. RAUER AND BRENDA L. VOLLING
Differential Parenting and Sibling Jealousy: Developmental Correlates of Young Adults' Romantic Relationships

CLAUDIA CHLOE BRUMBAUGH AND R. CHRIS FRALEY

Transference of Attachment Patterns: How Important Relationships Influence Feelings Toward Novel People

JAYE L. DERRICK AND SANDRA L. MURRAY

Enhancing Relationship Perceptions by Reducing Felt Inferiority: The Role of Attachment Style

GUY BODENMANN, THOMAS LEDERMANN, AND THOMAS N. BRADBURY

Stress, Sex, and Satisfaction in Marriage

GARY W. LEWANDOWSKI, JR, ARTHUR ARON, AND JULIE GEE

Personality Goes a Long Way: The Malleability of Opposite-Sex Physical Attractiveness

SUSAN J. T. BRANJE, TOM FRIJNS, CATRIN FINKENAUER, RUTGER ENGELS, AND WIM MEEUS

You're My Best Friend: Commitment and Stability in Adolescents' Same-Sex Friendships

ELIZABETH L. HAY, KAREN L. FINGERMAN, AND EVA S. LEFKOWITZ

The Experience of Worry in Parent-Adult Child Relationships

BRIEF REPORT

ROBERT KURZBAN AND JASON WEEDEN
Do Advertised Preferences Predict the Behavior of Speed Daters?

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF REVIEWERS

RRN is looking for an individual interested in joining the EDITORIAL TEAM of our newsletter. It is a great opportunity to be involved in the organization and to work with colleagues from around the world.

**Please contact
lesley.verhofstadt@ugent.be, if you
are interested in joining our team.**

MEMBER NEWS & UPDATES

PEARL DYKSTRA (Nederlands Interdisciplinair Demografisch Instituut, The Netherlands) received two European Union Seventh Framework grants for cross-national comparative research on intergenerational relationships and life courses. The first, **GENDER 2007**, involves the harmonization of the Generations and Gender Surveys. The second, **MULTILINKS**, is a so-called collaborative research project, in which GGS-data will be used to analyse how demographic changes shape intergenerational solidarity, well-being, and social integration.

IARR member **ROWLAND MILLER** (Sam Houston State University, Texas) was elected a Fellow by the Association for Psychological Science.

At the last American Psychological Association meeting in San Francisco, as member of the newly former Assembly of Italian-American Psychologists, **LUCIANO L'ABATE** was awarded a Certificate for Appreciation in Grateful Recognition and with Deepest Gratitude for Faithful and Devoted Service from the Supreme Lodge of the Order of Sons of Italy.

LUCIANO L'ABATE is pleased to announce the 2007 publication of his book "Low-Cost Approaches to Promote Physical and Mental Health" (Springer). In this book, interventions designed to promote positive health behaviors while requiring little or no outside funding are discussed. During 2007, he has also edited the "Handbook of Homework Assignments in Psychotherapy" (Springer) with Nikolaos Kazantzis and Francoise Gerard. This handbook addresses the role of homework across major therapeutic paradigms and complex clinical problems.

RAIMO LAASONEN would like to announce that he has written a book, entitled "If the Mind then Behavior and \neg Behavior". The book

focuses on mind processes and related behavior. The book is in cogprints.soton.uk (5518).

CATHERINE SANDERSON (Amherst College, Massachusetts) just published a parenting book entitled "Slow and Steady Parenting Active Child-Raising for the Long Haul from Birth to Age 3: Avoiding the Short-Term Solutions that lead to Long-Term Problems" (M. Evans & Company). This book is centered on the principle that slow and steady wins the race, and is a manual for raising children in today's world of immediate gratification. This book includes important lessons and helpful advice including: suggestions for decreased parent-child struggles, enhancing a child's psychological and physical well-being, etc.

PEARL DIJKSTRA (Nederlands Interdisciplinair Demografisch Instituut, The Netherlands) is pleased to announce that the Wave-2 data from the Netherlands Kinship Panel Study (NKPS) have been released. The NKPS is a large-scale, multi-actor, multi-method study on solidarity in Dutch families. To access the data, please visit www.nkps.nl.

Here is a list of recent publications based on NKPS-data:

De Graaf, P.M., & Kalmijn, M. (2006). Change and stability in the social determinants of divorce: A comparison of marriage cohorts in the Netherlands. *European Sociological Review*, 22, 561 – 572

De Jong Gierveld, J., & Van Tilburg, T. (2006). A six-item scale for overall, emotional and social loneliness: Confirmatory tests on survey data. *Research on Aging*, 28, 582-598.

De Valk, H.A.G., & Billari, F.C. (2007). Living arrangements of migrant and Dutch young adults: The family influence disentangled. *Population Studies*, 61, 201-217.

De Valk, H.A.G. de & Liefbroer, A.C. (2007). Timing preferences for women's family-life transitions: intergenerational transmission

among migrants and Dutch. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 69, 190-206.

Helderman, A. & Mulder, C. (2007). Intergenerational transmission of homeownership: The roles of gifts and continuities in housing market characteristics. *Urban Studies*, 44, 231-247.

Kalmijn, M. (2006). Educational inequality and family relationships: Influences on contact and proximity. *European Sociological Review*, 22, 1-16.

Kalmijn, M. (2007). Gender differences in the effects of divorce, widowhood, and remarriage on intergenerational support: Does marriage protect fathers? *Social Forces*, 85, 1079-1104.

Pollet, T. V., Nettle, D., & Nelissen, M. (2006). Contact frequencies between grandparents and grandchildren in a modern society: Estimates of the impact of paternity uncertainty. *Journal of Cultural and Evolutionary Psychology*, 4, 203-213.

Van Gaalen, R.I., & Dykstra, P. A. (2006). Solidarity and conflict between adult children and parents: A latent class analysis. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 68 (4): 947-960.

Voorpostel, M., Van der Lippe, T., Dykstra, P.A., & Flap, H. (2007). Similar or different? The importance of similarities and differences for support among siblings. *Journal of Family Issues*, 28, 1026-1053.

MARIA KAZMIERCZAK (University of Gdansk, Poland) is pleased to announce the publication of her new edited book "Appreciating Diversity – Cultural and Gender issues" (Oficyna Wydawnicza Impuls), co-edited with Aneta Chybicka (University of Gdansk, Poland). This is a two volumes series on cultural and gender issues. Among the twelve chapters of the first volume, seven are related to the psychological tasks that cultural diversity poses and five to close interpersonal relationships and their cross-cultural aspects. The second volume contains several chapters

written mainly by Polish authors about their work done in the crossroad of gender and culture in Poland.

VICTORIA H. BEDFORD (University of Indianapolis, Indiana) would like to draw IARR members' attention to the publication of "Men in Relationships: A New Look from a Life Course Perspective (2006, Springer), which she has co-edited with Barbara F. Turner (University of Massachusetts, Boston). This book discusses the functioning of men as husbands, fathers, brothers, coworkers, and friends with an emphasis on middle and old age and the perspectives of men. It aims at understanding men's relationships as viewed from a life course perspective of historical, social, and personal change over time.

STACEY NAIRN married Robert MacKinnon on July 28th, 2007 in Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island and will now be known personally and professionally as Dr. Stacey L. MacKinnon.

JENNIFER BEVAN has just started a new position as assistant professor at the Chapman University, Department of Communication Studies, Orange, California.

REBECCA WESTON was awarded early tenure last spring at the Southern Illinois University, Department of Psychology, Carbondale, Illinois.

MELIKSAH DEMIR received her Ph.D. from Wayne State University and accepted a tenure-track position at Northern Arizona University, Flagstaff, Arizona.

LOREEN OLSON was tenured and promoted to associate professor at the University of Missouri, Department of Communication, Columbia.

UPCOMING CONFERENCES

CALL FOR PAPERS FOR THE INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR RELATIONSHIP RESEARCH CONFERENCE (JULY 17– 20, 2008)

Providence, Rhode Island, USA

Mark your calendars! The 2008 IARR Conference will be held July 17-20 in Providence, Rhode Island, at the Westin Hotel ((401) 598-8000, www.westin.com/providence). Join leading relationships researchers from around the world and from multiple disciplines for a weekend of exciting papers, posters, symposia, interest groups, and networking. Submissions for conference presentations will be due December 15th through the IARR website (www.iarr.org). The website contains detailed information on all submission guidelines and procedures.

The local hosts for the conference, members of the Department of Communication at Bryant University, are thrilled to welcome IARR members to their beautiful hometown. Rhode Island is located in the heart of New England and offers a mixture of urban excitement, rural tranquility, and 400 miles of winding coastline. Providence, its capital, is known as the "Renaissance City." It has undergone years of development combined with careful restoration and preservation of its 361 year-old history. The result is a downtown filled with beautiful hotels, terrific restaurants, a variety of college campuses, theatres, and upscale shopping. *Yankee Magazine* explained, "No city in New England has been transformed so dramatically as (Providence). Old world sensibilities blend with twenty-first century visions and somehow it all works." Two narrow rivers, the Moshassuck and Woonasquatucket run through the city and converge to become the Providence River, the

head of Narragansett Bay. The rivers are now flanked by park areas and bisected by a series of beautiful Venetian Bridges. The centerpiece of the revitalization effort, WaterPlace Park is a few short steps from the Westin. It has an amphitheatre that hosts summer concerts as the starting point for Providence's world renowned WaterFire, an art installation of bonfires set to music that wind along the rivers (see www.waterfire.org) which was named by *National Geographic Traveler* as one of the "Top 20 Events in the US."

Several exciting events that feature the city and/or surrounding areas are currently being planned. We hope to schedule a "Gallery Night" where you can tour the many interesting galleries in the city, and a mini WaterFire. In addition, one night IARR members will have the option to dine on the Bay Queen, a large passenger ship that cruises Narragansett Bay. We'll start out in Bristol, RI and travel south to mouth of the bay and back again. We're also going to offer an afternoon and evening excursion to Newport, RI, where there is a wide variety of things to explore. Built by 19th century industrialists, the mansions in Newport are a "must see" for people interested in architecture and history. If you like to walk, there is a 3.5 mile trail along the rocky coast behind the mansions that you can take. Downtown Newport attracts people from around the world. There are literally hundreds of shops and galleries. Visitors can also stop in one of its many restaurants and bars, take a walking tour of historical sights such as Fort Adams or one of the many colonial era inns (Newport has the most in the country), visit the museums that range from naval history to tennis, science, and of course American history, tour the church where J.F.K. and Jacqueline Bouvier Kennedy were married, or just sit by the harbor. In fact, Newport is known as "The City by the Sea" and is home to some of the most beautiful yachts in the world. You can even charter a former American's Cup Boat!

We're also working on a day-long excursion to Martha's Vineyard following the conference. Martha's Vineyard is located 7 miles off the coast of Massachusetts and can be reached in

about 1 ½ hours by a high speed ferry from Quonset Point, RI. About 23 miles long and 8 miles wide, the island is chock full of places to explore. You can visit the multi-colored clay cliffs at Gay Head or tour Edgartown, the largest village on the island and once the seat of Dukes County, the home of many whaling ships and their captains. There are dramatic beaches, five lighthouses, "gingerbread" cottages, up-island stonewalls, Flying Horses, the country's oldest operating carousel, and the world famous Black Dog Tavern in Vineyard Haven.

We look forward to your joining us in Providence for the 2008 IARR Conference. Detailed information on submission formats and procedures is available on the IARR website (www.iarr.org), and submissions will be due December 15th. In the meantime, if you have questions about the conference site or facilities, please contact the Local Arrangements Chair, Dr. Wendy Samter, at wsamter@bryant.edu. If you have questions about the conference program or about submissions, please contact the Program Committee Chair, Lisa Diamond, at iarrconference@gmail.com.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

FACULTY POSITIONS (OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY)

The Ohio State University announces the opening of up to four 9 month, tenure track, open rank faculty positions in the areas of Family Science, Child Development, and Early Childhood Education areas. **Requirements:** *Family Science*: doctorate in Family Studies or related area; research and teaching excellence in individual, family, couple, and community processes that contribute to risk and problem behavior (including but not limited to violence, mental/behavioral health, substance use, crime, obesity, sexual behavior, academic failure, developmental disabilities etc). *Child*

Development/Early Childhood Education doctorate in Child Development, Educational Psychology, Developmental Psychology or related area; research and teaching excellence related to the impact of genetic, environment, community, and family factors on the cognitive, academic, social, or emotional development or adjustment of infants and/or children. For the full job ad and additional information about the college, department, or program areas, visit <http://ehe.osu.edu/hdfs/>.

Submit a statement of research and teaching interests, curriculum vita, up to three (3) preprints/publications, and three (3) letters of reference

Stephen A. Petrill, Chair, Search Committee - The Ohio State University - Department of Human Development & Family Science - 1787 Neil Avenue Columbus - OH 43210 – email: Petrill.2@osu.edu - Telephone (614) 247-2439

Evaluation will commence on October 1 and continue until positions are filled.

**CALL FOR PAPERS
FOR A SPECIAL ISSUE ON
RELATIONSHIP RESEARCH IN
SCANDINAVIA**

We are pleased to announce that “*Interpersona: An International Journal on Personal Relationships*”, an open access online scientific journal (ISSN 1981-6472), will publish a special issue on Relationship Research in Scandinavia.

All those investigating any aspect of personal relationships (family relations, romantic relationships, friendships and others) from any academic discipline (psychology, sociology, anthropology, communication studies, family studies, child development, social work and others) in Scandinavia are invited to submit papers to this special issue.

Original empirical (qualitative or quantitative) research, theoretical or methodological contributions, integrative reviews, meta-analyses, comparative or historical studies, and

critical assessments of the status of the field are welcome. All manuscripts should be submitted only by e-mail to b.m.holmes@hw.ac.uk as an attached file (preferentially in Word for Windows 6.0 or above). *Interpersona* accepts original articles on all aspects of personal relationships from any academic discipline.

Manuscripts should be submitted in English and should ideally be **5,000-7,500 words**, with an **Abstract** (in English) of **200-250 words**. Each manuscript will be evaluated by reviewers based on its relevance, clarity, originality and suitability for this special issue. Manuscripts will be sent anonymously for review by independent referees and so all material identifying the author should be confined to the title page. Further details are available at www.interpersona.org.

Please direct inquiries to Dr. Bjarne Holmes (b.m.holmes@hw.ac.uk) or Dr. Agnaldo Garcia (agnaldo.garcia@pq.cnpq.br).

Deadline: June 30th, 2008

**CALL FOR AWARD NOMINATIONS
FOR THE INTERNATIONAL
ASSOCIATION FOR RELATIONSHIP
RESEARCH
(due November 15, 2007)**

**To be presented at the 2008 Conference in
Providence, Rhode Island, July 17-20**

Please consider nominating a colleague or scholar you admire for one of IARR's awards for scholarship, teaching, and mentoring!! Many of the awards conferred by IARR to honor the accomplishments of its members depend on nominations from you and your colleagues. Please consider this list of our awards, and nominate a deserving relationship scientist. Self-nominations are also welcome. Please note: All parties, excluding students, must be members of IARR in order for a nomination to be valid. Nominations and all supporting materials must be received by November 15, 2007. Please address nomination materials to:

Denise Solomon
 Department of Communication Arts & Sciences
 Penn State University
 317 Sparks Building
 University Park, PA 16802
 Email inquiries to: dhs12@psu.edu

SCHOLARSHIP AWARDS

Article Award

This award honors an article published in *Personal Relationships* and the *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships* during 2005 or 2006 that has made a significant and original contribution to the study of personal relationships. The Awards Committee will review all the articles published in PR and JSPR during those years, but letters of nomination that note the contributions of particular articles are welcome.

Book Award

This award honors a book published by a member of IARR during 2005 or 2006 that has made a significant and original contribution to the study of personal relationships. Nominations should include:

- A letter of nomination that describes the contributions of the book, and
- Four copies of the book forwarded from the publisher.

Dissertation Award

This award honors an outstanding dissertation in the field of personal relationships that was defended during 2006 or 2007. A small cash prize is presented (\$200). Nominations consist of:

- A letter of nomination from the dissertation advisor, and
- A summary (5 page maximum) of the dissertation.

Nominees advancing to a second round of evaluation will be asked to provide an electronic copy of either the full dissertation or a manuscript that reports the research.

Steve Duck New Scholars Awards (2 awards)

- These awards provide small grants (\$400) to (1) a graduate student and to (2) a new scholar (within 3 years of receiving his or her Ph.D.) in support of their research on personal relationships. Self-nominations are expected, and should include:
- A proposal (5 page maximum) that outlines the relevant literature, the purpose and hypotheses of the research, the proposed design and methodology, and a budget that clearly indicates how the grant monies will be used to support the project,
- The applicant's curriculum vitae, and
- A letter of recommendation from an informed colleague.

TEACHING & MENTORING AWARDS

Teaching Award

This award recognizes excellence in teaching in the field of personal relationships at the undergraduate and/or graduate level. Nominations should include:

- A teaching portfolio that includes (a) a statement of teaching philosophy, (b) sample syllabi, and (c) summaries of course evaluations
- The nominee's curriculum vitae, and
- Two letters of support from colleagues and two letters of support from current and/or former students.

Mentoring Award

This award recognizes an outstanding mentor in the field of personal relationships. Nominations should include:

- A letter of nomination that describes the manner in which the mentoring relationship has advanced the professional development of those who were advised, supported, or sponsored by the mentor,
- The nominee's curriculum vitae, and
- Up to 3 additional letters of support.

CAREER AWARDS

Gerald R. Miller Award for Early Career Achievement

This award honors the distinguished scientific achievements of scholars who are still within 10

years of receiving their Ph.D. degrees. Nominations consist of:

- A letter of nomination that describes the accomplishments of the nominee,
- The nominee's curriculum vitae, and
- Two additional letters supporting the nomination.

Berscheid-Hatfield Award for Distinguished Mid-Career Achievement

This award honors the distinguished scientific achievements of scholars who are in the middle stages of their careers, that is, between 10 and 25 years post-Ph.D. Nominations consist of:

- A letter of nomination that describes the accomplishments of the nominee,
- The nominee's curriculum vitae, and
- Two additional letters supporting the nomination.

Distinguished Career Award

This award recognizes a full career of eminent, notable contributions to research in, theories of, or the practice of relationship science. The award is intended to acknowledge a long span of work that has enriched our understanding of personal relationships and contributed much to the field. Nominations consist of:

- A letter of nomination that describes the accomplishments of the nominee,
- The nominee's curriculum vitae, and
- Two additional letters supporting the nomination.

Ghana, Greece, India, Iran, Israel, Italy, Jordan, Kuwait, Malaysia, Mexico, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Pakistan, Poland, Portugal, Saudi Arabia, Serbia, South Africa, Spain, Switzerland, Taiwan, Turkey, United Kingdom, United States of America and Zimbabwe. The journal welcomes papers in different languages, always with a summary in English. Beginning in 2008, *Interpersona* will publish special issues on recent advancements in specific relationship research topics (the first will focus on “Matching Methods in the 21st Century”) and on relationship research conducted all over the world, starting with India and South Asia, China, Iran, Serbia, Croatia, Scandinavia and Brazil. Calls for papers for regular and special issues are available at our website. We hope *Interpersona* will contribute to the advancement and internationalization of relationship research. IARR members are specially invited to submit papers, propose special issues (suggesting countries or themes) or just visit the journal’s website at www.interpersona.org.

**INTERPERSONA:
AN INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL ON
PERSONAL RELATIONSHIPS**

Agnaldo Garcia, Editor

Interpersona’s first issue is already available at www.interpersona.org with papers from Brazil, Jamaica, New Zealand, Turkey and the USA and a Mexican book review. This open access new journal presents an international editorial board composed (so far) of 81 scholars from 34 countries: Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, China, Colombia, Croatia, Germany,

IARR BOARD

IARR OFFICERS

Immediate President

Phil Shaver
prshaver@ucdavis.edu

Immediate Vice-President and President-Elect

Frank Fincham
ffincham@fsu.edu

Immediate Past-President

Sandra Petronio
petronio@iupui.edu

Secretary & Treasurer

Michael Cunningham
michael.cunningham@louisville.edu

BOARD MEMBERS

Lisa Diamond (Program Committee Chair)
diamond@psych.utah.edu

Dan Perlman (Publications Committee Chair)
d.perlman@ubc.ca

Kostas Kafetsios (Immediate Member-at-Large)
k.kafetsios@psy.soc.uoc.gr

Pearl Dykstra (Member-at-Large)
dykstra@nidi.nl

Andrea Lambert (Immediate New Professional Representative)
alambert@du.edu

COMMITTEE CHAIRS

Leanne Knobloch (Future Conferences)
knobl@uiuc.edu

Denise Haunani Solomon (Awards)
dhs12@psu.edu

Chris Agnew (Membership)
agnew@purdue.edu

Ashley Duggan (Mentoring)
dugganas@bc.edu

Terri Orbuch (Media Relations)
orbuch@umich.edu

Benjamin Le (Website)
ble@haverford.edu

EDITORS

Paul Mongeau
(Journal of Social and Personal Relationships)
paul.mongeau@asu.edu

Rebecca Adams
(Personal Relationships)
Personal_Relationships@uncg.edu

Lesley Verhofstadt
(Relationship Research News)
lesley.verhofstadt@ugent.be