

# RELATIONSHIP RESEARCH NEWS

OFFICIAL NEWS JOURNAL OF THE INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR RELATIONSHIP RESEARCH

Fall 2011

VOL 10, NO. 1

## PRESIDENT'S COLUMN

### Your Relationship with IARR

by Christopher Agnew  
Purdue University

It is my great pleasure and honor to serve as President of IARR this year. Let me begin by thanking my wonderful predecessor, Anita Vangelisti, for her exceptional leadership during the past year. Together with IARR Officers Brooke Feeny (our Secretary-Treasurer) and Jacki Fitzpatrick (Past President), and our Board Members (Ximena Arriaga, Maria Kazmierczak, Sandra Metts, Laura Miller, and Lesley Verhofstadt), Anita was tireless in her efforts to move our association forward on various fronts. On behalf of us all, Anita, a big "thank you"!

We have also been quite fortunate to have the service of our various committee chairs and members, including Leah Bryant leading the Mentoring Committee, Bjarne Holmes handling Media Relations, Bill Dragon working on our website, Omri Gillath helping to locate our future conferences, Joao Moreira on the International Committee, Chip Knee working on awards, and Michael Cunningham providing helpful financial advice. And, of course, our journal editors (Lorne Campbell for *Personal Relationships*, Mario Mikulincer for *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, and Marian Morry for *Relationship Research News*), along with their boards, continue to do a spectacular job in showcasing the latest developments in our field.

In many ways I think we can consider what these fine folks do in relational terms. Through selfless hours of

work in a given year, they work to *maintain* IARR and our collective relationship with each other. I want to take this opportunity to ask you to consider YOUR relationship with IARR. If you are receiving this newsletter, it is safe to assume that you have already *initiated* a relationship with the organization. And many of you have maintained that relationship, in one form or another, for years.

I want to encourage you to *help others initiate a relationship with IARR* as well. This is particularly important at this point in time. Why now? Despite our best collective efforts, membership in our organization has declined significantly over the past several years. After increasing our membership numbers each year since our inception as an organization, our membership numbers peaked in 2007 and then began to decline in 2008. Take a look:

<u>Year</u>	<u>Membership</u>
2003	550
2004	707
2005	727
2006	757
2007	790
2008	697
2009	639
2010	578
2011	507

A breakdown of the total indicates that the drop in membership is not driven by a particular membership type: the number of both regular and student memberships have declined. We are now back to a membership of less than where we began a decade or so ago.

Certainly the decline in membership is not due to a reduction in relationship research. Far from. Our journals are receiving record number of submissions and relationship research is receiving increasing recognition in our various academic subfields, public

discussions and media outlets. Likely reasons for the decline in membership numbers are multiple, though I believe most have economic roots. The decline began in 2008, the beginning of the current economic crisis. The attendant financial constraints these past few years have been felt by all segments of society, including the academic world. With tighter finances, members (suffering from what might be termed “membership fatigue”) have sometimes had to make choices regarding in which organizations they wish to continue their memberships.

Mindful of the trend, the Board has worked to develop new membership categories and lower due rates that should hope overcome financial obstacles to both newly initiated and maintained memberships. The new categories, requiring changes to our bylaws, were overwhelming adopted by membership vote this summer and will take effect for 2012. We have created a “reduced fee” membership option that subsumes the former “student” category and includes both retirees and members from countries who reside in a country designated by the World Bank as anything other than a high-income economy.

There are now two rate options for both regular and reduced fee memberships. A “full-paper” option includes both print and on-line subscription to *JSPR* and to *PR* (\$90 regular membership; \$58 student membership). A “reduced-paper” option includes online only subscription to *JSPR* and both print and online subscription to *PR* (\$50 regular membership; \$38 student membership). Membership via either option also includes two annual issues of this newsletter, IARR Announcements sent regularly via email, discounts on conference registration fees, access to a membership directory, and publisher discounts. We will also soon be instituting a multi-year dues payment option that should reduce some of the variability in our membership numbers.

What can YOU do to help maintain and, beyond that, grow our organization?

1. Renew your membership and encourage others to join us. The benefits of membership are enormous. Journals, newsletters, conference discounts – all at a reasonably low rate -- what’s not to like? We particularly want to encourage new student memberships. For those of you who work with undergraduate and/or graduate students, why not

consider providing them with a student membership as a \$38 holiday gift?

2. Attend our conferences and encourage others to do so. Many of us first became acquainted with the organization (or its predecessors, ISSPR and INPR) via conference participation. Our conferences are fantastic opportunities to soak up the latest in relationship research, from multiple fields and multiple countries. Our next main conference is scheduled for next summer (July 12-16, 2012) in Chicago, Illinois, USA. Check out the conference website for details (<http://iarr2012conference.com/>), but I can tell you from the plans already in place that it will be an amazing event! The Local Planning Organizers, Lean Bryant, Sue Sprecher, and Ralph Erber are putting together an experience for us like no other. If you have not visited Chicago (ever or recently), there will be no better time than next July 12-16 – so plan on it!

3. Continue to push the frontiers of relationship research. Our general area of inquiry has never been so vibrant or so important. Whether your interests lie in furthering our understanding of basic relational processes or in the application of knowledge to ameliorate relationship-based problems, keep it up. As our field moves forward this will be reflected in a growing, vibrant IARR.

Many, if not most, organizations are seeing similar declines in their membership numbers the past few years. We can weather this decline better than most (e.g., we don’t have staff salaries to support), our finances are tightly linked to our annual numbers (e.g., we order journals for our members in a given year based on our paid membership numbers for that year), and our conferences have always been successful events. But, like a close relationship, we cannot take our relationship with IARR for granted -- it requires maintenance!

**INSIDE THIS ISSUE OF RELATIONSHIP RESEARCH NEWS**

**PRESIDENT’S COLUMN**

*Your Relationship with IARR*  
by Christopher Agnew .....1

**FROM THE EDITOR’S DESK**

by Marian Morry .....4

**2010-2011 IARR ELECTION RESULTS**

by Jacki Fitzpatrick .....5

**NEW PROFESSIONALS COLUMN**

*Accidental Mentorship: Information, Inspiration, and Influence*  
by Laura Miller ..... 6

**FEATURE ARTICLES**

*Planning, Luck, Relationships, and Research: The Secrets of Success Through the Ranks of the Academy*  
by Leah Bryant ..... 7  
*How to Talk About Writing*  
by Colleen Sinclair ..... 14

**HUMOR COLUMN**

*The Story of Co*  
by David Kenny ..... 21

**BOOK REVIEWS**

*The Forgotten Kin: Aunts and Uncles*  
Reviewed by Dan Perlman ..... 23  
*Interdependent Minds: The Dynamics of Close Relationships*  
Reviewed by Nancy E. Frye..... 24

**JOURNALS UPDATE**

*PR Report*  
by Lorne Campbell..... 26  
*Tentative Contents of Upcoming Journals..... 27*

**ANNOUNCEMENTS ..... 28**

*Call for Papers 2012 Conference, Chicago, Illinois*  
*Call for Proposals 2013 Mini-conferences*  
*Call for Proposals 2014 Conference*  
*Assistant/Associate Professor Position*

**MEMBER NEWS AND UPDATES ..... 33**

**IARR BOARD ..... 34**

**RELATIONSHIP RESEARCH NEWS**

Editor

Marian Morry  
University of Manitoba

**Associate Editors**

Stacey MacKinnon  
University of Prince Edward Island

Leah E. Bryant  
DePaul University

Colleen Sinclair  
Mississippi State University

*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 editor first (please do not send manuscripts). Submit all materials to Marian Morry, University of Manitoba, Department of Psychology, Winnipeg, MB, CANADA R3T-2N2; marian\_morry@umanitoba.ca. The deadline for final copy is September 1 for the Fall issue and April 1 for the Spring issue. Inquiries regarding Feature Articles are welcome at any time.

## FROM THE EDITOR'S DESK

by **Marian Morry**  
**University of Manitoba, Canada**

As the new academic year begins, we welcome many new students, both graduate and undergraduate, and colleagues into our departments. The articles included in this edition of Relationship Research News contain valuable advice for working with these new, enthusiastic scholars.

Laura Miller begins our feature section with advice on how to be an accidental mentor. Although written for new scholars the situational examples and suggestions for how we might be impacting others is relevant to all of us. Building on this mentoring, Leah Bryant's section has career advice from faculty at the Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, Professor, and Emeritus levels. While designed to give advice about how to develop a successful career trajectory, I also found it interesting to observe how individuals at different stages took very different perspectives when looking back over their careers.

We then move into one of the most demanding but also at times one of the most gratifying components of our work: writing. While much has been written about *the need to write* (see the career advice in Leah Bryant's section) and *how to write*, Colleen Sinclair asked individuals to talk about *how to teach about writing*. How do we nurture these skills in our undergraduate and graduate students? What skills are important? Upon receiving this feature article, I immediately translated some of these ideas into my own lab meetings and work with my students. I hope you find it as interesting and useful as I did.

Interestingly, David Kenny also wrote his humor column on a topic related to writing; dealing with co-authors. *The Story of Co*, while perhaps less humorous than some of David's previous articles, takes us through the joys and sorrows of co-authoring papers. Whether you are a seasoned author or a new scholar, this article is well worth the read. Be forewarned though, these events can and

will happen to you at some point in your career.

We also have two book reviews in this newsletter. Dan Perlman reviewed Robert Milardo's *The Forgotten Kin: Aunts and Uncles*. Nancy Frye reviewed Sandra Murray and John Holmes' new book *Interdependent Minds: The Dynamics of Close Relationships*. Thank you to our reviewers for their time and thoughtful write-ups.

Lorne Campbell has provided a report on *Personal Relationships*. The statistics indicate that PR continues to be a popular venue for publication among relationship researchers. We also provide you with a list of the tentative contents for upcoming editions of PR and JSPR.

Don't forget to read our announcements and member news! Here you will see the call for papers for the 2012 IARR Conference in Chicago, Illinois along with announcements for two conferences: the 2013 IARR mini-conference and the 2014 IARR conference. Under the member news, Elaine Hatfield and Ellen Berscheid were recently named recipients of the William James Award for a lifetime of significant intellectual contributions to the basic science of psychology. Congratulations to both of you.

---

Submission deadline for the  
Spring 2012 issue of RRN

April 1, 2012

Submit all materials  
to Marian Morry

Marian\_Morry@umanitoba.ca

## 2010-2011 IARR Election Results

### Jacki Fitzpatrick Elections Committee Chair

The 2010-2011 IARR election process has been completed. I would like to thank all of the other IARR members who served on the 2010-2011 Elections Committee. The committee members live in five different countries (Australia, Brazil, Israel, Taiwan, USA) and reflect five different professional disciplines (communication, family studies, gerontology, psychology, sociology). Thus, they brought a broad representation to the process of identifying potential candidates (for the open positions). The committee members were: Rebecca Adams; Gurit Birnbaum; Rosemary Blieszner; Szu-Chia Chang; Roi Estlein; Julie Fitness and Agnaldo Garcia.

There were two open positions (Vice-President/President-Elect and Boardmember-at-Large) for this year's election. There were nine candidates for the two positions. Geographically, the candidates represented Australia, Canada, Israel, New Zealand, Spain, Switzerland and USA. Disciplinarily, the candidates represented communication, family studies, gender/sexuality, lifespan human development, psychology, social sciences, social work and sociology (some candidates have degrees and/or professional experience in more than one field). Thus, I tried to achieve a diverse range of candidates for the IARR members to consider. I would also like to thank the IARR members who participated in the voting process (by submitting votes) in Summer 2011.

The following colleagues were elected to serve as of August 2011. I am sure that IARR will benefit from their efforts and dedication: Dan Perlman (Vice-President/President-Elect) and Emily Impett (Boardmember-at-Large). In addition, I would like to thank the following candidates who had offered their time and talents to serve as officers, but were not elected this year. Although these colleagues were not elected, their willingness to serve IARR in a leadership capacity is worthy of recognition as well. The other Vice-President/President-Elect candidates were: Anita Barbee and Garth Fletcher. The other Boardmember-at-Large candidates were:

Rodrigo Jesus Carcedo González; Gilad Hirschberger; Gery Karantzas; Jennifer Thiess and Marieke Voorpostel

There was one IARR Bylaw revision that was approved during the 2009-2010 election process. The revision statement was drafted by the members of the IARR Board of Directors. The statement was submitted to the IARR members (for a vote of approval or rejection). Based on the vote results, the revised statement has been accepted: "BYLAW REVISION, 2011 Subject to any provision of law applicable to the amendment of Bylaws of public benefit nonprofit corporations, these Bylaws, or any of them, may be altered, amended, or repealed and new Bylaws adopted upon approval of two-thirds of those members of the Association casting a ballot. In addition to any amendments to the Bylaws that may be proposed by the Board of Directors pursuant to a resolution duly passed by the Board, any petition submitted to the Board of Directors containing the signatures of ten percent or more of the membership shall be submitted by the Board of Directors to the full membership for a vote. Thus, you are currently asked to submit a vote in reference to one revision in the Bylaws. Vote for Modification to Bylaw Regarding Qualifications for Reduced-Fee Members Revised Bylaw Statement: 13.1 CATEGORIES OF MEMBERS The Association shall have regular members, reduced fee members, associate members, and such other members as may be established by the Board of Directors. No member shall hold more than one membership in the Association. 13.2 QUALIFICATIONS OF MEMBERS The qualifications for membership in this Association are as follows: (a) Regular members must have a graduate degree in, and/or be employed in, a field that involves the study, research, teaching, and/or professional practice related to personal relationships. (b) Reduced fee members include: (1) current students in a field that is related to the study of personal relationships. Upon completion of a graduate degree in a field that involves the study of personal relationships, student members automatically become eligible for regular membership. (2) those currently employed as a faculty member in a field related to the study of personal relationships or who work in a professional practice related to personal relationships and who reside in a country designated by the World Bank as anything other than a high-income economy (country

income status can be checked at [http://data.worldbank.org/about/country-classifications/country-and-lending-groups#High\\_income](http://data.worldbank.org/about/country-classifications/country-and-lending-groups#High_income). (3) those formerly employed as a faculty member in a field related to the study of personal relationships, including retired and emeritus faculty, or who worked in professional practice related to personal relationships. (c) Associate members may be domestic partners of regular or reduced fee members or other persons who have a bona fide interest in furthering the objectives and purposes of the Association. Rationale for revision: In the prior bylaw, only students were eligible for reduced-fee membership. However, IARR has received requests from other lower-income groups (i.e., retired/emeritus faculty, professionals from low-income countries) who would not be able to hold membership in IARR unless a reduced-fee option is available to them. Current Bylaw Statement: 13.1 CATEGORIES OF MEMBERS The Association shall have regular members, student members, associate members, and such other members as may be established by the Board of Directors. No member shall hold more than one membership in the Association. 13.2 QUALIFICATIONS OF MEMBERS The qualifications for membership in this Association are as follows: (a) Regular members must have a graduate degree in, and/or be employed in, a field that involves the study, research, teaching, and/or professional practice related to personal relationships. (b) Student members must be students in a field that is related to the study of personal relationships. Upon completion of a graduate degree in a field that involves the study of personal relationships, student members automatically become eligible for regular membership. (c) Associate members may be domestic partners of regular or student members or other persons who have a bona fide interest in furthering the objectives and purposes of the Association.”

I hope that this information is helpful to you. Please feel free to contact me at [Jacki.Fitzpatrick@ttu.edu](mailto:Jacki.Fitzpatrick@ttu.edu) if you have questions/comments about this information. Thank you for your attention.

Sincerely,  
Jacki Fitzpatrick  
IARR Past President

## NEW PROFESSIONALS COLUMN

### Accidental Mentorship: Information, Inspiration, and Influence

by Laura Miller  
New Professional Representative  
University of Tennessee - Knoxville

Young professional mentorship is often discussed in relation to the mentors helping us along the path toward tenure. Depending on the department, new assistant professors may be officially paired with a more experienced professional in the same field, who may be a tenured faculty member, department head, or esteemed colleague. The emphasis placed on these relationships is merited, as they are often a crucial piece to the tenure puzzle. However, emphasizing our own need for mentorship may create some oversight into the mentorship we, as young professionals, are able to provide.

At the start of our careers, mentoring others typically does not top the to-do list. In fact, it may be discouraged; thus, most of our mentoring may occur ‘accidentally’ rather than officially. As young professionals, we may accidentally fall into mentoring roles, with undergraduate students seeking advice on post-graduation plans, with graduate students preparing for the job market, or with fellow young professionals needing encouragement. As the young, ‘newbies’ on campus, we may not view ourselves as ‘experts,’ but we do have experiences that can inform, inspire, and influence others.

We can inform students about graduate school opportunities and share with them our own experiences. For some students, it just takes one teacher to recognize an interest in graduate school and to encourage applying. Indeed, one of the key people guiding my graduate school application process was a young professional who was brand new to campus. To this day I am so grateful that she

took the time to coach me and become my ‘accidental’ mentor. The information she provided me during that time was invaluable and we can step into the same role with our own students.

Not only does our knowledge provide guidance, but our expertise may inspire critical thinking, new ideas, and alternate career paths. New professionals often bring novel research agendas and teaching styles to departments that can foster newfound creativity. A colleague recently described her development of a brand new course. The course covered material that had never before been taught in her department. She proceeded throughout the semester wondering how students were responding to her perspectives and to the new information. Until one day, toward the end of the semester, she received an email from a quiet student who sat at the back of the classroom. The email thanked her and expressed how the course inspired a new career path that may not otherwise have been found. Thus, we may ‘accidentally’ impact students simply by teaching and discussing the very things that inspired us to become a part of the academy.

Taken together, we can enormously influence our campus as young professionals. As we navigate our own careers and countdown until tenure, let us not forget about the lives we can change along the way. Let us not be afraid to fall into ‘accidental’ mentorship, unplanned conversations, and spontaneous relationships. It does not take much to make a difference in someone else’s life and we have the opportunity to positively influence every student we come in contact with. Our experiences as young professionals remind me of one of my favorite quotes by cartoonist Scott Adams. As he describes, “You don’t have to be a ‘person of influence’ to be influential. In fact, the most influential people in my life are probably not even aware of the things they have taught me.” Let us remember the influence new professionals have on our campuses, communities, and colleagues. I challenge you to seek opportunities to reach out, set an example, mentor, and inspire those around you. You never know whose life might change as a result.

## FEATURE ARTICLES

### Planning, Luck, Relationships, and Research: The Secrets of Success Through the Ranks of the Academy

Edited by Leah E. Bryant  
DePaul University

A great deal of attention has focused on helping new scholars prepare for a successful academic career; but as they advance, there seems to be less guidance about how to achieve success through the stages of the academy. The goal of this article was to put together a career trajectory success guide to help scholars think about how to set meaningful goals to develop their career.

To learn about how individuals achieved career success, this article solicited the input from successful scholars at different stages in their career. Assistant Professors, Jen Theiss and Sean Horan, address the importance of goals and theory building. At the Associate Professor level, Drs. Lorne Campbell and Catrin Finkenauer, explain how they followed their heart, to another country and to conduct meaningful, but not millionaire making, research. Full Professors, Scott Christopher and Valerie Manusov share their sage advice that involves a bit of self-fulfilling prophecy and keeping research fresh. At the Emeritus level, Michael Johnson and Rod Cate both describe the serendipitous path they took to reach the academic rank which most of us aspire.

What is interesting, and not too surprising, is that there are a number of ways to achieve academic success. As I began to work on this article and learn from the contributors, the end goal was not just about achieving tenure and/or promotion, but rather carving out a successful path in the academy. For some people it means following their heart, even if it takes them to unexpected places, like Amsterdam. For others it means creating meaningful working relationships with not only graduate students,

mentors, but also liked minded scholars. This article begins with learning from successful assistant professors, followed by associates, then full professors, and closes with reflections from Emeritus professors.

### Assistant Professor

Jen Theiss, Communication, Rutgers University

As I was asked to reflect on the strategies that contributed to my successful career trajectory, I was struck by the fact that the definition of “success” is likely to vary widely by discipline, by university, by department, and by individual points of view. The career that some may view as an impressive success story, others might see as a lackluster flop. I approach my recommendations for success as a scholar on the tenure track, in a communication department, at a large research university. From that vantage point, three behaviors come to mind that helped me to “succeed.”

First, I followed a theory driven program of research. From my dissertation forward, my scholarship has aimed to advance and extend the relational turbulence model of romantic relationship development. The benefit of this approach is that each new study I conducted built upon an already established body of information and left me with new questions and ideas for future research. Thus, at the time I ended one study I already knew where I was headed in my next investigation in order to move the theory forward. Without a strong theoretical foundation, my research trajectory would lack the cohesion that has defined me as a scholar.

Second, I sought opportunities to mentor graduate students early in my career. Most universities, including my own, have rules to protect junior faculty from the demands of advising graduate students, and for good reason. Mentoring graduate students can be very time consuming and taxing for faculty who are truly invested in the process, which can be a distraction for junior faculty on the path to tenure. Although I am typically a fan of rules that protect junior faculty, I admit that breaking this one was a great secret to my success. Graduate students are enthusiastic, they are eager to get involved in research, they want to attend conferences, and they want to publish papers, because they want to get jobs. I found it to be a great motivator to work with

graduate students because I wanted to help them succeed, and in turn, helping them achieve their goals motivated me to be productive and successful.

Third, collaboration, in general, whether with graduate students or with colleagues from other universities, has been a great motivating force and helped me to be a more productive scholar. My collaboration with graduate students and other colleagues is related to the third secret of my success, which is to multitask. I always have at least two or three studies going on at one time, partially because I am advising multiple graduate students who are each working on a different project, but also because I never want to be in a position where I cannot be productive while I am waiting for data to roll in. Thus, while I am writing papers from one data set, I have another that is being collected, and possibly another that is simply waiting to be analyzed. I have found that being busy is a good problem to have.

Sean Horan, Communication, DePaul University

I want to begin by thanking Leah Bryant for asking me to contribute to this piece. I am entering into my third year as an Assistant Professor in the College of Communication at DePaul University. Prior to DePaul, I completed my PhD in 2009 at West Virginia University, which was preceded by my BA and MA at Texas State University. Leah asked me to share some things that have helped me throughout the research process, and below I share some thoughts. It is important to note, however, that individuals should discover/know what works best for them – some of the ideas below will likely work for you, whereas others might warrant refinement. Know what is a good fit for you.

*Set goals and be mindful of the bigger picture.* As any time management or self-help guru will likely espouse, it is important to set goals. Although I am not here to sell you a moment of a Zen or a new time management tool, I will echo the importance of setting goals. As researchers it is important that we set goals for the calendar year and semester. Maintaining an awareness of the bigger (year) picture allows you set larger goals, and then work to develop smaller plans to achieve goals. We plan our classes with clear goals in mind, it is equally

important that we plan our research with such care.

*Write regularly, and be protective of that time.* It is important that we have regularly scheduled writing time. I have certain days of the week, or blocks of time when a semester schedule does not allow a day, that are established writing time. In my experience, this needs to be several hours of time, not an hour here or there. As Faculty members, our jobs consist of teaching, research, and service. Often times we are tempted to view our writing time as flexible/free time that we can sacrifice for meetings or other non-research based activity; however, I would encourage you to be protective of this time. If it is the time you have set aside for research and writing, think of it as a meeting you have scheduled that you cannot simply cancel to meet with a student or grade. I adopt the phrasing of one of my mentors, Tim Mottet, who describes this time as “a research appointment.” So if individuals are trying to gain access to your time, you can explain you have “a research appointment”; although it sounds very official, this “research appointment” can simply be your writing time.

*Know how/where you work best.* Some of us work well in the evening, others work well in the office, and still some prefer local coffee shops. Whatever the situation, make sure your writing time allows you work where/how you work best. For me, it is in my home office, mid-day, with a large cup of coffee (which turns into 4-5 cups of coffee), with questionable music playing. I know I am less productive in my University office, and I do not write well after 5:00 PM, so I do not force myself to try and write during those times (and on the rare occasions that I do, I become frustrated with my lack of productivity).

*Utilize mentors.* I was only able to *learn* research by *doing* research, so I am thankful for individuals like Melanie Booth-Butterfield, Rebecca Chory, and Marian Houser who advised me throughout my graduate time. Even though I am no longer in school, I still turn to these people for advice, and would recommend for you to continue relying on mentors. Also turn to your peers, as I do with Alan Goodboy and Brandi Frisby. One of the most rewarding things, though, which continues to give me new energy and ideas for research, is mentoring my own graduate students. Their ideas are great, and energy

contagious.

*Lists.* My MA Advisor taught me to keep a large research question file. This is an ongoing list that you keep for years about things you want to know. I know that I will not get to most ideas, but I regularly revisit that list and occasionally an idea resonates that I execute. Revisit the list once every three-to-six months to see if any ideas resonate.

*Maintain multiple projects at once.* Working on multiple studies at once offers many benefits. For instance, I am often tired of looking at the same manuscript repeatedly, so I have the option to jump from manuscript to manuscript. Also, you never know how fast journals are going to get back to you with a decision, so this allows you to have multiple things in the pipeline.

*Be mindful of IRB.* The response rate of an IRB varies from school to school. Even if you do not plan on beginning a study for a few months, submitting the IRB paperwork early on allows you the flexibility to begin the project when you are ready. At DePaul, I have both a preliminary College review followed by a University review, so while planning studies, I have to allot for that time lapse. Although not always possible, I try and submit protocols as soon as possible.

#### Associate Professor

Lorne Campbell, Psychology, The University of Western Ontario

Over 20 years ago a very good friend of mine informed me that he would be a millionaire by the time he was forty. I asked him how he planned to achieve this goal, and he said any way he could! He tried a few different careers that had the promise of delivering wealth, but he discovered he did not enjoy those vocations. He lives what I consider a very good life now, but he will not be a millionaire within the next two years. We all know the moral to stories like these: find out what you like to do and do it instead of focusing on your ultimate destination. I believe this is good advice for academic scholars as well. In graduate school we are told that we need X number of publications to get a job; as assistant professors we are told we need even more publications and grant funding to keep our jobs; and as tenured professors we are told to keep producing

every year or central administration will keep an eye on us! I decided a long time ago not to worry about how many publications I “needed” at any point in my career, but instead to focus on research questions that were of the most interest to me. I assumed that my natural curiosity and intrinsic motivation to find answers for my research questions would result in data worthy of publishing, and over time this proved to be true. I think it is important to be aware of what is required of us to get a job in academia and keep it, but the path to achieving these goals begins and ends with doing what you like to do. This seems obvious, of course, but it is easy to forget when almost everyone around us focuses on our productivity.

**Catrin Finkenauer, Clinical Child and Family Studies, VU University Amsterdam**

When people ask me what was the most important influence in my career, then I have to answer that it was luck, luck to meet the right people at the right time. When I graduated from high-school, I wanted to become a medical doctor. When I didn’t make it through the lottery, a friend of mine suggested I become a flight-attendant with Lufthansa. The thought had never crossed my mind, but it seemed a good idea to travel the world in luxury. While traveling the world, a colleague told me about her studying psychology while flying. Psychology sounded exciting, a bit more exciting than asking people what they’d like to drink 400 times a day, and I was able to accomplish part of my studies while earning enough money to finance them.

During my studies, I met Prof. Klaus Fiedler who not only didn’t mind me being irregularly present, but who made me discover the fascinating world of social psychology. How do others influence what we feel, do and think? I realized that for me there is no question that is more important. And when I listened to a talk by Cloe Madanes, a gifted strategic family therapist working with Jay Haley, I discovered that many family therapists use social psychological principles to solve relationship problems. I went for training at the Family Therapy Institute in Bethesda, Maryland. Upon my return to Germany I met Prof. Gun Semin, who asked whether I had considered doing a PhD. I never had, but his question and his recognition of the truly social nature of relationships was inspiring. I got a grant to stay with Prof. Semin at the VU University in Amsterdam examining

language use in different social contexts.

During the year in Amsterdam two things happened that would change my life dramatically. First, I met my future husband. Second, I met Prof. Bernard Rimé who had just built the first department of Social and Clinical Psychology in Europe, and was looking for a PhD. student who had experience with both social and clinical psychology. The research by Prof. Rimé combined all aspects of research and relationships that are close to my heart. I spent 6 years at the University of Louvain at Louvain-la-Neuve in Belgium studying secrecy and its impact on people and their relationship partners.

But I had fallen in love with a Dutch man, remember? When I received my PhD I therefore wanted to return to the Netherlands. During my research on secrecy, I had met Prof. Maggie Stroebe, whose ground-breaking work was on the social sharing of grief. She asked me to join her team of student mentors at the University College Utrecht. At the same time, I applied for a position at Child and Adolescent Studies. I became an assistant professor in the department of Prof. Wim Meeus who enabled me to develop my research on parent-child relationships and honed my fascination for the truly reciprocal nature of relationships.

In the meantime I had become a mother of a beautiful daughter. I was living in Amsterdam, and had to travel substantially. After 3 years, I was asked to join the department of Social Psychology, by Prof. Semin in Amsterdam. Gaining 3 hours per day to spend with the family was an offer I couldn’t refuse, and when we had a second daughter these hours became all the more valuable. When Prof. Caryl Rusbult joined our department in Amsterdam, my interest in close relationships increased exponentially. Caryl not only examined what relationships are all about, she knew what relationships are all about and unfailingly practiced it in everyday life both at the university and outside (see Finkenauer, 2010). I received a huge grant which enables me to set up my research on relationships, and together with Caryl, I built a wonderful team of PhD. students studying interpersonal relationships. In January 2010, Caryl passed away. I lost a wonderful mentor and friend, but I had gained a deepened commitment to trying to understand the mechanisms and processes

underlying various phenomena in interpersonal relationships.

To put my research into practice, in April 2011, I have joined the department of Clinical child and Family studies with Prof. Carlo Schuengel and Prof. Francien Lamers, two researchers devoted to making a difference in the life of families who struggle with challenges, including child abuse, domestic violence, and chronic illness. Given the vast variety of relationships that are concerned by these topics, the research in this group is paradise for a relationship researcher like me who is devoted to answering the question how we can use scientific knowledge to alleviate distress, to maintain well-being, and to prevent problems in relationships.

### Professor

Scott Christopher, Family and Human Development, Arizona State University

When I was asked to write a piece giving advice to those “who are more advanced” in their careers, I did some quick math and discovered that I’ve spent around three decades in the academy. A check in the mirror confirmed the fear this math triggered. I have wrinkles, and what hair I have left is gray. Putting this all together led me to one conclusion, *Yikes - Someone is turning to me for Sage Advice!* When did I arrive at that point in my career? Me give sage advice? What do I know? Of course, I rarely shy from sharing my ideas, so let’s see what I come up with.

So what is a good starting point for this sage advice? How about right after achieving tenure? I remember the day our faculty voted on my tenure. I was outwardly confident of the outcome, but while the department faculty met and voted on my future, I sat in my office having the only panic attack I have ever experienced in my life. I am happy to report that the vote went well, and that this was a liberating moment for me in my career. Prior to that tenure decision, it was all about numbers. How many publications do I have? How many manuscripts have I submitted? Have I served on too many or not enough committees? Have I taken on too few or too many graduate students? So what have I learned from that point on (besides the fact that some of these questions never go away)? I learned at least three things.

First piece of sage advice for those at this moment of their careers, you now have time to take your research in new directions. I explored sex pre-tenure, and after being granted tenure I took my exploration of sex to a whole new level! Wait a minute - that statement requires some clarification. Before earning tenure, I had researched the ties of college students’ sexuality to their relationships. While I continued in this direction, I also evaluated an abstinence-only sex education program, researched sexual aggression, and wrote about marital sexuality. These new directions broadened my knowledge and allowed me to develop new research skills.

Second piece of sage advice, switch up your projects. One of the nice things about having the liberty to take a longer view of what to accomplish is that one discovers that scholarship comes in a variety of forms. Take a moment, step back, and ask yourself if you think the moment is right in your research area for a special journal issue that you could edit. Is there a book series that you could make a contribution to? If you’ve not already applied for a grant, is it time to seek funding for that big project you’ve been thinking about? I have found taking on different challenges has kept me engaged and interested in my work.

Third piece of sage advice, go find others to work with. Propose projects to them. You might be surprised; they may actually think these are good ideas. I know I was! Early in my career, I made a point of introducing myself to others with similar research interests at conferences. While approaching someone you do not know very well and saying “I’m interested in sex and you are too, we should talk.” can have its awkward moments, I can happily report that such moments can be worked through. Developing a professional network of others in your field allows you to find someone to work with on those new projects. My previous collaborations have been some of the most rewarding experiences of my career. I learned from those I have worked with, and developed lasting friendships. Many resulted in additional opportunities to work together.

That’s it, three pieces of sage advice. I think that is a good number, don’t you? I’m going to quit before I tax my brain too much. So now that I’ve finished, is

it time for a nap? Isn't that what givers of sage advice are supposed to do?

Valerie Manusov, Communication, University of Washington

When I was an Assistant Professor and new to the University of Washington I heard a speech by the then Dean of the Graduate School. A Full Professor in Anthropology, this dynamic woman talked about an attitude she learned that had served her well: Whenever she was getting close to a possible promotion, she began to act in ways that made her seem like she was already at the advanced rank. Not long after she started acting in her new role, she started to fully embody it: When she engaged in behaviors consistent with an Associate Professor, she began to feel like she was at that rank; the same thing happened before she became a Full Professor. And not surprisingly, others saw her as an authentic performer of the new role, and her promotions came easily.

I always remembered that, and whereas I wasn't very strategic in the process, the same events occurred for me. I felt like an Associate Professor before I became one, and I felt that I was a Full Professor before that promotion as well. And in embodying the new role—understanding what it looked like and what it involved—the transition to actually becoming that worked pretty seamlessly.

So perhaps the best advice I can pass on is to take some time to imagine what a person should be like who is in the role that you want. What makes a Full Professor seem to be a different from an Associate? For me, it was a certain amount of comfort that comes from having made it to this level and that allows me to think much more about others than about my own path. It was a feeling that I didn't need to prove myself; I just needed to *be* myself.

Moreover, such imaginings also provide the chance to ask, not only what is normative, but what is *ideal*. That is, you can ask yourself what a *good* Full Professor (or whatever) acts like and how she moves through the world. Given the constraints that are around, how can you shape it to be the kind of professor that can make a difference in the way *you* want to?

The idea that we can take on roles that we do not yet hold may seem disingenuous, but I think it actually ends up working quite differently. As we imagine what we could be, we become that. Our promotion (or other move) is then a natural manifestation of what already is occurring. And it is likely to be one that better reflects some core parts of ourselves in addition to the aspects of the role that are mandated by others around us. We then become, not just a member of the new rank, but the person we want to be within that role.

### Emeritus

Michael Johnson, Sociology, Women's Studies, and African and African American Studies, Pennsylvania State University

Here is my task for this note: "You are someone who is successful at your career level in the academy. Would you be willing to share some information/advice/tips/dos and don'ts/etc. with me for this article please? This doesn't need to be too formal or lengthy. I'm just looking for a short reflective piece that helps us know how you got to where you are, and what you recommend for others to be successful in their own way."

Here is my initial reply to the request for this piece: "My path has been quite unconventional, probably untenable with today's grant-dominated 'productivity' demands, and you should know that I retired as an associate professor. Let me know if you want something anyway, but perhaps a more conventional tale would better suit as a model of success." In any case, my story is that I got where I got because I worked my tail off in graduate school, I never stopped reading and thinking furiously about what I read, and I worked hard as a professor—but also because some wonderful people helped me along the way, and I was lucky.

In fact my path was in many ways quite conventional, in others not. I'm not sure my professional life is a usable model for success, but I do know that when I look back on it I feel great satisfaction with how it turned out. That satisfaction has to do with the fun of teaching, my impact as a teacher, and the somewhat serendipitous, late career, direct involvement in social policy matters.

The conventional part is working hard to prove

myself in a Master's degree program in social psychology that became a stepping stone to what was probably the best social psych program in the country, where I had to work hard to prove myself once again. My mentors at Iowa helped me to get into the program at Michigan, and my mentors at Michigan helped me to find my job at Penn State. Here's a little bit of luck and people: a graduate student buddy from Iowa happened to be at Penn State when my application was first discussed and put in a good word for me.

Teaching at Penn State from 1972 to 2005 may seem conventional enough, but I never did quite fit the model there. I was committed to a balance between teaching and research that favored teaching, and to a balance between work and family that favored family. So, not so much publishing—and no grants. As a result, I almost didn't get tenure, wasn't promoted to Associate Professor until long after the tenure decision, and never did make Professor. But I lived the life I wanted to live. So here's my first tip: if you get tenure by doing what you don't want to do, you'll probably end up doing what you don't want to do for the rest of your career. It's not worth it. In 1978 I told myself, and anyone else who would listen, that I was going to do what I wanted to do and if I didn't get tenure, then that was for the best and I would try to find a school where I *could* do what I wanted to do.

I may have paid a price for being in a department where I didn't fit the model of success, but, given the nature of academic freedom and the tenure system, it was a small price. Promotions and raises are as useful to me as to anyone else, but they were at the time pretty low in my rank-ordering of things. Much more important was that I was able to balance work and family and to put most of my work time into my teaching (for me the most fulfilling part of the job). I was also fortunate to have a joint appointment in women's studies, which allowed me to teach the courses that were most meaningful to me and imbedded me in a network of scholars and teachers with whom I shared the social justice values that had attracted me to sociology in the first place. My second tip: surround yourself as much as possible with like-minded people.

And here the like-minded people and the luck come together. In 1992 a good feminist friend asked me

join a group of feminist family scholars she was taking to Vietnam. Because of the structure of the group, and our mission to help the women of Vietnam, I chose domestic violence as my topic, even though it had not yet been a research interest of mine. In the process of preparing for that trip I developed the typology of intimate partner violence that has shaped my career ever since. At the time the typology seemed so obvious to me that I didn't see it as publishable, but two good friends (both feminist family studies scholars) pushed me into submitting it to the *Journal of Marriage and the Family*. There are the like-minded people again. Well, that framework took root in academia and is now sweeping the world of intervention, and I am spending the first years of my retirement doing workshops all over the world about the importance of differentiating among types of intimate partner violence.

For me, career "success" has clearly been about the social justice values that have been central to my life since the 1960s. Over the years I've exposed thousands of students (along with the people they talk to) to a knowledge base and a feminist sociological perspective that I presume has helped them to understand the social injustices that are sometimes built into the structure of human societies, and to understand processes of social change in which they themselves can be a force. And now I am lucky enough in my late career to be involved personally in shaping policies that will affect millions of women who are coping with the behavior of violent partners or ex-partners.

Rodney Cate, Family Studies and Human Development, University of Arizona

My career as a personal relationships scholar took an atypical path to the present. I came to the field without a background in social and behavioral sciences. I had trained to become a pharmacist and worked in that field for eight years before going back to graduate school. After deciding to go back to graduate school, a series of serendipitous events greatly facilitated my early career. I was quite lucky to be admitted to a family studies graduate program without the proper background. My 27 hours of chemistry was not a major selling point to graduate admissions committees. The second serendipitous happening to influence my career was being assigned as an advisee to Dr. Ted Huston when I entered the

PhD. program at Penn State. Ted introduced me to the fledgling field of personal relationships. This allowed me to get a front row seat of the early development of the field of personal relationships. I also was fortunate to be in a cohort of graduate students at Penn State that have made significant contributions to the field of personal relationships. These people include Cathy Surra, Bob Milardo, Rosemary Bliezner, Alexis Walker, and Leigh Leslie. These experiences served me well throughout my career. The final serendipitous event in my career concerns getting my first job. Like most people, as I approached finishing my Ph.D., I was particularly concerned about getting a job. There were not many job openings that year. I went on one interview, but didn't get the job. So, I began to worry a bit, since I was married and had two small children. I heard through the grapevine that Texas Tech might be advertising a job. Since Tech was where I got my M. S., I called the department chair and asked about the potential position. There was a position opening and after a few phone conversations with the chair, I was hired—no interview, no affirmative action. In those days, hiring was not as strictly controlled as it is today.

I do not want to suggest that a successful career is mainly formed through chance happenings, although I think serendipity plays a larger role in life than we are willing to acknowledge. On the other hand, I would be less than honest if I claimed that the course of my career was carefully planned out. I approached my career in the manner that I approach life. My approach to life is to develop strong interpersonal relationships. I know my career would not have been successful without the support of my wife, Pat. We will be married for 50 years this coming December. We met in high school and have been together ever since. My career has also been enhanced by my relationships with faculty colleagues. I've been inspired and supported by Alan Sugawara (Oregon State), June Henton (Auburn), Carl Ridley (University of Arizona), Jacques Lempers (Iowa State), David Almeida (Penn State), and many others. Nothing is more important to a career than competent, caring colleagues. I also have benefitted from colleagues that I know from my participation in professional associations. My work with Sue Sprecher (Illinois State) and others has been very rewarding. Last, but not least, my career has been immensely bolstered by my work with

many graduate students, e.g., Sally Lloyd, James Koval, F. Scott Christopher, Ellen Abell, James Ponzetti, Amy Reesing, Brian Ogolsky. They have inspired and taught me on many occasions. Establishing close relationships with students is a gift that keeps on giving.

I guess it is possible to plan out the perfect career, but I doubt it. I am not much of an advice giver, but if pressed, I would advise the beginning professional to seize opportunities when they happen to appear and form close relationships along the way. Relationships can last you a lifetime.

### Successful Summary

Some common themes exist throughout each of these essays. These themes include -- finding yourself, finding a scholarly voice, and finding people with whom to share the path to success in the academy. Without the generosity of these eight contributors, we would know less about academic success trajectories. I am grateful for their insights, ideas, thoughtfulness, and creativity.

### References

Finkenauer, C. (2010). Although it helps, love is not all you need: How Caryl Rusbult made me discover what relationships are all about. *Personal Relationships, 17*, 161–163.

---

## How to Talk About Writing

Edited by H. Colleen Sinclair  
Mississippi State University

*“Writing is to academia what sex was to the nineteenth-century Vienna: everybody does it and nobody talks about it.”*- Belcher (2009, pg. 1)

Whether just beginning your academic career or a seasoned veteran of the publication process, there are likely things everyone could stand to learn about writing. Yet, we don't talk about it. Writing seems to be something we learn by doing and, often, by “failing” – as indicated by the pages of drafts submitted to adviser and returned bleeding red ink or by the virtual piles of rejection letters. However, writing is central to our career and thus should be a central component in the training of our future

scholars. Accordingly, the purpose of the present set of articles is to start the conversation. We begin with talking about why writing is seen but rarely heard about in the halls of our field. Next, a template for an academic writing workshop is proposed. Lastly, a sample lesson providing 10 tips on how to publish rounds out our discussion. Thus, this set of articles raises the question of why we don't teach writing, provides a potential means to start teaching writing, and concludes with a condensed mini-lesson in writing for everyone.

### **Why Don't We Teach Graduate Students**

#### **How to Write?**

**Paul J. Silvia**

**University of North Carolina at Greensboro**

Most of us learned academic writing on the street. People learn a lot on the street, but the writing street isn't the tree-lined boulevard where you learned about smooching or the sandy boardwalk where you learned about what follows smooching. The writing street is a grimy slum of shuttered buildings ("For Lease: Owner Didn't Get Tenure"), grad students selling pirated copies of Mplus out of a van, and half-starved adjuncts burning old editions of the *Publication Manual* to keep warm. Walk warily.

Why should we learn writing on the street? Are our graduate advisors too bashful to talk about what happens when two clauses come together? Writing is an oddity—graduate programs in psychology do a good job of teaching other professional skills. Let's start with statistics. No one learns statistics on the street: they take at least one undergraduate class in probability and statistics and suffer through at least two graduate classes in statistics. Experts in statistics (i.e., smart people with graphing calculators) teach novices (i.e., we, the crassly ignorant). Students who take two classes will get around 200 hours of structured practice in statistics, according to my graphing calculator; students who take more classes can get around 1000 hours.

Let's turn to teaching. Psychology does a good job of training people to teach. Fresh-faced grad students cut their teeth on an easy teaching-assistant assignment: they grade a few tests, give a mini-lecture to the class, and coerce false confessions out of suspected cheaters. Students rarely teach their own course without some supervised experience as a

TA. While teaching their own course, students typically take a seminar on the teaching of psychology, where they read books about teaching, learn from grizzled teaching veterans, and get feedback about their instruction. Learning to teach, like learning statistics, involves hundreds of hours of training.

But how many hours of structured practice did you get in writing? How many times did an expert explain the general principles of writing, give you skill-building assignments, and then provide feedback and criticism? Did you take a class in professional writing? Did anyone ever recommend a book about writing to you? Some people, I've found, received good training in writing during graduate school. These people write well and often, and one suspects that causation lurks beneath this correlation. Most departments, however, lack a graduate class on professional writing: students are expected to learn writing tacitly while working on their research. This creates a sad cycle of ignorance. When they get jobs, students who lack formal training in writing can't give formal training to their students. The grimy writing street becomes more populous with each academic generation.

Psychology ought to do a better job of training the next generation of writers. If you're a grad student at a program that lacks formal training in writing, it's time to buy some books about writing, read them, and practice. If you're a professor, think about the formal training at your institution. Add a graduate class on professional writing, but set an enrollment cap: grad students across the university will want to take it. (Professors will take it, too, but "only to observe.") If enough departments teach students to write, the urban planners can redevelop the writing street into something more useful—another sandy boardwalk, perhaps.

*Paul J. Silvia is an Associate Professor of Psychology at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro. His book *How to Write A Lot: A Practical Guide to Productive Academic Writing* was published by the American Psychological Association in 2007, is his latest book. He doesn't really own a graphing calculator. An earlier version of this essay appeared in *Dialogue*, the newsletter of the Society for Personality and Social Psychology.*

## Teaching Writing: A Writing Workshop Template

H. Colleen Sinclair  
Mississippi State University

As discussed in Dr. Silvia's article, there is a paucity of classes on writing in graduate school. Yet, publications are the primary currency of our field. In response to this call for formal writing instruction, I have assembled a template that could be used to create an academic writing workshop. Admittedly, this is a work in progress. Quite literally, this semester represents my first foray into the academic writing workshop with my ten guinea pigs...I mean, eager aspiring academics.

However, I grew up on creative writing workshops (writing summer camps, writing after-school programs, a creative writing Bachelors degree), and used that as my template. Some may think that creative and academic writing are two vastly different animals. Yet, I find a lot of the advice overlaps. In both fields I was told that writer's block was a boogeyman. Further, the goal of both academic and creative writing appears to be to tell a good story (see Dr. Maner's article below). Thus, I borrow from the field that talks about writing constantly to see if there is something to be gleaned for the field that doesn't talk about writing enough.

### *Step 1: Credit*

You will want to decide if the course is going to be 1-3 credits. Is it going to be a comprehensive seminar with multiple readings and discourse? Or is it going to be more of a 1-credit brown bag with maybe one goal or one paper per week? Note, even if you have non-credit weekly writing workshop meetings with your lab members it should help get manuscripts out the door. The point is to start the conversation.

### *Step 2: Audience*

Who will you include and how many? I never attended a writing workshop with more than a dozen members, and recommend that as a *maximum*. As for who, you will want to consider whether you want to gear your workshop to be something for any student, for all first year graduate students, or only for advanced graduate students with manuscripts near completion. You may want to consider having the course spread over multiple semesters; one

introductory version, one intermediate, one advanced. Alternatively, seminars could vary in focus: journal articles, grant writing, etc.

Whoever the audience may be, it is imperative to the "workshop" component of the writing workshop that *every* member, at some point in the semester, submits a piece of writing (e.g., introduction, proposal, white paper) for critique. Thus all members should have such a submission or could write one.

### *Step 3: Reading*

There are numerous guides for writing, some technical, some motivational. Some are focused on academic writing (*Writing Your Journal Article in 12 weeks* by Wendy Belcher) and a few of those on writing in psychology (*Guide to Publishing in Psychology Journals* by Robert Sternberg). A number of resources are listed in the appendix of Dr. Silvia's *How to Write A Lot*. Rather than re-listing them all here, I will refer the reader to his Appendix. Whether you choose to assign reading from writing texts will depend on what information you want to impart in the instructional portion of the class and whether you want the core of reading to be from texts or the work of the workshop members. Further, you will want to find the text that is the right mix for your course. Such that it isn't so "technical" that you feel you are reading a programming manual on where to place a comma nor is it so "motivational" that it more self-help fluff than concrete how-to.

### *Step 4: Instruction*

Whether you choose to lecture or have discussions, it is important to *talk* about writing at introductory and advanced levels. For example, Dr. Maner's helpful *Top 10 Tips on Getting Your Manuscripts Published* (below) could be an example of a lesson. Also consider the following conversation-starters:

- Why publish at all?
- How do I create a writing schedule (and stick to it)?
- How do I defeat "writer's block"?
- How do I prioritize and manage multiple writing responsibilities?
- How do I negotiate authorship and set up an authorship contract?
- What are the stages of the publication/grant process?
- How do I read an article to use it for writing

- an article?
- What are some writing tips for writing a *good* journal article?
  - How do I edit my manuscript?
  - How do I write a critique?
  - How do I respond to reviewers? Is a rejection the end of the world?
  - How do I establish, maintain, or withdraw from a collaboration?
  - How do I package a multi-study paper together vs. how do I break up a large project into multiple smaller publications?

This is not intended to be an exhaustive list but with just these examples we already have semester's worth of weekly discussion topics. Some could be combined. Some might be trimmed or saved for other workshops. Others might emerge by asking the students what they most want to know. Whatever the case, you will likely want to have at least a few "information sessions." These sessions can be led by the instructor, senior students, or perhaps guest lecturers. Readings and amount of discussion can depend on topic and time.

#### *Step 5: Assignments*

- Weekly Goals. Borrowing a chapter from Dr. Silvia's *How to Write A Lot*, I adopted the approach of treating the workshop a little like an "Agraphia group." Meaning, at the start of every meeting each member (instructor included) is required to report what their writing goal was for the week, whether they met, failed to meet, or exceeded their goal. They then set a new goal. There should be consequences for failure that are decided upon by the group (my students agreed to pay \$5 per failure but are still debating what to do with the money at the end of the semester) as well as rewards for achievement [they choose their individual reward (e.g., that extra Starbucks mocha, a manicure) but I also give them a jumbo candy]. Goals should be as concrete as possible (e.g., "I will write an outline for my introduction on X paper" or "I will write 500 words for my *RRN* article"). A one trial week is permitted as people often start too ambitious.
- Mock Review. An essential aspect of a creative writing workshop is the critique. However, learning to construct a critique in academic writing is a lesson in and of itself. As a lesson on

critiquing, responding to reviews, and the publication process, students can be assigned to read a first submission journal manuscript for which critiques had already been received.

- *Part 1:* They read the article and submit a critique. You can provide a template or potentially use a template available on websites such as: <http://www2.etown.edu/docs/Psychology/SamplePeerReview.pdf> [http://mendota.english.wisc.edu/~WAC/page.jsp?id=32&c\\_type=category&c\\_id=22](http://mendota.english.wisc.edu/~WAC/page.jsp?id=32&c_type=category&c_id=22) These critiques are discussed and compared with their peers' in-class.
- *Part 2:* They receive the official reviews (perhaps one of the reviews is even controversial). They read the reviews, compare the reviews to their own, and prepare for a class discussion of the validity of the reviews and how they would handle the reviews if they had received them.
- *Part 3:* They get to read the response letter and revised manuscript and submit a second round of critiques on the revised manuscript.
- *Part 4:* They get to see the final product (copy of the final manuscript and response letter) and compare to the original to make a critical assessment of where the paper improved versus declined.

Portions of this process could be skipped or condensed (you may simply give them the opportunity to critique and spend the next class comparing critiques to those submitted by the experts and then just post the revision and response letter for their reference).

- Peer Review. During the workshop portion of the seminar, members should be required to submit weekly critiques of at least one peer's work. It could be more than one peer's work, depending on if your seminar is 1 or 3 credits. These critiques and the student's work would then be discussed in the workshop.

Of course, this means that you have to have students willing and able to submit something for critique. In creative writing workshops, many writers tended to fight for the chance to get feedback on their work earlier, rather than later. You may encounter the opposite problem with tentative junior scholars all vying for the last

possible submission date. Accordingly, you may be forced to employ random assignment. If you have a class of more senior and more junior students, hopefully the senior students have something they want to share while the junior students are just putting their first year projects together.

Ideally the submission should be an entire manuscript intended for journal or grant submission or an invited review. However completed sections of an article, grant, or chapter should be accepted. In order to get the most out of the workshop, the students should be encouraged to submit as much of their future manuscript as possible.

- Final Project. If you choose to require a final project, an easy choice may be to have the students submit a revised manuscript with a detailed response letter indicating how they addressed each of the critiques. Alternatively, you could have them critique the quality of the critiques, potentially employing a worksheet like that from Wendy Belcher's website ([http://www.wendybelcher.com/pages/documents/Belcher\\_page\\_305\\_unnumbered\\_table.pdf](http://www.wendybelcher.com/pages/documents/Belcher_page_305_unnumbered_table.pdf)).

Assignment options are always at the discretion of the instructor. Above are merely suggestions. Advanced classes could feature the class reading the paper and responses a peer has received and providing feedback on a plan of attack. Other instructional exercises could involve giving students a lengthy introduction and telling them to cut it in half in order to learn editing. Alternatively, you could provide students with the hypotheses for a paper and tell them to construct what the outline for the introduction would need to be to provide support for those hypotheses. Given the multiple steps to reach publication, assignment options are numerous. What is important is that we start teaching academics – aspiring and enduring – to write, even if, and perhaps especially if, we still feel we have much to learn ourselves.

A Top 10 List for Getting your Manuscripts  
Published  
Jon K. Maner  
Florida State University

Publishing empirical articles can be challenging and even intimidating, especially for newcomers to the field. Here I provide some tips for scholars interested in getting their manuscripts published in high visibility journals. There are obviously a lot of factors on the “front end” that go into publishing your manuscript including: ask important and interesting research questions; design good studies and use high caliber methods; collect top-notch data (I know, all of this easier said than done). For now, I'm going to assume that you've been fortunate enough to do all those things. You have in hand data from one or more studies that you want to write up for publication. Here are 10 tips that might help.

#### *Tip #10. Make it interesting*

Readers like to be drawn in and engaged by what they are reading. The best papers are intrinsically attention-grabbing and they tell a good story. A good paper often will open with an illustrative “real-world” example or by posing an interesting question or mystery (bonus points if the paper returns to that example, question, or mystery at the end of the paper; it creates a nice sense of closure). If you capture your reader's attention in the opening pages, it will put them in a good mood and they will keep reading. The opening of your paper should be carefully crafted. As the saying goes, there is no second chance to make a good first impression, and the opening of your paper will generate a strong first impression. In addition to grabbing the reader's attention, the opening is also an opportunity to frame the overall question or hypothesis that guides your work; it's your chance to tell the reader what your paper is about.

#### *Tip #9. Write clearly*

There is no substitute for clarity. In many ways, the simpler your writing, the better. Readers shouldn't have to work hard to understand what you are telling them. Use short sentences and try to make each sentence about a single idea. In editing your writing, try breaking up longer more complex sentences into shorter, simpler ones. When articulating a complex or difficult idea, try using a concrete example. There's usually no substitute for a good example. In crafting your Introduction, connect the dots; make sure you don't leave any gaps in the theoretical logic. Create a linear flow of ideas from the beginning of the introduction to the presentation of your hypotheses. Try to equip each paragraph with a

strong topic sentence and a concluding sentence that transitions into what's to come. In preparing a manuscript, try to separate the "thinking stage" from the "writing stage." That is, don't begin writing until you have a clear roadmap of where you're headed. Outlines are very useful in that regard. If you have a clear plan in place, the writing process will be more efficient and the end-product will be stronger and clearer.

#### *Type #8 Be terse*

Shorter papers are almost always better than longer papers. One reason is clarity. In making your paper shorter, you are also usually making it clearer. When editing your writing, ask yourself: Is this paragraph or sentence or word really necessary. If it's not, delete it. If you can say something in one sentence, don't say it in two or three. Avoid stray thoughts and tangential issues. Focus your paper on a singular idea and take-home message, and stick closely to that message. A second benefit of being terse involves competition for journal space. Journals are given only so many pages to work with. Consequently, papers often need to compete with one another over which is to be published. If an editor is considering two papers of equal quality, but one is considerably shorter than the other, more often than not the editor will select the shorter paper. Doing so allows for the acceptance of a larger number of articles. So put things in your favor by making your paper as short as possible (without sacrificing quality, of course).

#### *Tip #7. Highlight the contribution*

The sine qua non of any scientific paper is that it makes a clear contribution to the relevant literature. Hence, it's essential that your paper's contribution is absolutely clear. Don't assume that your reader will be able to figure out on his or her own why your paper is important. Articulate the paper's importance clearly and strongly. It's okay to be straightforward and say: "The current paper contributes to the literature by..." (indeed, this is a signal to readers to pay attention). Articulate the contribution of the paper early (in the first few paragraphs) and often (return to it throughout the paper, especially in the Discussion section). In identifying the contribution of your paper, note that "nobody has tested this hypothesis yet" is not a strong basis for theoretical contribution. (Maybe nobody has tested the hypothesis because it's simply not interesting.) Explain why there is merit in your paper's

theoretical or practical implications. What important question is being addressed? You should try to convince your reader within just the first few paragraphs that, not only is your paper going to be interesting, it's also going to address an important question and make a substantive contribution to the scientific literature.

#### *Tip #6. Don't oversell or undersell your work*

Highlight every strength of your work. Make the most out of counterintuitive findings; explain why other patterns of data might have been more intuitively obvious. Point out all methodological strengths, whether those strengths involve unique manipulations, dependent measures, characteristics of your sample, etc. If you have used strong measures of implicit cognition or behavioral measures instead of just self-report measures, for instance, don't let that go unnoticed. In short, don't undersell your work. At the same time, it's also important not to oversell your work. Don't extrapolate too far beyond what the data actually show. As just one example, if you haven't actually measured behavior, don't imply that you have. Acknowledge limitations of your studies. Limitations often provide useful avenues for further research, so describe those limitations clearly and explain how they pave the way for future studies.

#### *Tip #5 Don't promise anything you can't deliver*

The Introduction to your paper will create a set of expectations in the mind of your reader. In doing so, it's important to be judicious. Do not create expectations that you will fail to meet in the empirical portion of the paper. For instance, if you highlight particular problems with previous studies, your reader will expect you to fix those problems in your own research; so don't highlight shortcomings of previous research unless you aim to fix them. When outlining the hypotheses of your study, keep in mind the empirical tests you will be providing. Data should flow naturally from predictions and predictions should flow naturally from the theory articulated in the Introduction. Thus, you should limit your theorizing to predictions that you actually test. If there are other predictions or implications associated with your work that are not actually tested, they belong in the Discussion section, not the Introduction.

*Tip #4 Pick the right journal*

Every journal is different in terms of the magnitude and quality of the research it publishes. Journals such as *JPSP* prioritize papers that make a strong theoretical contribution and that are likely to be of interest to a broad readership. Other journals such as *PSPB* or the *JESP* also prioritize high impact theoretical work, although the bar is sometimes a bit lower (relative to *JPSP*) in terms of the overall empirical yield required for publication. Many other journals prioritize papers that are more specialized in terms of their content and theoretical focus. In deciding where to send your manuscript, you should carefully examine recent issues to see what the published papers are like in terms of content, quality, and focus. Most journals have websites that describe the types of papers they publish. It's a good idea to aim for the highest impact journal you can, as long as your paper is a good fit for the journal in terms of quality and content. If you shoot too low, your paper might not get the attention it deserves. If you shoot too high, your paper is likely to be rejected and you may waste precious time in the review process.

*Tip #3 Write a good revision*

Most manuscripts, even the strongest ones, require some revision before being accepted. It's essential that you don't skimp on the revision; although an invitation to resubmit means you made it over the first hurdle, many revisions are ultimately rejected so you need to be very responsive to the critiques offered by the editor and reviewers. In preparing your revision, remember that data speak louder than words. In addressing a particular point, try to provide empirical support, rather than just theory or argumentation. Whether in the form of additional analyses from the studies in the paper, or new data collected from additional participants, supportive findings usually provide a strong case. In addition, devote significant attention to the revision letter. Be exhaustive; address each and every point mentioned by the editor/reviewers and do so in detailed fashion. Be persuasive; explain why the merits of your study outweigh any limitations. And be appreciative; editors and reviewers are people, and they like to feel that their feedback has helped strengthen the paper; adopting a genuinely appreciative attitude can help put things in your favor.

*Tip #2 Have a zen attitude and be persistent.*

Even the best papers usually receive a lot of negative

feedback along the road toward publication, and many good papers are initially rejected. In publishing your work, it's good to develop a thick skin. Don't take negative feedback personally. Negative feedback and rejection should not be viewed as personal tragedies, but as opportunities to learn and enhance your work. Take very seriously the critiques you receive from reviewers and editors and try to learn from their feedback. While there are many important qualities that go into successfully publishing your work (e.g., intelligence, creativity, methodological skill, and so on), the linchpin that ties it all together is persistence. It can take years to bring a research project from the data collection stage to the point of finally being accepted for publication. And there are often many obstacles along the way. Don't give up. The road to publication can sometimes be long and hard, but the payoff is usually worth it.

*Tip #1 Write a lot*

The best predictor of publishing papers is writing papers. There is simply no substitute for spending as much time as you can writing. The book *How to Write a Lot: A Practical Guide to Productive Academic Writing* by psychologist Paul Silvia (and published by the American Psychological Association) provides a number of valuable tips. Schedule solid blocks of time for writing and don't sacrifice those times. A little bit every day goes a long way. Make writing a habit. By writing a lot, not only will you produce a lot of scholarly work, but over time the constant practice will make the writing process easier and easier.

In closing, there are many ingredients for success in scientific publishing, and these tips may help you make the most of your manuscripts. A final tip: Before submitting, ask a colleague to read your paper and ask for *critical* feedback (although kind words such as "great paper!" will give you a boost, they will not help you fine-tune your paper). Try to establish reciprocal relationships with colleagues so that you can help and enhance each other's work. Papers that are clear, even-handed, and tell a strong theoretical story are not only more likely to be published; they are also more likely to be read and cited. Ultimately, such papers have a stronger impact on the field and the writer's own career.

## HUMOR COLUMN

### The Story of Co

by David A. Kenny  
University of Connecticut

As relationship researchers, we study all sorts of relationships. Sophia Jowett and Ben Jackson have each studied coach-athlete dyads, Glenn Adams has studied enemies in Ghana, Sam Gosling has studied human-canine relationships, and Jonathan Cohen has studied para-social relationships a person has with a fictional character. In a *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* paper, I even investigated the fictional relationship between Norm and Cliff from the television show Cheers. However, the relationship between coauthors has not been given much study. This is very surprising as this type of relationship is critical for our own success, as well as for scientific progress.

The most common type of co-authorship is dyadic, about 40 percent according to Nemeth and Goncalo (2005), which is greater than the 32 percent for solo authored papers. Also, there is evidence that the trend is toward work becoming increasingly collaborative. If we think of some of the most important work in our field, co-authored papers and books come to mind: Hazan and Shaver, *Spitzberg* and *Cupach*, Berscheid and Walster, Baxter and Wilmot, and Thibault and Kelley, to name just a few. Of the most cited papers in the *Journal of Personal and Social Relationships*, 5 of the top 10 are two-authored papers, the most highly cited being Rusbult and Buunk (1993). I bet if you check your vitae, you will see that most of your co-authored papers are with just one other person. For me, about half of my papers have one co-author.

One thing inherent in co-authorship is that unlike the other “co’s” such as: cohabitation, co-conspirator, copilot, and coworker, being a coauthor is not a relationship between equals, no matter what might say be said. Authors are always listed in an order, and despite what any footnote says, one person is the

first author and the other is the second. Being first author is a big deal and do not let anyone, especially your major advisor, tell you anything different. Second authors, despite good intentions, often get the short end of the stick. The first author almost always gets more credit and more of the goodies gained from publication. In fact, this has been quantified, and in some systems the first author is given three times more credit than the second author.

Sometimes it can even happen that a second author works harder than the first author. On a paper I wrote with Bella DePaulo, she was second author, but she largely wrote the paper, she gathered the new data for that paper, and she battled the editor, Bob Sternberg, to get the paper into *Psychological Bulletin*, after it had been rejected by *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*. How did Bella end up being the second author? We had agreed to co-author two papers and take turns being first author and she was first author on the first paper and second on the second. Although it is important to agree on order of authorship early in the process, sometimes circumstances change and prior commitments make it difficult to change the order of authorship. In retrospect I feel guilty about what happened, but at the time it never crossed my mind that we should reverse the order of authorship. Things do have a way of equaling out. I have many second-authored papers, where I have done the bulk of the work (or at least I feel that way).

Like any relationship, coauthors can have a breakup. I have twice “dumped” a coauthor, and both times it has been most unpleasant for me, and I imagine even worse for my dumped ex-coauthor. Other times, I have bitten the bullet and not ditch a lazy co-author, when perhaps I should have. I remember a few other times, while editing a manuscript I have added a minor thanks to someone in the acknowledgement section of the paper or in a footnote, only to realize later that the person already was a coauthor. They had contributed so little that I had forgotten they were my co-author. Then, there was a case of someone who was my secret coauthor without my knowing. The nameless person, who was up for tenure, sent off a paper to a major journal listing me as a co-author, and I had no knowledge of the paper. Fortunately, my “co-author” sent me a copy of the paper, and when I requested it, took my name off. Perhaps even stranger, is that I once met a fellow

who insisted we had written a paper together and we never had.

There are clear benefits to having a coauthor. Best is to find coauthors who actually like to do the stuff you hate to do. One of the reasons I love to write papers with Charles Judd or Deborah Kashy is that they are both very detail oriented and work very hard to get things right. Of course, it does not hurt that they are also both very smart and write a lot better than I do. Also, because I am a lousy data gatherer, I need to find people who gather their own data (more on this later). For me, one of the key functions of a coauthor is supplying the other desk to get the damn paper off my desk and onto someone else's. Perhaps the most annoying thing a coauthor can do is to return the paper, with his or her changes, in less than a week. You want conscientious coauthors but not too conscientious ones.

There are several things I hate that some co-authors do: 1) Add or delete references in the text, but not update the bibliography, 2) Cite themselves needlessly. 3) Edit the wrong version of the paper, or edit the paper when they should know that I have not finish editing, 4) Says "Rewrite" or "I do not like this part" without making changes or specific suggestions, 5) Adds a proposed citation that reads "xxxx", 6) Keeping the paper for months, saying they are working on it, but clearly they have not, and 7) They are responsible for an entire section of the paper but write only a few short sentences. I have to admit, I have been guilty of doing all of these things, especially the very last one.

To see an example of authors who were exasperated by a coauthor not finishing an assignment, check out Chapters 8 and 9 of the book *Unobtrusive Measures* by Webb et al (1966). They gave up waiting for Donald Campbell to write those chapters, and they decided to include only the chapter title and an opening quote, but no text!

How do you find a coauthor? It is a little like finding a date. One of my colleagues found a coauthor at a bar during a conference. Of course, people find most collaborators who work with them as students, postdocs, supervisors, or colleagues. People sometimes write papers with a sibling (e.g., the Fiskes) and I have written one with my daughter. People often write papers with their spouse, e.g., the

Sarasons and the Arons, a thought that does not appeal much to me. If I wrote a paper with my spouse, then who would I complain to about my indolent, apathetic and obtuse coauthor? Earlier I mentioned that I need others to collect data. Of course, my students have been my major source, but I have often sent "cold" letters to people requesting data. The first dataset that I obtained was from Timothy Curry at Ohio State when I was a graduate student and Timothy was coauthor, actually first author, on the paper. I milked that dataset nicely, using it three more times, once some 25 years later. I once found a coauthor after giving a talk at a conference. Zipora Shechtman heard me speak, after the talk we planned a study, and she did all of the data gathering work in Israel.

You might be tempted to seek out a coauthor to take advantage of the halo effect. If you can coauthor a paper with someone famous, perhaps some of the fame of that person will shine on you. No doubt such a phenomenon occurs. One problem with coauthoring papers with famous people is very often they are too busy and they do little or no to work on your paper. So, you end up doing almost everything. I remember once writing a paper with someone eminent who contributed almost nothing except to suggest adding a few sentences here and there. When the paper came back after review, the reviewers mainly wanted us to take out those sentences. Also the fame of a famous coauthor may shine so brightly, that no one will even notice you. All too often in two-authored papers, the less senior or renowned person gets little or no credit even if the celebrity is the second author.

However, contrast effects can sometimes occur. If you write a good paper with someone who had a less than stellar reputation, you might get even more of the credit. I will never forget a comment made by Tom Pettigrew. After we heard a social psychologist, who had written a well-known coauthored textbook, give a boring and virtually incomprehensible talk, Tom told me he now had an increased respect for the speaker's coauthor. No doubt after reading this column, your opinion of Reuben Baron will have been greatly enhanced.

## BOOK REVIEWS

**The Forgotten Kin: Aunts and Uncles**  
By Robert M. Milardo (2010)  
Cambridge. 224 pp.

Reviewed by Dan Perlman  
University of North Carolina at Greensboro

Have you ever had a favorite aunt or uncle? Niece or nephew? Think about that relationship. What was it like? If you were studying these relations, what would you want to know?

In the preface of his volume, *The Forgotten Kin*, Robert (Bob) Milardo begins by telling about his family of origins. He had seven aunts and five uncles, all living within a short distance of his own parents' home. Bob writes:

I was raised in a typical Italian-American family. It was large and sociable. ...I had a passel of second mothers and fathers who were encouraging, supportive, interested, playful, and always there. There were exceptions. There always are....From my parents perspective.... I suspect they would view their siblings as part occasional irritation, part fun, and in a larger part supportive of themselves, their parenting, and their children. But most important for my parents, their siblings were central to the mix of ingredients that defined what it meant to be a family. (pp. xi and xii)

Bob's personal experiences are a harbinger of what he would find in investigating aunts' and uncles' relationships with their nieces and nephews (hereafter "ANUN" relations). He paints a picture with a few dark spots but dominated by warmth and support. As he says "there is little question of a decidedly generative culture of aunting and uncling" (p. xiv).

Bob's title, *The Forgotten Kin*, comes from the fact that ANUN relations are largely ignored in the family literature. In a review of ten leading family textbooks, Bob found no mention of aunts and uncles. The study of aunts and uncles is in its infancy.

Derlega and Margulis (1982) described three overlapping stages in concept development. In the

first stage, proponents justify a concept by observations, cases, and preliminary studies that demonstrate its importance and viability. In the second stage, researchers accept the importance of a concept and attempt to explicate it further, in part by showing similarities and differences between it and related concepts. In the third stage, scholars give concepts theoretical definitions and articulate interlocking propositions (i.e., theories useful in predicting and understanding the concept). *Forgotten Kin* is mostly in the first and somewhat in the second stage of concept development (or examining a phenomenon).

Bob used qualitative interviews with 104 unrelated aunts, uncles, nieces and nephews as the basis of his exploration of ANUN relationships. He focused solely on same-sex relations (i.e., aunts' relations with nieces and uncles' relations with nephews). His sample consisted of individuals from New Zealand and the U.S. Bob's participants were primarily — but not exclusively — white and heterosexual. The U.S. subsample contained a smattering of French Canadians and two Native Americans. Obviously, this sample isn't nationally representative nor a suitable basis for sophisticated statistical analyses. He had informants discuss their relationship with a "favorite" ANUN. I suspect that choice leads to a portrait of ANUN relationships that are closer and stronger than would asking about the range of ANUN relations. Nonetheless, Bob's procedures were well suited for the early stage of investigating a phenomenon. They provide him with a rich basis for describing ANUN relations.

I believe good description is highly valuable. Focusing on describing a phenomenon can lead to better understanding and form the basis for later hypothesis generation and theory building.

*Forgotten Kin* is aimed toward a broad audience of researchers, students, family counselors, specialists in family policy, and the like. Bob has a nice writing style: clear, easy to follow, seeped with personal narratives, and humorous as well as wise in spots. He has an extensive, balanced knowledge of the literature on family and close relationships. He judiciously used this knowledge to help guide and interpret his work.

The book is divided into 9 chapters. In Chapter 1,

Bob reviews the literature that helped frame his study. He covers work on kinship, intergenerational solidarity, generativity, the role of geography in predicting closeness, sibling relations, and the role of gender in kinkeeping. Chapter 2 describes the study that Bob conducted. Chapter 3 provides a snap shot of the basic features of ANUN relations: how often they are in contact, the activities in which they engage, four key forces that influence how close their relationships are (relationships between other family members, careers/obligations, personal conditions such as childlessness, and family norms), etc. Chapter 4 addresses the question of major types of roles that aunts and uncles have (e.g., third parties with a unique perspective, adjuncts to parents, surrogate parents).

Chapters 5 through 7 deal with generativity, or concern with future generations. Chapter 5 is on mentoring, a classic form of being concerned about future generations. In Chapter 6 on family work, Bob includes those things that help family members develop or sustain their relationships and their family culture. This typically occurs via talking about family members, telling family stories and/or instances when family members mediate between members, support one another or criticize each other. Chapter 7 is on friendship. Bob sees the lines between kinship and friendship as blurred with ANUN relations often involving elements of friendship that are intertwined with generativity.

In his classic view, Erik Erikson considered generativity a stage in the life cycle. Bob has a different view of generativity in that he does not see it as stage-specific but instead sees it as bi-directional. Nieces and nephews can at times influence their aunts and uncles (e.g., think of getting a younger family member to help you with your computer). In delinking generativity from a specific life stage, Bob joins other contemporary lifespan developmental theorists in believing that varied factors can foster generativity (e.g., personal choice, parental status, health, economic and political climates, cultural beliefs, etc.).

Chapter 8 on the “social reproduction of aunts and uncles” covers how people form beliefs about these roles and are socialized into them. Bob emphasizes the discussions people have, especially with family members, and how the behaviors of one’s own aunts

and uncles serve as a model for how one enacts the role. Chapter 9 summarizes previous points. Bob offers further reflections on generativity, and argues against the limited view of the family as a couple and their children. He quotes Holmberg, Orbuch and Veroff (2004) that “Marriage is not a duet but rather a complex orchestral arrangement in which many different people’s needs and preferences must be considered and negotiated” (p. 154). Among those people whose needs must be accommodated are aunts, uncle, nieces and nephews.

In conclusion, Bob Milardo has written what is the most thorough, comprehensive family studies analysis to date of the relationships between aunts, uncles, nieces and nephews. He has richly described ANUN relations and answered key, basic questions about them. He is a scholar with a deep knowledge of research on the family yet his text will be enjoyed by a broad audience. He is trailblazer whose book widens and extends the path into ANUN relations. I recommend it for its depiction of those relations and for the possibility that you will be among those who further develop scholarship on this topic.

Derlega, V. J. & Margulis, S. T. (1982). Why loneliness occurs: The interrelationship of social-psychological and privacy concepts. In L. A. Peplau & D. Perlman (Eds.), *Loneliness: A sourcebook of current theory, research and therapy* (pp. 152-165). New York: John Wiley.

Holmberg, D., Orbuch, T. L., & Veroff, J. (2004). *Thrice-told tales: Married couples tell their stories*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

---

Interdependent Minds: The Dynamics of  
Close Relationships  
By Sandra L. Murray and John G. Holmes  
(2011)  
New York, NY: The Guilford Press, 402 pp.

Reviewed by Nancy E. Frye  
Long Island University

While reading *Interdependent Minds*, something very unexpected happened: I started having flashbacks to learning about signal detection theory

as an undergraduate. This seems like a strange thing to have happened while reading a book about romantic relationships. However, *Interdependent Minds* discusses the implicit “if-then” rules that people develop and apply throughout their relationships. As people develop these rules (and determine whether or not to apply them in particular situations), signal detection ideas come into play, as people must work to determine whether their partner’s behavior is really a signal about feelings concerning the relationship or noise due to extra-relationship factors such as stress at work.

Using this basic premise of “if-then” rules (e.g., “if I walk in front of the television while my partner’s favorite football game is on, then he will throw his hands in the air in exasperation and blame me if they miss a touchdown”), Murray and Holmes discuss issues including individual differences in what sorts of rules people develop, how rules may change with time and circumstances, and possible differences between conscious and unconscious rules. To help illustrate these ideas, Murray and Holmes use four couples who each follow various patterns involving personality, external stress, and relationship expectations. This relatively simple and straightforward premise of pattern and rule-detection leads to many intriguing and intricate predictions concerning how various relationship outcomes may develop.

The wide array of relationship concerns that the authors address using this theme of if-then rules includes balancing of the desire to commit and connect with someone else with the desire to avoid taking a gamble on being hurt by one’s partner; the role of personality and similarity; and the role of relationship context. Through it all, the underlying theme is that partners use the expected consequences of different courses of behavior in order to decide what to do. These expected consequences may be conscious or unconscious. For instance, the authors mention Sally, who is debating whether she should refill an ice tray which her husband emptied, or ask him to do it. This one seemingly simple event allows Murray and Holmes to address how personal and relationship history feed into expectations, which, in turn, color behavior.

The book is organized into 12 chapters, with the first two chapters describing the basic tenants of the model. Within these chapters, Murray and Holmes

note that, through the development and implementation of if-then rules on the part of each partner, the relationship itself begins to develop its own unique personality. Murray and Holmes return to this idea later in the book, discussing the fact that the relationships of the same person may have markedly different personalities, depending on the partner in each of the relationships.

In chapters 3 and 4, Murray and Holmes note the importance of trust and commitment. In fact, they note that finding a partner whose commitment can be trusted is crucial – more crucial than finding a partner who meets some idealized set of traits. They point out that partners who seek those who meet an idealized set of traits risk having lower levels of commitment, as they may constantly be on the lookout for people who better meet that set of traits. Instead, they note the importance of people acting in ways that ensure that their partners need them, and they describe data that show how people may strategically do this by being especially likely to act in a way that makes their partner dependent on them following times when they start to question whether they deserve their partner. In these chapters, Murray and Holmes note and describe effects that can be, on the face of them, surprising, such as people valuing their partner more after their partner has been particularly frustrating to live with.

In chapter 5, Murray and Holmes tackle conflicts of interest between partners. They describe categories of different types of conflicts within romantic relationships (e.g., coordination, zero-sum) and note the applicability of the Prisoner’s dilemma to romantic relationships. This application is so appropriate and so intuitively appealing that it took me several minutes as I was reading to realize that it is an application that is only rarely made to romantic relationships.

In chapters 6 and 7, Murray and Holmes thoroughly discuss the advantages, and the risks, of acting in ways that increase one’s commitment to one’s partner, signal one’s commitment, increase one’s dependence on the relationship, and increase one’s partner’s dependence on the relationship. Included in the discussion is a distinction between automatically and consciously activated goals and behaviors. In chapter 8, the authors note how relationship behaviors and responses (i.e., relationship specific if-

then rules) create a unique personality for each relationship, which could include partners living relatively separate lives, partners living quite intertwined lives, or partners turning every interaction and decision into a battle.

In chapters 9 and 10, Murray and Holmes discuss how the initial positive interactions and experiences of early relationships, which prompt partners to become more committed and dependent on each other, shift to a motivation to avoid feeling hurt and too dependent as the tunnel-vision attraction of the relationship wanes and concerns of life become more forefront in partners' minds.

In chapter 11, Murray and Holmes discuss the full picture of the relationship, including both partners and the situation in which the partners find themselves. They note that the characteristics of the relationship are not simply a sum of the partners and the situation. Instead, they discuss how the context and the partners (including their background and past experiences) combine together to create a relationship that has a unique set of rules and expectations. In some ways, relationships, and behaviors within relationships, are an accidental mixing of two people and the situation.

In chapter 12, Murray and Holmes apply the ideas of the book as they discuss possible ways to improve relationships, and ways in which people can maximize the chances that their relationship will bring them joy and minimize the chances for sorrow and hurt feelings.

This book would work well as a text in a graduate course focused on therapy, since it does a nice job of discussing the possible real-world implications of research findings. Because of this, its use might serve well to stimulate discussion and debate. It is also a book that is useful for researchers and laypeople alike, as it does a nice job tying together research findings, explicitly making connections, and speculating on possible implications of various theoretical ideas and research findings. It may even be of interest to signal detection theorists in search of interesting possible applications of signal/noise ideas. In short, it is a book that is likely to inspire ideas and connections, which is perhaps fitting for a book about how interdependent people can be.

## JOURNALS UPDATE

### A Report on Personal Relationships

by Lorne Campbell  
University of Western Ontario,  
Canada

My editorial team is now well into our fourth and final year of processing new submissions to PR. We will hand over the reins to a new editorial team June 1, 2012 (I imagine the board will begin the process of seeking a new editor in the near future), but we will continue to process manuscripts submitted up to that time and fill issues through the year 2013. It has certainly been a busy few years for me, my fellow editors, and of course reviewers. We began by moving the submission and review process online, and have recently adopted Early View to publish accepted manuscripts online ahead of in print. This year we published a special issue on mind-body connections with the assistance of guest editor Timothy Loving. We have also continued to process a large number of submissions to the journal each year, reflecting the global strength and diversity of the field of relationship science. To deal with the backlog of accepted manuscript not yet appearing in print, we received approval from the board of directors to purchase additional pages from the publisher for the September and December issues of PR. Ensuring the smooth operation of the journal requires the coordination of different groups of dedicated individuals, and therefore I would like to thank my tireless associate editors, the wonderful group of people at Wiley-Blackwell, the officers and board members of IARR, my editorial assistant Rachel Harvey, and of course the reviewers that volunteer their time.

#### Basic Statistics for the Journal

Our editorial team began receiving manuscripts on June 1, 2008, and to date we have received a total of 673 original submissions. In our first year we received 171 original submissions, in our second year we received 224 original submissions, and in

our third year we received 219 submissions. At the time of writing (September 13, 2011), we have received 59 submissions since June 1, 2011. As noted above, PR continues to be a popular outlet for research on close relationships.

Of the 673 manuscripts submitted to PR since 2008, we have made final decisions on 617 manuscripts (or 91% of all submissions). A total of 122 manuscripts have been accepted for publication, meaning that our acceptance rate is currently 21% (the acceptance rate has held fairly steady since our editorial team began processing manuscripts). In terms of diversity of authorship, 62% of all original submissions since June 1, 2008 have come from scholars based in the United States. We have received submissions from 40 different countries, and it is encouraging that we continue to receive submissions representing a wide range of countries and cultures. Consistent with prior trends, 61% of all manuscripts accepted for publication to date are from scholars based in the United States, a percentage very similar to the proportion of US based scholars submitting their work to PR.

Overall, our editorial team continues to efficiently process manuscripts. The average number of days from submission to first decision for submitted manuscripts is 81 days (close to 3 months). The average reviewer turnaround time is 33 days for original manuscripts, and 30 days for revised manuscripts. Lastly, the average number of days from submission to our team making a final decision on manuscripts is 82 days. Thank you to everyone that has assisted with the submission/review process!

I am well aware that the numbers presented above are averages. Authors who receive feedback more quickly than average, or near average times, are probably more satisfied with the efficiency of the review process than those who wait longer for feedback. In some instances the time to first decision is longer than we would like for a number of reasons. As always, we do our best to provide feedback to every submitting author in a timely manner.

## Tentative Contents of Upcoming Journals

### *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships* November 2011 [Volume 28 #7] Table of Contents

ANGELIQUE M. JERGA, PHILLIP R. SHAVER &  
ROSS B. WILKINSON

Attachment insecurities and identification of at-risk individuals following the death of a loved one

KATHERINE PÉLOQUIN, MARIE-FRANCE  
LAFONTAINE & AUDREY BRASSARD

A dyadic approach to the study of romantic attachment, dyadic empathy, and psychological partner aggression

KAREN MUI-TENG QUEK, CARMEN  
KNUDSON-MARTIN, SEAN ORPEN & JASON  
VICTOR

Gender equality during the transition to parenthood: A longitudinal study of dual-career couples in Singapore

IZASKUN ORUE & ESTHER CALVETE

Reciprocal relationships between sociometric indices of social status and aggressive behavior in children: Gender differences

PAUL SCHRODT

Stepparents' and nonresidential parents' relational satisfaction as a function of coparental communication in stepfamilies

GRACE H. CHUNG, M. BELINDA TUCKER,  
GANG LI, XIAOMENG ZHOU & SUN HWANG

Exploratory analysis of verbal aggression in romantic relationships among unmarried men and women: Predictive patterns by gender and race

---

### *Personal Relationships* September 2011 [Volume 18 #3] Table of Contents

OR IZHAKI-COSTI & YAACOV SCHUL

I do not know you and I am keeping it that way: Attachment avoidance and empathic accuracy in the perception of strangers

JESSICA L. BORELLI, DAVID A. SBARRA,  
MATTHIAS MEHL, & DARYN H. DAVID  
Experiential connectedness in children's attachment  
interviews: An examination of natural word use

PAUL SCHRODT & DAWN O. BRAITHWAITE  
Coparental communication, relational satisfaction,  
and mental health in stepfamilies

AMY CANEVELLO & JENNIFER CROCKER  
Changing relationship growth belief: Intrapersonal  
and interpersonal consequences of compassionate  
goals

HEIDI R. RIGGIO & ANN MARIE  
VALENZUELA  
Parental marital conflict and divorce, parent-child  
relationships, and social support among Latino-  
American young adults

MING CUI, FRANK D. FINCHAM, & JARED A.  
DURTSCHI  
The effect of parental divorce on young adults'  
romantic relationship dissolution: What makes a  
difference?

ROLAND IMHOFF & RAINER BANSE  
Implicit and explicit attitudes toward ex-partners  
differentially predict breakup adjustment

SAM G. B. ROBERTS & ROBIN I. M. DUNBAR  
Communication in social networks: Effects of  
kinship, network size, and emotional closeness

COLIN HESSE & KORY FLOYD  
The impact of alexithymia on initial interactions

NANCY E. FRYE  
Responding to problems: The roles of severity and  
barriers

SHANNON E. MYRICK & GABRIELA A.  
MARTORELL  
Sticks and stones may break by bones: Protective  
factors for the effects of perceived discrimination on  
social competence in adolescence

DIANE HOLMBERG, CHRISTINE D. LOMORE,  
TRISTA A. TAKACS, & E. LISA PRICE  
Adult attachment styles and stressor severity as  
moderators of the coping sequence

## ANNOUNCEMENTS



THE INTERNATIONAL  
ASSOCIATION FOR  
RELATIONSHIP RESEARCH  
CONFERENCE  
July 12 – 16, 2012  
Chicago, Illinois

On behalf of the International Association for Relationship Research (IARR), we offer an invitation to submit a proposal for presentation at the 2012 conference to be held at the Palmer House Hilton and DePaul Loop Campus in Chicago, Illinois. The conference will provide an opportunity to present and learn about cutting-edge research in the field of personal relationships. Scholars from different countries representing a broad range of disciplines (e.g., psychology, sociology, communication, family studies, gerontology) will gather at the conference to share their work in various formats (e.g., symposia, papers, posters, round table discussions).

IARR conferences provide rich opportunities for professional growth, education, and conversations with colleagues who have similar professional interests. Please consider joining colleagues for five days of networking in beautiful downtown Chicago. Invited speakers include Margaret Clark, Pearl Dykstra, Julie Fitness, Jacki Fitzpatrick, Brian Spitzberg, and Anita Vangelisti.

**Submissions:** The Program Committee invites proposals for symposia, papers, posters, roundtables, and interest groups on topics relevant to research and practice in social and personal relationships. Detailed

information about the conference (e.g., how to submit proposals, how to register for the conference) is available on the conference website (<http://iarr2012conference.com/>).

Submissions should be sent electronically via the conference website beginning November 1, 2011. The deadline for submissions is December 15, 2011.

Program: *Sandra Metts* and *Lesley Verhofstadt*, Program Committee co-chairs, can answer your questions about the program. Please feel free to contact them via email if you have questions/comments about the conference program or the Call for Submissions ([iarr2012program@gmail.com](mailto:iarr2012program@gmail.com)).

Local Arrangements: *Leah Bryant*, *Susan Sprecher*, and *Ralph Erber*, Local Arrangements Committee co-chairs, can address questions about the local community and conference arrangements. Please feel free to contact them via email if you have questions/comments about local arrangements ([iarr2012chicago@gmail.com](mailto:iarr2012chicago@gmail.com)).

### SUBMISSION FORMATS

Submissions must be submitted between November 1 and December 15, 2011. Each submission will be blind-reviewed by relationship scholars from various disciplines and geographic regions. Reviewers will evaluate the submissions for quality and conference fit. A description of the types of submissions and the procedure for submitting proposals is presented below.

**Paper:** An oral presentation (approximately 10-15 minutes) that summarizes an empirical investigation or theoretical analysis of a topic.

**Symposium:** A collection of oral presentations (3 to 5) that focus on a single topic, problem, or theme, from an empirical and/or theoretical perspective. The symposium may also include a discussant who integrates and critiques the presentations.

**Poster:** A visual presentation (on a 4' by 8' poster) which summarizes an empirical investigation or theoretical analysis of a topic.

**Roundtable:** A one-hour discussion on a specific

theme or issue. The roundtable is led by one or two speakers. The speaker(s) could begin with a 10-15 minute presentation that introduces the topic and/or provide(s) materials that help define the issues. Colleagues who attend the roundtable sessions will have opportunities to participate in the discussions.

**Interest Group Meeting:** An opportunity for scholars with common interests and questions to engage in discussion. The group meetings provide opportunities for colleagues to share ideas, ask questions, and explore research initiatives for the purpose of building networks.

### SUBMISSION REQUIREMENTS

1. For panel papers and posters, please submit a 250-word abstract. For a symposium, submit a 300-word overview of the symposium summary and a 250-word abstract for each paper. When submitting a symposium, the convener should upload the abstracts for each author under the online symposium option. For roundtables and interest groups, please submit a 250-word summary of the proposed discussion topic (in lieu of the traditional abstract). The summary should identify the goals and potential benefits of the roundtable and interest group. For interest groups to be scheduled, at least three individuals must co-author the submission.

2. Submissions must be sent electronically by December 15, 2011 via the conference website <http://iarr2012conference.com/>. The conference website will provide more detailed information on electronic submission guidelines and procedures.

3. Please periodically log onto the IARR website ([www.iarr.org](http://www.iarr.org)) and the conference website (<http://iarr2012conference.com/>) for more information about submissions, conference registration, and local arrangements. If you know of others interested in relationship research, please forward this message to them, and also suggest they register for the IARR 2012 conference.

## CALL FOR PROPOSALS



International Association for Relationship Research

### Call for Proposals 2013 Mini-Conferences

The Future Conferences Committee (FCC) of the International Association for Relationship Research (IARR) invites proposals to a host regional, thematic, or graduate student / new professional conference to be held in 2013. The deadline for submission is November 1, 2011.

Hosting an IARR conference is an excellent way to showcase your school and your city. It also provides your team with the opportunity to develop new organizational skills, and establish contacts with the business community in your area. Based on past conferences, you can project a financial impact of several hundreds of thousands of dollars on the local economy.

Proposals to host a 2013 mini-conference can be submitted by an individual or a small group of individuals, but all applicants must be IARR members. Proposals will be evaluated according to three criteria: (a) potential for interest among IARR members; (b) capacity to provide opportunities for education, collaboration, and networking among attendees; and (c) ability to generate revenue equal to expenses (i.e., all mini-conferences must be self-funded). Proposals will be reviewed by members of the Future Conferences Committee and the IARR Board.

A proposal to host a 2013 mini-conference should contain the following information:

1. Name, title, and contact information of applicants. Include mailing address, telephone number, fax number, and e-mail address for all applicants. Designate one or more applicants to serve as the Local Arrangements Chair or Co-Chairs. (In the case of a single Local Arrangements Chair, designate a second applicant willing to take charge if the Local Arrangements chair is unable to fulfill his or her duties.)

2. Theme. Explicate the theme of the conference. Discuss how the theme fits into the mission of IARR.
3. Site. Include city, state or province, and country. Specify the physical site of the conference, such as a university campus or a conference center. Provide a brief description of the ambience and amenities of the site. Describe the transportation options for traveling between the local airport and the site.
4. Proposed dates.
5. Projected number of attendees.
6. Any possible co-sponsors. Estimate their degree of financial involvement.
7. Major venues. Include descriptions of the following:
  - a. Meeting places, including rooms for plenary sessions and paper sessions.
  - b. Eating facilities, including cafeterias, banquet halls, and restaurants in the vicinity.
  - c. Lodging facilities, including local hotels, dormitories, and on-site housing. Describe any low-cost housing options.
8. Any stipends offered to invited speakers and / or students.
9. Projected costs of travel and lodging. Provide current airfares from gateway cities around the world (i.e., Beijing, Sydney, Chicago, Montreal, Buenos Aires, London, and Cairo). Estimate lodging costs for participants. Describe any low-cost housing options.
10. Projected registration fee. The fee structure should include (a) a rate for members of IARR; (b) a rate for non-members of IARR; (c) a rate for graduate students; and (d) a rate for participants from underrepresented countries (based on World Bank classifications).
11. Projected budget. Complete and attach the *Mini-Conferences Budget Form* available on the IARR website ([www.iarr.org](http://www.iarr.org)). Estimate revenue (from registration fees, co-sponsors, etc.) and costs (for venue, meals, equipment rentals, conference program, speaker honorariums, etc.). Provide both overall and itemized estimates of revenues and costs.
12. Projected Sponsorship. Report the money and services that your school, local business community, and others will provide to defray the cost of the conference

To apply, please submit a proposal and a completed budget form via e-mail attachment to Omri Gillath, PhD, Chair of the Future Conferences Committee (ogillath@ku.edu) by November 1st, 2011. Please direct any questions regarding submission or proposal preparation to him.



International Association for Relationship Research

## Call for Proposals 2014 Conference

The Future Conferences Committee (FCC) of the International Association for Relationship Research (IARR) invites preliminary proposals to host the 2014 conference. The deadline for submission is November 1st, 2011.

Proposals to host the 2014 conference can be submitted by an individual or a small group of individuals, but all applicants must be IARR members. Applicants will act as Local Arrangements Chair (or Co-Chairs) for the conference. The Local Arrangements Chair will be responsible for coordinating the venue, meeting spaces, lodging, and meals for the conference. (The Local Arrangements Chair will also work closely with the Program Chair, an elected IARR member who is responsible for developing the program.)

The FCC will begin by reviewing preliminary proposals. The preliminary proposals contain only the most essential information needed to evaluate potential conference sites. After screening preliminary proposals, the FCC may solicit a full proposal. The full proposal contains the detailed information the IARR Board needs to make a final decision about the conference location.

The 2014 conference can be held in either a North American location or a non-North American location. The estimated conference attendance is approximately 350-450 people.

A preliminary proposal to host the 2014 conference should contain the following information:

1. Name, title, and contact information of applicants. Include mailing address, telephone number, fax number, and e-mail address for all applicants. Designate one or more applicants willing to serve as the Local Arrangements Chair or Co-Chairs. (In the case of a single Local Arrangements Chair, designate a second applicant willing to take charge if the Local Arrangements chair is unable to fulfill his or her duties.)
2. Site. Include city, state or province, and country. Specify the physical site of the conference, such as a university campus or a conference center. Provide a brief description of the ambience and amenities of the site. Describe the transportation options for traveling between the local airport and the site.
3. Proposed dates. Specify the proposed dates of the event. The conference is usually held during a 4-5 day period in July, which is a reasonably convenient time for most IARR members.
4. Proposed schedule. Provide a preliminary outline of the conference schedule. Include time for lunches, dinners, coffee breaks, approximately six plenary sessions (90 minutes in length), and approximately eight paper / poster sessions (90 minutes in length). (Note: The Local Arrangements Chair(s) will work closely with the program planner on the final schedule to accommodate the number of submissions accepted for presentation.)
5. Major venues. Include descriptions of the following:
  - a. Meeting places, including (a) auditoriums for plenary sessions; (b) a central area for breaks between sessions; (c) large rooms for symposia, book exhibits, registration, and poster sessions (with the capacity to house at least 70 posters); and (d) smaller rooms for paper sessions and interest groups.
  - b. Presentation equipment, including access to (a) overhead projectors; (b) computers for power point presentations; (c) computer projectors for power point presentations; and (d) poster stands for poster sessions.
  - c. Eating facilities, including cafeterias, dining rooms, and banquet halls.

- d. Lodging facilities, including local hotels, dormitories, and on-site housing. Describe any low-cost housing options.
6. Hospitality. Describe plans for lunches, dinners, and coffee breaks. Traditionally, all lunches and at least two dinners are served in community to encourage interaction among attendees. One coffee break in the morning and one coffee break in the afternoon (with beverages and light snacks) also should be included in the registration fee.
7. Awards dinner. Include plans for an awards dinner with a social event (typically a dance) afterwards. The awards dinner can be included in the registration fee or available at an additional cost.
8. Optional excursion. Describe plans for an optional excursion (if desired). This excursion should not be included as part of the registration fee.
9. Projected costs of travel and lodging. Provide current airfares from gateway cities around the world (i.e., Beijing, Sydney, Chicago, Montreal, Buenos Aires, London, and Cairo). Estimate lodging costs for participants (for both regular and low-cost housing options).
10. Projected registration fee. The fee structure should include (a) a rate for members of IARR; (b) a rate for non-members of IARR; (c) a rate for graduate students; and (d) a rate for participants from underrepresented countries (based on World Bank classifications).
11. Projected budget. Complete and attach the *Main Conference Budget Form* available on the IARR website ([www.iarr.org](http://www.iarr.org)). Estimate revenue (from registration fees, co-sponsors, etc.) and costs (for venue, meals, equipment rentals, conference program, speaker honorariums, etc.). Provide both overall and itemized estimates of revenues and costs.

To apply, please submit a proposal and a completed budget form via e-mail attachment to Omri Gillath, PhD, Chair of the Future Conferences Committee ([ogillath@ku.edu](mailto:ogillath@ku.edu)) by November 1st, 2011. Please direct any questions regarding submission or proposal preparation to him.

## Assistant/Associate Professor Position

### Department Of Human Development And Family Studies Auburn University

**POSITION & AVAILABILITY:** Auburn University's Department of Human Development and Family Studies invites applications for one (1) nine month tenure track position at the Assistant or Associate level to begin August 16, 2012. Women and minorities are encouraged to apply.

**RESPONSIBILITIES:** Responsibilities include teaching undergraduate and graduate courses, directing theses/dissertations, and maintaining an active program of scholarly research, including publishing and securing extramural support for research from federal, state, or private organizations.

**QUALIFICATIONS:** We seek candidates with an earned doctorate in human development, family studies, or a closely related discipline, whose ongoing research and teaching will strengthen the Department's main area of focus: interpersonal competence and relationship dynamics across the life-span. Special consideration will be given to candidates who successfully bridge two or more of these areas: (1) social/emotional development and health in the context of interpersonal and family functioning, (2) family studies with an emphasis on factors and processes that underlie the development of interpersonal competence, (3) evaluation of social policy affecting children and families, or (4) research design and statistical expertise (e.g., SEM, growth modeling, dyadic analyses). Successful candidates will demonstrate a sophisticated understanding of multiple research methods for assessing human development and family relationships.

**THE DEPARTMENT:** The Department includes 17 full-time faculty, 300 undergraduates, and 50 graduate students and offers undergraduate, masters, and doctoral degrees. It also administers a Center for Children, Youth, and Families, a Marriage and Family Therapy Center, the Auburn University Early Learning Center, and the Harris Early Learning Center of Birmingham.

**THE UNIVERSITY:** Auburn University is a land-

grant institution with a multicultural student enrollment of more than 26,000. The University provides instruction in approximately 70 academic departments and maintains graduate research and public service programs. The University is located in the city of Auburn in east-central Alabama near several large metropolitan areas of Alabama and Georgia.

**APPLICATIONS:** Send a letter of application, curriculum vitae, and samples of recent publications (no more than 3) to: [HDFS-Position@Auburn.edu](mailto:HDFS-Position@Auburn.edu). Please submit three (3) reference letters to Dr. Margaret K. Keiley, Chair, Search Committee, Department of Human Development and Family Studies, 203 Spidle Hall, Auburn University, AL 36849, (334) 844-4151, FAX (334) 844-4515. Review of applications will begin October 15, 2011, and continue until a suitable candidate is selected and recommended for appointment. A successful candidate must meet eligibility requirements to work in the U.S. by the date the appointment is scheduled to begin and must be able to communicate effectively in English.

*Auburn University Is An Affirmative Action Equal Opportunity Employer*

---

## MEMBER NEWS & UPDATES

### Psychology professors win prestigious lifetime achievement award

University of Hawai'i at Mānoa psychology professor Elaine Hatfield and University of Minnesota's Ellen Berscheid were recently named recipients of the 2012 Association for Psychological Science's (APS) William James Award for a lifetime of significant intellectual contributions to the basic science of psychology.

Awarded since 1989, the William James Award is a lifetime achievement award for basic research and is the highest honor conferred by APS. Award recipients must be recognized internationally for their outstanding contributions to scientific psychology. James was one of the most influential pioneer theorists in psychology and commonly referred to as the father of modern psychology.

---

James Giles, La Trobe University, has recently published an article in *Biological Theory* that maybe of interest to many of our readers and has received some recent media attention. A brief description of this work is listed below but check out the article at:

Giles, J. (2010). Naked Love: The Evolution of Human Hairlessness. *Biological Theory*, 5(4), 326–336.

Dr. Giles argues that human nakedness has its origin in the ancestral mother-infant relation. Skin-to-skin contact between mother and infant was experienced as affectionate and pleasurable by the mother. This would have encouraged ancestral females to bear their infants, which was essential for the infant's survival because with the advent of bipedalism, infants could no longer hold onto the mother. Dr. Giles argues that The Naked Love Theory also helps to explain the evolutionary origins of romantic love.

---



IARR  
BOARD

---

## IARR OFFICERS

## President

Christopher R. Agnew  
[agnew@psych.purdue.edu](mailto:agnew@psych.purdue.edu)

## Vice-President &amp; President- Elect

Dan Perlman  
[d\\_perlma@uncg.edu](mailto:d_perlma@uncg.edu)

## Past-President

Anita Vangelisti  
[a.vangelisti@mail.utexas.edu](mailto:a.vangelisti@mail.utexas.edu)

## Secretary &amp; Treasurer

Brooke Feeney  
[bfeeney@andrew.cmu.edu](mailto:bfeeney@andrew.cmu.edu)

## BOARD MEMBERS

Lesley Verhofstadt (2010 Conference Program  
Committee Co-Chair)  
[lesley.verhofstadt@uclouvain.be](mailto:lesley.verhofstadt@uclouvain.be)

Sandra Metts (Publications Committee Chair; 2010  
Conference Program Committee Co-Chair)  
[smmetts@ilstu.edu](mailto:smmetts@ilstu.edu)

Ximena Arriaga (Member-at-Large)  
[arriaga@psych.purdue.edu](mailto:arriaga@psych.purdue.edu)

Emily Impett (Member-at-Large)  
[emily.impett@utoronto.ca](mailto:emily.impett@utoronto.ca)

Laura Miller (New Professional Representative)  
[lmille41@utk.edu](mailto:lmille41@utk.edu)

## COMMITTEE CHAIRS

Stanley Gaines (Membership)  
[sogainesjr@yahoo.com](mailto:sogainesjr@yahoo.com)

Leah Bryant (Mentoring)  
[lbryant2@depaul.edu](mailto:lbryant2@depaul.edu)

Bjarne Holmes (Media Relations)  
[B.M.Holmes@hw.ac.uk](mailto:B.M.Holmes@hw.ac.uk)

William Dragon (Website)  
[WDragon@cornellcollege.edu](mailto:WDragon@cornellcollege.edu)

Omri Gillath (Future Conferences)  
[ogillath@ku.edu](mailto:ogillath@ku.edu)

Gery Karantzas (International)  
[gery.karantzas@deakin.edu.au](mailto:gery.karantzas@deakin.edu.au)

C. Raymond Knee (Awards Committee)  
[Knee@UH.EDU](mailto:Knee@UH.EDU)

## EDITORS

Mario Mikulincer  
(Journal of Social and Personal Relationships)  
[mario@idc.ac.il](mailto:mario@idc.ac.il)

Lorne Campbell  
(Personal Relationships)  
[Personal\\_Relationships@uncg.edu](mailto:Personal_Relationships@uncg.edu)

Marian Morry  
(Relationship Research News)  
[marian\\_morry@umanitoba.ca](mailto:marian_morry@umanitoba.ca)