

RELATIONSHIP RESEARCH NEWS

OFFICIAL NEWS JOURNAL OF THE INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR RELATIONSHIP RESEARCH

SPRING 2003

VOL 1, NO. 2

PRESIDENT'S COLUMN

Robert Milardo

By any measure our first year of operation is turning out to be one of many achievements. As an organization, IARR hit the ground running, all due to the outstanding efforts of your board of directors, committee chairs, editors, and volunteers.

Under the leadership of our Program Chair, Scott Christopher, IARR will sponsor our first professional workshop for students and new professionals in June at Arizona State University. Sue Sprecher and her committee have organized a conference on compassionate love in late May. With very generous funding from the Fetzer Foundation, and IARR sponsorship, this conference will feature over 100 leading scholars in this exciting field. Terri Orbuch, Chair of the Future Conferences Committee, led the development of our future biennial conferences, one in Madison, Wisconsin for 2004, where Linda Roberts and Denise Solomon are acting as local conference chairs, and one in Bruges, Belgium, for 2006, where Patrick Hunout is acting as local conference chair. We are rich in committed, highly talented professionals and as a result we will have a wealth of creative opportunities to showcase and further develop our work.

Our publications are strong and continue to grow. Mark Fine, editor of the *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, will be stepping down as editor and a search is now

underway for a new editor by Anita Vangelisti chair of our Publications Committee. As many of you know, I regard my own six years as an editor as some of the most rewarding years of my career, and I encourage you to consider this opportunity to envision, enact, and lead the field.

Personal Relationships, and the new editorial team led by Sue Sprecher, recently published their first volume. *PR* is celebrating its tenth anniversary and we look forward to continued growth in the future, particularly with our new publisher, Blackwell.

We will soon be looking for a new editorial team for this newsletter, *RRN*, and I encourage you to consider this opportunity. Kathy and Kory, our sincere thanks for your continuing service.

Our new web site has been under development and is now up and running at <http://www.iarr.org>. Thanks go to Lisa Baker, our new web chair, and the entire Web site committee.

On June 1, William Cupach will begin his term as president along with a team of newly elected officers and board members. My thanks to Bill, who served as President-elect over the last year, and to William Dragon who served in the dual role of treasurer and secretary and did so superbly. To all of the board members, committee chairs, and volunteers, mille grazie. Sweet trip leading this group and I deeply appreciate your help.

INSIDE THIS ISSUE OF RELATIONSHIP RESEARCH NEWS

Presidents' Column
by Robert Milardo 1

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

FEATURE ARTICLES

*Relationship Research Coverage in the Popular Press:
The Good, The Bad, and The Just Plain Silly*
Moderated by Diane Holmberg 3

Mapping IARR
By Nick Haslam 6

BOOK REVIEWS:

*The Ontogony of Human Bonding Systems: Evolutionary
Origins, Neural Bases, and Psychological
Manifestations*
By W. B. Miller and J. L. Rodgers
Review by Kory Floyd 8

Close Relationships
By Kelley, Berscheid, Christensen, Harvey, Huston,
Levinger, McClintock, Peplau, & Peterson
Review by Rowland Miller 8

*Conversation as Method: Analyzing the Relational
World of People who were Raised Communally*
By R. Josselson, A. Lieblich, R. Sharabany, & J.
Wiseman
Review by Mary Gergen 10

*Emotionally Focused Couple Therapy with Trauma
Survivors: Strengthening Attachment Bonds*
By S. M. Johnson
Review by Douglas K. Snyder 12

LIGHTER SIDE OF RELATIONSHIPS:

*"The Causal Nexus between Relationship Dissolution
and Psychopathological Symptomatology" or "I Just
Can't Sleep after My Divorce"*
By David Kenny 13

NET NEWS: By Lisa Baker 14

PR REPORT: By Susan Sprecher 15

JSPR REPORT: By Mark Fine 16

CONTENTS OF UPCOMING JOURNALS:

Personal Relationships 16
Journal of Social and Personal Relationships 17

Call for Nominations 18

MEMBER NEWS & UPDATES 19

NEW MEMBERS 21

Conference Announcements 22

**LIST OF IARR BOARD OF DIRECTORS &
COMMITTEE CHAIRS** 24

RELATIONSHIP RESEARCH NEWS

Editors

Katherine Carnelley
University of Southampton

Kory Floyd
Arizona State University

Associate Editors

Michele Acker
Otterbein College

Shelly Gable
University of California, Los Angeles

Diane Holmberg
Acadia University

Ofra Maysseless
University of Haifa

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

FROM THE EDITORS'

DESK



by Kory Floyd and Kathy Carnelley

Arizona State Univ. Univ. of Southampton

We are pleased to bring you this issue of *RRN*. As Bob Milardo's article noted, it has been a busy and highly productive year for our organization. We much appreciate the leadership that he and his team of officers have provided during this critical transition year. Now, we look forward to many successful years ahead.

Many interesting offerings await you in this issue. A good heading for our two features articles might be "Looking out, looking in." On the former theme, Diane Holmberg moderates a roundtable discussion popular press coverage of relationship research and the positive and negative experiences of relationship scholars who have shared their research with journalists. On the latter theme, Nick Haslam presents an analysis of the research interests of the IARR membership and their associations with disciplinary affiliation.

Members will want to mark their calendars for the special topics conference on compassionate love, co-sponsored by IARR, the Fetzer Institute, and Illinois State University. The conference will take place May 30 through June 2 at the Chateau Hotel and Conference Center in Bloomington/Normal, Illinois. Sue Sprecher reports that over 75 submissions were received and that an excellent panel is keynote speakers has been assembled. It looks to be an outstanding conference, one that should not be missed.

It has been a busy year so far for IARR. Our members have had many important accomplishments, as the Member News and Updates section attests. Our journals, *JSPR* and *PR*, are as busy as ever. And we welcomed several new members to the organization in the past six months, whose names appear in the New Members section.

Importantly, IARR is beginning the search for a new editor for this newsletter. Kathy and I have so enjoyed our experiences, first as editors of the *ISSPR* and *INPR* newsletters, respectively, and then as co-editors of this newsletter. Our term will expire after the next issue (September 2003), and we are looking forward to assisting the new editor during the transition. We encourage members to consider applying for this post, and will be happy to answer any questions from those who are interested.

We hope you will find much to enjoy in this issue of *Relationship Research News*!

FEATURE ARTICLES

Relationship Research Coverage in the Popular Press: The Good, the Bad, and the Just Plain Silly

Diane Holmberg
Acadia University

As a relationship researcher, you would like to see some of our field's important findings disseminated more widely. "If only the newspaper and TV reporters would cover the important research we know is out there", you think. Initially, then, you are excited to get a call from the local television station for an interview. What a wonderful opportunity to share your ideas! However, it soon turns out that you will be featured in a 30-second clip on Valentine's Day, and be billed as "The Love Doctor". Your excitement quickly turns to trepidation...

Sharing our information with the popular press has its good and bad points, as the opening vignette illustrates. In the

Spring 2002 issue, Michael Cunningham and Harry Reis recommended that IARR members “accept opportunities to talk to journalists about relationship issues, and identify yourself as a relationship researcher whose comments are based on solid scientific research (and not personal intuitions, hunches, and speculations).” However, IARR member Stanley Gaines wrote back and pointed out some of the pitfalls that can occur, when journalists attempt to twist your words to fit into their predefined agenda.

We decided to organize a roundtable discussion, asking several researchers in the field to comment on their experiences with the popular media, and share any tips they might have as to how to make the interaction a positive one. Here are their suggestions. Many thanks to our roundtable participants, Michael Cunningham [MC], Stan Gaines [SG], Susan Hendrick [SH], John Holmes [JH], and Harry Reis [HR]. Editorial comments are in italics.

1. How often do you receive requests to talk to journalists about relationship issues?

Answers ranged from 2-3 times per year to once every 2 weeks. People pointed out that it varies, however, with some noting a peak around Valentine's Day.

[MC] Journalists' interest tends to come in cycles. I might publish an article that gets some media attention from one newspaper, and then I will get calls from a dozen newspapers, radio stations and television programs. I did 10 interviews last week, due to having a short segment in a BBC show. This week, the 15 minutes of fame is over, and I'm back to being anonymous.

2. Do you usually agree to give an interview? Why or why not?

Roundtable participants usually agreed to give interviews:

[JH] I usually agree to an interview if the topic is closely related to my work.

[MC] I will always give an interview if I feel competent to discuss the topic. That is, if I've conducted research on the issue, or include the topic in one of my courses.

[HR] If it is a topic I know something about, and if the interviewer's spin doesn't seem ludicrous, I tend to say yes.

Michael Cunningham articulated some of the reasons in favour of giving interviews:

[MC] I'm happy to do interviews because (a) I like to share the insights of relationship researchers with the wider community; (b) journalists often take unexpected angles on questions, which can be intellectually stimulating; (c) responding to journalists generates good publicity for the field and for my university, and finally; (d) if I don't answer

the journalist's question, they may keep looking until they find someone who will. The alternative "expert" may be someone who is unqualified and who will offer misinformation. So, I see it as a public service.

Others pointed out there are some circumstances under which they would decline to give an interview:

[SG] Since August 2002, however, I would say "No" to this question, because of a particularly negative experience that I had with a documentary producer who clearly wanted me to confirm certain stereotypes regarding sexuality and race -- even when empirical evidence flatly contradicted those stereotypes.

[JH] Sometimes journalists have chosen you as a so-called "relationships expert" to comment on themes that they're pushing, such as, "If educated women get divorced more often, doesn't that mean...." I always turn these down.

[HR] There are quite a few who don't meet [my] standards (e.g., one that wanted to know if there was any hope for the "bow-wows" (i.e., unattractive females)).

[MC] If the topic can be better addressed by someone in another discipline, like a Social Work researcher or a Political Scientist, then I will offer the phone number of a colleague.

[SH] . I usually refuse if they need an immediate interview or are researching a topic out of my area ... If I am over-committed at the time, I might be less likely to agree.

3. Do you ever do any screening of journalists before you agree to an interview?

[HR] I won't talk to reporters from publications that abuse scholarship (e.g., the *Star*).

[SH] I would prefer to work with someone employed by a publication, rather than someone who is working as a freelancer.

[MC] . Screening is usually pretty easy, in that the better journalists clarify their affiliation, and indicate that a fact checker will call to verify quotes. If someone calls and only says "I'm working for a Miami publication", then I will ask which one, because it could be a tabloid. I will talk to the *National Enquirer* et al., but I prefer to know that up front. Interestingly, sometimes the supermarket tabloids are more accurate in their quotes than the more reputable publications (perhaps trying to compensate for the "aliens made me pregnant with Elvis' baby" stories).

4. Do you lay out any "ground rules" before agreeing to an interview?

[MC] I will generally say that if I don't feel comfortable answering a question, I will pass on it.

[JH] In a few cases where I have been nervous that the person just wasn't getting it, I asked to clear the final draft with the editor.

[SG] I would certainly ask, prior to doing the interview, for a copy of any document that the interviewer would expect me to sign. [In one negative interview], it was only after I did the interview that the producer told me that I needed to sign a document waiving my rights to the interview.

5. In your experience, has the interview process itself usually been a good or bad experience?

Respondents mostly had positive experiences:

[SG] Usually, the interview process has been a good experience; the journalists in question were genuinely interested in accurately reporting the empirical results of my research.

[SH] The process is usually pleasant, though it always takes more time than one expects it to.

[JH] A *New York Times* interviewer asked penetrating and difficult questions, but also got the story "right" without my having to be too controlling.

[MC] Appearing in high visibility venues, such as *Oprah* or *Dateline*, is a bit stressful, but certainly fun.

But some were negative:

[HR] Some reporters do not want to be educated about the ins and outs of our research findings, and if you give them something to misconstrue, they will usually do it.

[JH] A *Self* magazine interviewer clearly didn't understand the idea of positive illusions about a partner and kept asking the "wrong questions".

[SH] When someone seems to misinterpret or "stretch" what I say, I always try to correct them. I won't go out on the limbs they try to get me out on.

[SG] [In one case] the interviewer did not ask a single question about the empirical results of my research.

[MC] Attracting publicity creates the risk that pieces will be written which criticize or oppose one's position, or what the journalist believes is one's position. I have had the experience of one journalist writing a critical piece about my research based solely on reading what another journalist incorrectly said about it, and then having an editorial writer expressing even more criticism based on that.

6. How satisfied have you been with the final product that appeared in the media? Has it accurately reflected your views?

[SH] I don't always see the finished product. When I have, I have usually been pretty happy with the result.

[HR] Most reporters are pretty careful. If you watch what you say, it is usually fine.

[JH] On the whole, I've found that the quality of the outlet quite strongly determines the quality of the interview and subsequent story.

[MC] Reading a journalist's rendition of your views is a bit like correcting essay tests from one's class. Sometimes, the facts are twisted or erroneously rendered, distinctions are obscured, and subtleties are trampled. Other times, you can only admire how elegantly a point has been rendered by a journalist.

[SG] [In one negative experience in a TV interview], the producer decided to omit my interview. Was I not sufficiently telegenic? Was I not sufficiently compliant? I may never know, but at least I know my words were not distorted to "support" stereotypical assumptions that I actively reject.

[MC] Print journalists are often more scrupulous about accuracy than TV journalists. In my experience, TV journalists will tape 20 minutes in order to get two usable sentences, and sometimes appropriate one's best observation as their own. But, at least the observation gets out there.

7. Do you have any "words of wisdom" to share with other researchers facing popular press interviews?

[SH] Never relax completely and always keep your internal "editor" going. Be willing to frustrate the writer by not giving them the easy answers they are looking for.

[SG] Based on my single negative experience, I would recommend that researchers seek legal advice before consenting to interviews... I will assert my legal rights as an interviewee before I grant an interview.

[JH] Take over the interview by reframing the questions in cases where the interview is going in unproductive or wrongheaded directions ... I also ask less impressive interviewers the question "What are you hearing me say about that?" so that I can correct their summary. If the person gets my key "sound bites" right, they will have trouble writing a story that doesn't fit with them. So take charge.

[HR] Remember, the reporter is neither a colleague, nor a student wishing to be edified. Rather, this is someone with a tight deadline, a small amount of space, and the primary goal of creating an article that someone will want to read.

[MC] Journalists have their own agenda, so don't be afraid to ask how they are going to spin the story. If they have a basic point that they intend to make, and you don't agree with it, don't hesitate to say so. Use your skill as a relationship researcher to win them over to your point of view. If a journalist says "we're going to have fun with it" then don't expect a lot of reverence. Poking fun at academics is common among TV journalists, especially when they are handling the emotion-laden topic of relationships. Just like in dealing with your students, it's okay to say you want to double-check a fact, pause the interview and look it up on PsychLit.

8. Any final comments on this topic?

[SH] Don't give interviewers too much time unless you are sure that it will be printed.

[MC] When speaking to a journalist, it is a good idea to adopt the perspective that you are chatting with an old friend at a high school reunion, rather than presenting a 50 minute lecture to a class. Short, clear sentences are helpful, so the writer can take notes, or the film editor can slice a soundbite. Another thing to keep in mind is that most people are saturated with news, so you will not be personally identified either with your brilliant insights or your embarrassing gaffes 48 hours after they appear. Finally, you might want to keep a nice change of clothes in your office. It's not unusual for local TV to call at 1:30 for an interview to be broadcast at 6. Good luck and enjoy the ride!

Mapping IARR

Nick Haslam
University of Melbourne
Department of Psychology

The IARR's first membership directory, brought out in 2002, is a comprehensive record of the shiny new association. Although it could hardly be described as an exciting read, lurking behind its thicket of details are some interesting patterns. Some simple statistical exploration reveals how members' interests and affiliations are organized and interrelated, and offers a kind of map of our field. Although seasoned researchers may hold similar maps as parts of their tacit professional knowledge,

newcomers may find it valuable to see it made explicit. It may even hold some surprises for old hands.

Following similar procedures to an earlier analysis of INPR, one of IARR's forerunners (Haslam, 1997), I examined patterns of co-occurrence of primary affiliations and interests among IARR members. Analyses were restricted to the 91.8% of members ($n = 552$) who reported at least one affiliation and one interest. Members could record up to four affiliations and seven interests, and those in the sample tended to nominate few of the former (mean = 1.28) and many of the latter (mean = 5.96). The analyses excluded affiliations and interests endorsed by less than 5% of the sample, leaving a manageable 6 of 8 listed affiliations and 39 of 100 listed interests. The degree to which each pair of affiliations or interests tend to co-occur systematically over the sample was measured by phi coefficients. The matrix of these was subjected to multidimensional scaling (MDS) and cluster analyses to yield dimensional and categorical "maps" of relationship studies. Affiliations and interests that fall in the same clusters or share similar dimensional positions tend to be nominated by the same members, and thus have some sort of affinity.

The MDS analysis, using Guttman's method, yielded a rather limited fit to the data. A three dimensional solution was interpretable, but accounted for only 50.0% of the variance (alienation = .25). The five affiliations or interests with the most extreme dimensional coordinates are presented in Table 1. The first dimension contrasts traditionally social-psychological interests and the Psychology affiliation with family- and child-related interests typically associated with Family Studies or Child Development affiliations. The second dimension contrasts interests in romantic relationship processes that have no clear link to any affiliation, with interests in health and affect that tend to be associated with a Health Studies affiliation. The third dimension, finally, contrasts diverse interests with sociological or individual differences themes with others that are largely associated with a Communication affiliation. Thus the three dimensions tend to discriminate among groups of interests that are moderately associated with members' main disciplinary affiliations.

An alternative, category-based map was developed using cluster analysis with Ward's linkage method. A 7-cluster solution was most interpretable, and is presented in Table 2. Not surprisingly, the clusters are somewhat redundant with the MDS. Cluster 1 joins together family- and child-related interests and affiliations, whereas Cluster 2 contains health-related interests and Health Studies. Cluster 3 contains intrapsychic- and individual difference-focused interests traditionally associated with a Psychology affiliation, including attachment, the most popular interest of all ($n = 135$), while Cluster 4 collects the interactional interests that are emblematic of Communication researchers. Clusters 5 and 7 are alone in having no clear associations with particular affiliations, emphasizing the dark (conflict, dissolution, violence, negative emotion) and

bright (love and romance) sides of relationships, respectively. Cluster 6, finally, contains some core sociological interests, such as networks and social stratification (e.g., ethnicity and gender), and methodological preferences (i.e., qualitative).

The MDS and cluster analyses point to associations between affiliations and interests, but are these associations robust? Table 3 lays out the 16 interests that are reported at significantly ($p < .05$) different rates by IARR members who endorsed one of the three most popular affiliations: Psychology ($n = 243$), Communication ($n = 117$), and Family Studies ($n = 53$). Interests listed as high (or low) were reported at higher (or lower) rates by one affiliation subset than both alternatives. The Psychology affiliation's distinctive interests are attachment, individual differences, and "bright side" aspects of close relationships, as well as a relative disinterest in qualitative methods. IARR members with Communication affiliations tend to have distinctive interests in nonverbal communication and social skills and relative disinterest in marital satisfaction. The Family Studies affiliation is associated with a raft of distinctive marital, family and child interests, and with relative disinterests in friendship and health.

IARR is a thoroughly multidisciplinary organization, so some might be inclined to look upon this evidence of affiliation-linked interest patterns with concern. This concern can be allayed on several grounds. First, the MDS and cluster analyses do not suggest that interest patterns are primary determinants or definers of interests: affiliations are rarely at the extremes on the dimensions and some clusters have no linked affiliation. Second, 23 of the 39 interests (59.0%) were not differentially endorsed by members allied to the 3 dominant affiliations in IARR. Third, most of the interests that were differentially endorsed (12 of 16) represent an affiliation's distinctive interest preferences or specializations rather than topics that it specifically excludes or avoids. Finally, individual members show a strong tendency to report a diverse range of interests. On average, members listed interests that fall in 3.1 of the 7 clusters, a finding that is incompatible with any discipline-based confinement to a narrow range of approved subject matter.

Overall then, the picture that emerges from this statistical exploration is of an organization whose interest areas are moderately associated with its members' varied disciplinary affiliations. As should be the case in a healthy multidisciplinary enterprise, however, IARR members are not tethered to their disciplinary "homes": they may have distinct vantage-points on the field of relationships but still range far and wide over it.

Reference

Haslam, N. (1997). Mapping INPR. *Personal Relationship Issues*, 4, 1-3.

Table 1: Affiliations (bold) and interests with highest or lowest coordinates on the MDS dimensions

	Dimension I	Dimension II	Dimension III
High	Attribution Cognition Marital Satisfaction Psychology Attraction	Disengagement Dating Marriage Courtship Commitment	Sex Networks Love Personality Life-events/Lifespan
Low	Families Parenthood Qualitative Methods Children Gender	Health Social Support Stress Mental Health Emotion	Communication Social Skills Nonverbal Comm. Jealousy Self-Disclosure

Table 2: Clustering of affiliations (bold) and interests

Cluster 1	Cluster 2	Cluster 3	Cluster 4
Marriage Divorce	Health Studies Health	Attachment Psychology	Social Skills Nonverbal Communication
Family Studies Families Parenthood Children	Mental Health Social Support Stress	Personality Cognition Attribution Marital Satisfaction	Communication Social Interaction Self-disclosure Intimacy
Child Development		Communication Style	Emotions
Cluster 5	Cluster 6	Cluster 7	
Jealousy Abuse/Aggress/Bully Conflict Disengage./Dissolut. Commitment Rel. Maintenance	Rel. Types Qualitative Methods Life-events/Lifespan Sociology Networks Friendship Culture/Ethnicity Gender Sex	Love Attraction Courtship Dating	

Table 3: Interests that significantly distinguish the three most popular affiliations of IARR

	Psychology	Communication	Family Studies
High	Attachment Love Personality Attraction	Nonverbal Comm. Social Skills	Families Marriage Dating Parenthood Courtship Children
Low	Qualitative Methods	Marital Satisfaction	Friendship Health

BOOK REVIEWS

The Ontogeny of Human Bonding Systems: Evolutionary Origins, Neural Bases, and Psychological Manifestations

By W. B. Miller & J. L. Rodgers
(Boston: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 2001, 142 pp.)

Review by Kory Floyd
Arizona State University

In Molière's play, *The Imaginary Invalid*, a medical student is asked by his physician-examiners to explain why opium induces sleep. He replies that opium induces sleep because it contains a "soporific factor," and the doctors applaud the intellect of his response. The scene is satirical, of course, because the student's explanation is a non-explanation. Opium causes sleep because it contains a sleep-causing agent. Because such a theory has a zero chance of disconfirmation, it contributes little, if anything, to scientific understanding. One may have a similar initial reaction to Miller and Rodgers' monograph on human bonding systems. After posing the question of why humans bond with each other, the authors review various lines of thinking on the topic before arriving at what appears to be their answer: people bond because they are subject to systems that promote bonding.

To be certain, I am greatly simplifying Miller and Rodgers' argument, but one must read a fair way into the book to discover that. In the first three chapters, the authors focus on describing their ontogenetic bonding system (OBS) as the confluence of four interrelated systems, each of which promotes bonding at a different developmental stage and for a different purpose. The first of the systems is the succorant bonding system, which is operative at birth and which serves to bond children to their parents. The second is the affiliative bonding system, which emerges during childhood and leads one to develop friendships. The third system is the sexual bonding system, which emerges after puberty and promotes sexual and romantic bonding. Finally, the nurturant bonding system, which emerges in tandem with the sexual bonding system, bonds parents to their children. An important aspect of the OBS is its recognition that, during the developmental course, people bond with others for a variety of evolutionary purposes. Succorant bonding helps infants and young children to survive by keeping them close to the protection of their parents. Sexual bonding promotes procreation, and nurturant bonding helps to sustain one's

offspring, increasing their chances of reaching sexual maturity themselves. Affiliative bonding elicits the emotional support and the sharing of resources that accompany friendships and social relationships. Until the fourth chapter of the book, however, Miller and Rodgers offer a good typology of bonding functions but little else in the way of theoretic advancement to explain how the various systems operate.

In chapter four, which is the longest and most detailed in the book, Miller and Rodgers greatly expand the scope of their discussion by detailing the cognitive mechanisms underlying each of the four systems in the OBS. Their description integrates existing knowledge about cognitive schemas, developmental psychology, and neuroanatomy into a theoretic framework that goes far beyond the typology that they presented early in the book. Chapter five extends the discussion by speculating as to how the four bonding systems might have operated in the environment of evolutionary adaptedness. This is an important consideration, given the contention of evolutionary psychologists that adaptations need not be adaptive for modern living but for the environment in which they evolved; for humans, this inevitably means the hunter-gatherer environments of our ancestors.

Chapter six considers human bonding from a life history perspective, which focuses attention on how variation in traits such as size and age at maturity, number of offspring, and age at mortality affects evolutionary fitness and the propagation of genes associated with those traits in succeeding generations. Here, the authors make the case that the systems of bonding included in the OBS are adaptive as strategies for fitness at various stages of the life course.

My overall assessment of this book is quite positive, despite its getting off to a relatively slow start. Although their explanations are unabashedly grounded in evolutionary psychology, I believe Miller and Rodgers' discussion will be of interest to personal relationships scholars from across the epistemological spectrum. One reason is that nearly every type of personal relationship is attended to, in some way, in the OBS; there is insight in Miller and Rodgers' discussion to be found on friendships, marital and sexual relationships, and parent-child pairs. Bonding is at the heart of attachment, relationship development, affection, and other processes that are often the focus of research in the personal relationships field. As such, I expect Miller and Rodgers' book to be a useful contribution to these endeavors.

Still Clever After All These Years: A Review of *Close Relationships*

By Kelley, Berscheid, Christensen, Harvey, Huston, Levinger, McClintock, Peplau, & Peterson
(NY: Percheron Press, 2002, 612 pp.)

**Review by Rowland Miller
Sam Houston State University**

Twenty-five years ago, a group of eminent relationship theorists assembled to develop essays that would shape and promote studies of close relationships. They sought to provide coherence and direction to a nascent relationship science both by organizing existing knowledge and by offering a springboard for future inquiry. But to their surprise, this was a harder task than they had anticipated. They encountered a rambling, “tangled skein” of relationship knowledge that was epitomized by their own disagreements; even the leaders of the new field held variable conceptions of the processes they sought to describe. Five years of discussion and collaboration ensued before the landmark volume, *Close Relationships*, was published by Kelley et al. in 1983.

This classic work has now been reissued in its entirety by Percheron Press (Clinton Corners, NY; \$39.50) with a new Introduction by Berscheid and Kelley. A re-reading of the book in the new millennium proffers both an affirming recognition of how far we’ve come in the past two decades *and* a cautionary notice of what relationship science has yet to accomplish.

Many, but not all, of us remember 1983. The relationship science we know and love today had yet to take shape. The field was beginning to define itself; a handful of books (among them Kelley’s [1979] *Personal Relationships*) had brought attention to relationship studies, Steve Duck and Robin Gilmour were producing a series of edited volumes on the development and deterioration of relationships, and Susan and Clyde Hendrick (1983) had just published a first undergraduate text, *Liking, Loving, and Relating*. But INPR and our journals, *JSPR* and *PR*, did not exist, ISSPR was a small group comprised almost entirely of social psychologists, and the first comprehensive relationships text (arguably Sharon Brehm’s [1985] *Intimate Relationships*) had yet to be produced.

Into this frontier came *Close Relationships* (1983). Its 572 pages contained individual chapters on emotion, power, love and commitment, roles and gender, conflict, and therapeutic interventions, among others. The heart of the book, however, was a chapter created by all nine coauthors on “Analyzing Close Relationships;” it was there that the team of theorists delineated their shared vision of the central focus of their work. They described *relationships* as patterns of interaction in which two people frequently affect each other’s actions, thoughts, and feelings in meaningful, diverse ways over long periods of time, and they emphasized that such patterns result from a complex matrix of causes and causal loops. Identification

of the various influences that shape relationships was said to be a difficult and often tedious task, but the authors made (at least) two key points. First, not only were relationship partners affected by their social and physical environments, the partners both selected and sculpted their environments in return. Thus, relationships were influenced by much more than the dispositions and moods of their participants; they were embedded in a societal and local network of both distal and proximal causes that was shaped by the partners’ ongoing interactions. Second, the authors stressed the importance of the *relational* influences that were created by the partners’ interactions with each other (and with their environments) and that could not be predicted from the study of either partner alone. Only when partners’ properties were *combined*, dovetailing to produce outcomes that would not have occurred without contributions from both individuals, did many key influences on relationships begin to take shape. The authors thus envisioned relationships as being much more than the simple sum of their parts.

How do these notions--and the rest of the book--hold up 20 years later? In my view, the most notable characteristic of the volume is the number and quality of the insights it continues to hold after all these years. The authors were prescient in forecasting the emergence of the robust relationship science we know today, recognizing that the study of close relationships “will be enriched by research and theory from many disciplines” (p. 7). They also suggested ideas that have been borne out in subsequent research. In his discussion of commitment, for instance, Kelley proposed that the renunciation of outsiders who might threaten a valued relationship may “involve downgrading their attractiveness” (p. 306); Johnson and Rusbult (1989) and Simpson, Gangestad, and Lerma (1990) obtained those very effects. Kelley also suggested that being inattentive to one’s alternatives may be “part of a self-regulation process in which one’s life is made free of decisional conflicts” by “putting out of mind what one might have” elsewhere (p. 306); my own results regarding attention to alternatives (Miller, 1997) were perfectly consistent with that prediction.

More importantly, there are provocative ideas sprinkled throughout the book that, to my knowledge, have yet to be carefully studied. For example, Kelley implied that people often illogically seek to continue disadvantageous relationships as “various attribution tendencies, just-world beliefs, and dissonance mechanisms often converge to induce us, following initial irretrievable investments in an activity, to make further contributions to it” (p. 300). To what extent do processes of self-justification cloud and contaminate our assessments of our intimate relationships and their futures? I don’t think we yet know.

Admittedly, some of the book’s material is dated. Kelley’s treatment of love preceded Sternberg’s (1987) triangular theory of love and seems a bit antiquated, and Peplau’s depiction of marital roles is probably less applicable to our sons and daughters than it was to us. The

book also says little about two themes that have become important foci of relationship science, social cognition and evolutionary psychology. There's little hint that studies of relational attributions (Fincham, 2001), positive illusions (Murray, 2001), ideal standards (Fletcher, 2002), or even attachment styles would come to be such important areas of research, and the sociobiological predecessors of modern evolutionary perspectives are mentioned in passing in a total of three paragraphs. There have clearly been some developments in relationship science that these thoughtful theorists did not foresee.

Given the recent advances in our treatment of the interdependent data that emerge from studies of relationship partners (e.g., Gonzalez & Griffin, 2001), I read Harvey, Christensen, and McClintock's chapter on research methods with particular interest. The authors argued that relationships are typically treated as dependent variables rather than as independent variables that affect the partners and their physical and social surroundings, and--despite some recent studies of how relational experiences shape subsequent beliefs and behavior (e.g., Conger, Cui, Bryant, & Elder, 2000)--this is a point that remains true today. The authors also stressed the desirability of longitudinal designs, forecasting the increasing impact of such designs in modern relationship science. Still, although they acknowledged that partners' characteristics interact in producing relational outcomes, the authors did not foresee how much our analytic techniques would progress in addressing that issue. As a result, the book's methods chapter is now only a superficial introduction to modern sensibilities and methodologies.

Other chapters have fared better with the passage of time. Berscheid's emotions chapter remains the formative statement of her interruption-based theory of emotions in relationships, and Levinger's "development and change" chapter uses his underappreciated Acquaintanceship-Buildup-Continuation-Deterioration-Ending model to good effect. Huston's chapter on power, Peterson's analysis of conflict, and Christensen's discussion of interventions also remain excellent summaries of their fields.

On the whole, then, the book retains considerable value. Despite its age, we are still meeting its suggestions and fulfilling its promises (witness the upcoming special issue of *Personal Relationships* on context effects that takes the book's consideration of social and physical environmental influences seriously). There was much we take for granted now that we didn't know back in 1983, but my reading of the book increased my considerable respect for the authors, who were even wiser than I knew. Their admonitions to consider the broader contexts in which relationships operate and to address the relational nature of the phenomena we observe are still valuable today. Certainly, I encourage you to read the new Introduction to the book by Berscheid and Kelley; you'll be heartened and encouraged by their 20-year retrospective, and I predict you'll be even prouder of your membership in this club.

Talking it Through: Relationships and Children of Israeli Kibbutzim: A Review of *Conversation as Method: Analyzing the Relational World of People who were Raised Communally*

By Ruthellen Josselson, Amia Lieblich, Ruth Sharabany, & Hadas Wiseman.
(Thousand Oaks, CA, London: Sage, 1997, 168 pp.)

**Review by Mary Gergen
Pennsylvania State University**

If one thinks about children raised collectively in the kibbutzim of Israel, perhaps the major question one asks is how does being raised without the special attentions of one's own parents influence people in terms of their relationships with others as they grow into adulthood. Are they less dependent, less able to love, lonelier? Or better off? This is a fascinating account of the meeting of four highly competent researchers who have studied the lives of people raised in kibbutzim, and who try to discuss issues related to this big question.

The book is uniquely designed as scripted conversations. Originally created in 1990, the transcriptions have been edited and revised to make them more coherent and readable; however, they have not lost the feel of spontaneous and compelling conversations. The conversations center on eight dimensions of a model of relationship proposed by Ruthellen Josselson. These dimensions include Holding (the feeling of being held, supported and protected); Attachment (being emotionally connected to special people, usually one's mother); Passions (energetic pursuits to satisfy drives and quest for unity); Eye-to-eye validation (communicating non-verbally with others); Idealization and Identification (becoming like someone we admire), Mutuality and Resonance (companionship and bonding with friends), Embeddedness (defining who we are in terms of our contexts); and Tending or care-giving (offering ourselves to others). The beauty of this form of organizing around central themes is that the multifaceted nature of the orientations is obvious and the ways that different forms of research lend themselves to different outcomes and to different styles of communicating is apparent within the text.

While their conversations enrich our understanding of kibbutz life, the answer to our major question is, in the end, not easily derived. As they discover, the differences in how research is done (forms of clinical interviews, surveys, and therapy groups), differences in definitions (e.g. How should attachment be defined?) and differences in interpretations influence the summaries they give. Here are some excerpts, describing people from the kibbutzim:

On attachment: Ruthellen: "For most people, it's ... more just the sense of being part of this group... without the feeling that there was an individual who ... could be counted on... I hear more from nonkibbutz people about specific friends who serve as attachment figures. I think I only have one kibbutz-raised subject who had a lifelong friend."

Ruth: "When kibbutzniks describe friends, they describe them as less intimate than city children describe their friends".

Amia: "I have one story about attachment to a peer [from the kibbutz], .. and it comes from a man who is in one of my therapy groups"....

Hadas: "I think it also depends on what kind of message the parent gives the child.... One girl... told me that because her mother was city raised, her mother was different from the other mothers. She was much more caring, she was much more attached." (pgs. 55-56)

In terms of adolescent sexuality: Amia: "There is a lot of sexual activity going on, and the grownups know about it, and what they want is only to prevent pregnancies. As long as sex takes place with agreement, it's not a problem. "

Hadas: "There is less rebellion against parents, like the scenario of wanting to have sex when your parent's don't want you to."

Ruthellen: "By not getting upset about adolescent sexuality, what the parents are also doing is not pushing people together as a couple.The parent generation is trying to ..keep the kids from having relationships that are too emotionally charged and might not fit the larger context of the kibbutz." (pg. 67)

In terms of mutuality, Ruthellen: "It's really complicated to talk about this dimension without just loading it up with a lot of values I've had the experience of trying to do a self-study group with my students, and they say, in effect, "Look, if you're trying to push us to be self-revealing, it's going to ruin our closeness and our mutuality." ... What they're talking about is a different level of mutuality. In my terms, they're superficially mutual, they are together, they feel very harmonious.... Their question is, and I suppose it's also my question, is it worth it? They get to a different level of intimacy, but they also pay a price for that."

Hadas: "We shouldn't lose sight of the positive side; in the kibbutz, there is a sense that you are never alone, which has both a benefit side and a cost side. The good side is that you're always in company, and there's always someone."

Ruthellen: There is a loneliness in city life that isn't there on kibbutzim." (pg. 110)

On helping: Amia: "The kibbutz would have made sure that somebody was there with Ziva during her bad nights, and it would never be left to her family, or neglected and fall between the different authorities."

Ruthellen: It was very hard for me, being an outsider, to really discriminate how much of this was a function of the kibbutz and how much is Israeli society." ...

Amia: "Helping. It's really Jewish, I think."

Ruthellen: "It's in Christian theology too, but it doesn't come out as much."

Amia; "It comes out at Christmas." (pgs. 132-133).

Two ingredients add special interest to the interactions: First, the four women are friends and colleagues, and second, they have developed their "data" using different methods of inquiry within somewhat different theoretical frameworks. The conversation reflects the confluences and contrasts among them well. Ruthellen Josselson and Amia Lieblich have worked together within the narrative tradition for many years, while the other two authors, Ruth Sharabany and Hadas Wiseman have published with each other and with Amia. Ruthellen's study on the kibbutzim used a relational mapping technique based on interviews concerning who the people are who had been important in each interviewee's life. Amia Lieblich conducted a field research project on one kibbutz in 1978 during which time she interviewed more than 100 members and wrote Kibutz Makom, an oral history. As a therapist, she has also worked with many kibbutz people who have revealed their emotional lives. Ruth's first personal contact with kibbutz occurred through the Israeli youth movement. In 1968 she was involved with a large-scale study of socialization in the kibbutz initiated by Urie Bronfenbrenner at Cornell University. Ruth specialized in intimate friendships among kibbutz children. Her work is the most reliant upon quantitative methods, and she is most concerned about issues related to measurement and validity. Her recent work with her students involves studying attachment patterns of mothers who were raised on kibbutzim in family versus communal sleeping arrangements and are currently raising their children under similar or different conditions. Hadas is interested in how growing up in the kibbutz influences processes of separation and individuation, intimacy and loneliness in adolescence. She has employed interview and questionnaire data. Her work has been involved with content analysis of themes and categories.

The last chapter consists of a reflexive moment when the authors speak about their collaboration. The end result for the reader is a much enriched sense of the diversity of experiences possible within the kibbutzim and without. Laced with compelling narratives, the conversations allow the reader to join in, albeit silently, to respond to their points of view. The answer to our first significant question, remains elusive. To hazard a concluding comment, I might say: In general, the orientation of kibbutzim people toward the group rather than toward the individual or a small family unit influences people strongly, but not always

uniformly. (One is never alone, never abandoned, yet never totally free of the sense of the others, as well.) How this “togetherness” is perceived depends upon context and the luck of the draw. The importance of the group overshadows many other considerations and leads to different emphases in relationships. Yet there is a different story for every occasion.

I would heartily recommend this book as a text for courses on interpersonal communication, qualitative methods in the social sciences, personal adjustment and life-span developmental courses in psychology, family studies, and sociology.

Emotionally Focused Couple Therapy with Trauma Survivors: Strengthening Attachment Bonds

By Susan M. Johnson
(NY: Guilford Press, 2002, 228 pp.)

Review by Douglas K. Snyder
Texas A & M University

Couple therapists frequently find themselves confronted with dual tasks. Not only must they confront relationship processes between partners that detract from emotional intimacy and that foster or maintain relationship distress, but couple therapists often also need to address partners' individual emotional and behavioral difficulties that interfere with relationship health. An emerging empirical literature documents what experienced couple therapists have long known – that individual well-being and relationship functioning have complex and mutually recursive effects.

Susan Johnson's text on Emotionally Focused Couple Therapy with Trauma Survivors focuses on the critical but frequently ignored relation between couples' functioning and prior emotional trauma in one or both partners. Epidemiological research indicates that maritally distressed individuals are 3-4 times more likely than individuals from nondistressed relationships to have coexisting posttraumatic stress disorders (PTSD). Johnson argues that emotionally focused couple therapy (EFCT) offers a strong theoretical base and uniquely effective interventions for helping individuals to overcome trauma and achieve emotional intimacy. Grounded in an expanded conceptualization of attachment theory as applied to adult relationships, EFCT promises to help individuals to explore

the traumatic sources of insecure attachments and to strengthen secure attachment bonds in their adult love relationships. Johnson contends that for traumatized couples, *“the therapist's goal must be not just to lessen the distress in a survivor's relationship, but to create the secure attachment that promotes active and optimal adaptation to a world that contains danger and terror, but is not necessarily defined by it”* (p. 10, italics in original).

EFCT with Trauma Survivors is divided into two parts. The first half of the book provides a brief overview of the nature of trauma and attachment, and the relevance of an attachment perspective for trauma survivors and their partners. Johnson describes three stages of EFCT and specific interventions from this approach tailored to couples facing trauma. The second half of the book emphasizes clinical case studies of therapy with couples dealing with the aftermath of trauma arising from combat, mental or physical illness, and physical or sexual abuse in previous relationships. Also included are treatment considerations when the emotional injuries result from a partner's lack of responsiveness at a time of extreme emotional need that was itself traumatic.

Johnson notes that the effects of trauma go well beyond the primary symptoms of intrusive re-experiencing, numbing or avoidance, and hyperarousal described in the DSM-IV. A survivor's sense of self is so deeply damaged that fundamental processes of emotional regulation, appraising the objective nature of emotional or physical threat, and managing relationships with other people are severely compromised. Survivors become victims of an absorbing inner state in which “everything leads into a sense of darkness, helplessness, and hopelessness, and nothing leads out” (p. 21). Trauma survivors struggle with a shattered, disorganized sense of self; they are often flooded with acute shame and self-disgust. They can't imagine how someone else worth loving could be affirming or loving toward them.

Johnson argues that treating a trauma survivor requires helping the individual to recast his or her intrapsychic world by creating new interpersonal connections. EFCT is viewed as uniquely positioned to facilitate this objective because it is based on an attachment perspective focusing on emotions and emotional engagement. From the perspective of EFCT, emotion is viewed as an integration of physiological responses to survival-related cues, along with related cognitive schema and reflexive behaviors intended to manage re-experiencing of earlier traumatic events. EFCT proceeds through three stages. In the first stage of *stabilization*, the therapist seeks to disrupt the negative consequences of traumatic retreat by providing both partners with information about trauma symptoms, relabeling trauma-related emotions and the maladaptive coping strategies they tend to elicit, and outlining more positive ways of regulating these emotions. The unique benefit of engaging in these interventions in couple therapy, as opposed to individual therapy, is the ability to promote new understanding by *both* partners in a way that promotes mutual comfort. Johnson notes that

partners' ability to soothe and respond empathically is crucial from an attachment perspective. "When the partner becomes an ally in regulating a survivor's feelings of helplessness, more problematic ways of fending off such helplessness can be short-circuited" (p. 60).

The second stage of EFCT with trauma victims emphasizes *restructuring attachment bonds* by strengthening self and relational capacities. Specifically, the survivor is helped to own and integrate traumatic memories and form a coherent narrative. Secrecy and inhibition are replaced by vulnerable self-disclosure. EFCT promotes a "corrective experience" between partners in which empathic understanding combats the feelings of violation that characterize the trauma experience for the survivor. The final stage of therapy promotes a process of *consolidation and integration* by helping the couple to develop a common worldview about the meaning of the trauma, strategize how to protect their present relationship and each other in case of future incursions of trauma, and actively use the comforting of each other as a first-line defense against traumatic re-experiencing of debilitating fear.

Through rich clinical case studies, Johnson illustrates the process and content of EFCT as applied to a broad spectrum of trauma. The diverse nature of the original traumatic experiences and their current expression both individually and relationally, along with detailed case formulations and specific interventions and client-therapist dialogue, ensure that virtually every therapist will discover useful applications of this material to their own work. In some cases, couples are initially unable to recognize their previous trauma and the effects on themselves and their relationship. In other cases, the trauma are more explicit and readily recognized – as for survivors of childhood physical and emotional abuse, life-threatening physical illness, or exposure to military combat. For some couples, the trauma has occurred from within their own relationship – such as a partner's emotional unavailability during a time of profound loss (e.g., miscarriage or loss of a parent).

Johnson notes that dealing with trauma survivors from a couple perspective challenges the emotional well-being of therapists themselves. In dealing with partners' trauma and their chaotic expression in couples' relationships, therapists sometimes struggle to regulate their own affect. "Sometimes when we weep for others, we suddenly find that it is also ourselves we are weeping for. . . This can occur in all couple therapy, but the poignancy and emotional intensity of the process with traumatized couples is more likely to exacerbate this process" (p. 199). Toward this end, Johnson offers explicit guidance to therapists regarding critical issues of self-care, consultation with trusted colleagues, and tempering therapist self-disclosure to ensure that this is done in the service of the couple's emotional well-being and not the therapist's own.

Johnson is widely recognized not only for her theoretical contributions to understanding couple attachment and therapy, but also for her achievements as a researcher committed to empirically evaluating both the

process and outcome of couple therapy. She is an experienced clinician and a gifted writer. Individuals interested in adult attachment processes and the impact of trauma on either individual or relationship functioning, and clinicians committed to intervening with trauma survivors from either an individual or couple perspective, will find this book an invaluable resource.

THE LIGHTER SIDE OF RELATIONSHIPS

"The Causal Nexus between Relationship Dissolution and Psychopathological Symptomatology" or "I Just Can't Sleep after My Divorce"

By David Kenny

One of the things that makes our field fascinating yet simultaneously challenging is that we study topics that everyone "knows." There was an article on the difficulty of doing research in education entitled "Everyone went to high school." The comparable article for us would be "Everyone has been in a relationship." One problem created by all of us being relationship experts is that the terminology that we use can be very confusing. There is a tension between using terms that lay people use versus inventing new terms (aka, jargon) so as to avoid the potential misunderstandings that arise in the use of lay terms.

I think that sometimes we are tempted to create jargon to prove, likely more to ourselves than to others, that we really know something. We equate being incomprehensible with saying something important. We forget the nominal fallacy: Giving something a name does not in and of itself provide any real understanding.

You may be surprised to hear that I was once told that I was getting myself in trouble by using lay terms. Yes me, the person who wrote the following sentence "If the one-cue, differential weight model were correct, then the INSCAL analysis would yield a single dimension" was

accused of writing too simply. I was advised many years ago by a senior researcher to avoid using lay terms as people will too easily think they know what the term means but not really know. While there is a risk in using lay terms, I think there is a benefit to building on lay notions. Yes, they eventually come to mean something very different, but by using lay concepts we make clear that we are studying something fundamentally important and human. Note that physicists still use terms like "energy," "mass," and "velocity," even though these terms now have very little to do with the lay use of those terms. I see it as a challenge to use lay terms but show how their meaning changes as relational science makes advances.

Let us consider a specific example. What if Hazan and Shaver had not used the terms "secure, avoidant, and anxious-ambivalent" (of course, I know they borrowed these terms) for attachment styles, but instead to avoid "confusion" they invented their own terms. So for instance, they might have come up with "equilibrant, fugalant, and petalant" in terms of intimacy seeking. Are we lucky that they did not invent such jargon! As another example, I cannot understand why social network researchers continue to call people "nodes" and "vertices." I realize that not all networks refer to people, but when they are used to study relationships they always do.

One can make the argument that the use of jargon reinforces a "western bias." How so? Because most jargon has Latin or Greek roots (e.g., Psychopathological Symptomatology), it reinforces the Western-centrism.

In the spirit of reducing jargon in our field, I list the titles of papers published in either the two journals or cited by a paper in one of those journals and my proposed less "jargony," yet hopeless silly translation. With apologies to the authors, here we go:

Original: "The benefits of positive illusions: Idealization and construction of satisfaction in close relationships." Revised: "You will be a lot happier not knowing what the jerk is really like."

Original: "Associations of maternal and paternal direct differential behavior with siblings relationships: Contemporaneous and longitudinal analyses." Revised: "I used to and still hate my brother thanks to mom and dad."

Original: "Memory structures for relational decay: A cognitive test of sequencing de-escalating actions and stages." Revised: "Breaking up is not hard to do."

Original: "Heterogeneity of peer rejected boys: Aggressive and non-aggressive subtypes." Revised: "Boys everyone hates are either bullies or dweebs."

Original: "Intimacy and the magnitude of experience of episodic relational uncertainty within romantic relationships." Revised: "Crap happens."

Original: "The influence of relational context on support processes: Points and

difference and similarity between young adult sons and daughters in problem talk with mother." Revised: "When you need help, ask mom."

Original: "Sexual strategies theory: An evolutionary theory on human mating." Revised: "Darwin made me be a male chauvinist pig."

Original: "Mothering in context: Ecological determinants of parent behavior." Revised: "Your mom may be nice to you in public, but she is gonna whip your ass at home."



Net News

Lisa Baker
Purchase College, SUNY

Like everything at IARR, our Web presence is being modified to reflect our new organizational structure. Both of IARR's parent organizations had active Web sites, managed by Bill Dragon (www.inpr.org) and Regan Gurung (www.isspr.org). At last summer's ICPR, Shannon Weaver and I volunteered to develop a new Web site for the merged organization.

Since then, I have apparently become chair of the Web Site committee, with Bill and Regan continuing as members of the committee. I am a 1999 McGill University Psychology Ph.D. and am currently an assistant professor of psychology at Purchase College, State University of New York. I have research interests in parenting, particularly parenting special-needs children and gay male parenting. I have been active in developing and maintaining the Web site in my division at Purchase, and I am happy to be able to use some of those skills in support of IARR.

Back to the Web site: Since January 2003, a prototype of the new IARR Web site has been up and running at www.isspr.org/iarr. The new Web site draws heavily from the content of the parent Web sites, but is now frequently updated with all the most recent IARR announcements and information.

Next steps: We are in the process of putting Web hosting in place so the IARR Web site can move to its new home at www.iarr.org. In addition, we have a designer working on a graphical interface for the new Web site, so that IARR will have an attractive, welcoming Web presence.

I encourage you to bookmark and visit the IARR Web site often, for up-to-date information about conferences, journal special issues, award nominations, and organization happenings. IARR's current Web site policy is to post announcements from IARR members that are of general interest to the membership, so feel free to email your announcements to me at LBaker@ns.purchase.edu. I also want to post links to members' Web pages, so send me your url's!

The Web Site committee welcomes your feedback about the new Web site, particularly features that you would like to see added. You can send your comments to me (LBaker@ns.purchase.edu). I look forward to hearing from you!

JOURNALS UPDATE

A Report on *Personal Relationships* Submitted by the Editor, Susan Sprecher

Visit the new website for updated information on the journal: <http://lilt.ilstu.edu/personalrelationships/>

Although our team has been processing the manuscripts submitted to the journal since June 1, 2001, our first issue has just been published (the March issue of 2003). We hope that you enjoyed this issue (which included Brant Burlison's Distinguished Scholar Article, "*The experience and effects of emotional support: What the study of cultural and gender differences can tell us about close relationships, emotion, and interpersonal communication*"). We also hope that you'll enjoy the next 15 issues our team will be producing (through December, 2006)!

We are happy to report a healthy number of submissions to the journal. In 2002, we had over 90 regular submissions and 36 submissions to the special issue on Contextual Influences on Relationships. Thus far this year (as of April 1), we have had 30 regular submissions, and expect that we will have 100 or more submissions by the end of the year (not including those submitted to the emotions special issue).

Because of the slight increase in the number of submissions, we have decided to add a new Associate

Editor. We are pleased to announce that **Ximena Arriaga** (Psychology, Purdue University) will join as an Associate Editor beginning June 1 of this year. In addition, **Walid Affi** (Communication, Penn State) will be an Associate Editor beginning June 1 and replace **Steve Wilson**, who has decided to step down this summer. We are pleased to have Walid join us, and want to thank Steve for his diligent and high quality work for the journal. Steve will continue to process those manuscripts for which he is an Action Editor through the fall and winter of this year. **Graham Allan**, **Julie Fitness**, **Leanne Lamke** and **Dan Perlman** plan to remain as Associate Editors. Our team will continue to process manuscripts until May 31, 2005, when a new editorial team should be in place.

There also will be transitions in Editorial board members this summer. The current editorial board members agreed to serve a two-year term, which ends June 1. Although we will beg some existing members to stay on for another two years, we also anticipate inviting some new folks on the board. If you wish to review in some capacity for the journal, please write to me: Sprecher@ilstu.edu. We also continue to involve new scholars (graduate students, post-docs, assistant professors) as reviewers on manuscripts. If you are a graduate student, post-doctoral student, or assistant professor interested in reviewing, please contact me

We also encourage you to consider *Personal Relationships* as an outlet for your best scholarship on personal relationships. When you are ready to submit your manuscript, please e-mail me (Sprecher@ilstu.edu) the title page and abstract to your paper and I will e-mail you an assignment of an Action Editor, usually within 24 hours. For other information on the submission process, please see the *Instructions for Contributors* on the back inside cover of a recent issue of *Personal Relationships*, or go to the website: <http://lilt.ilstu.edu/personalrelationships/>

Those of you working in the area of emotions are also encouraged to consider submitting to the special issue on *Emotion in Personal Relationships*, co-edited by Julie Fitness and Sally Planalp. The general purpose of the special issue is to highlight advances in understanding of emotions and emotion-related processes within personal relationships and to elucidate, in turn, the impact of relationship context and processes on emotions and emotional behavior. Deadline for submission is May 31, 2003. In submitting papers, e-mail Julie Fitness (jfitness@psy.mq.edu.au) with your title and Abstract, and she will advise you of the co-editor issue editor to whom your manuscript should be sent.

Blackwell has been a wonderful publisher of *Personal Relationships*. We hope that you like the look to the journal. We have heard many compliments of the new cover. You can help IARR by making sure that your university or college library has a subscription to the journal. If it does not, please print information from the following website and put your librarian in contact with Blackwell publishers:

<http://www.blackwellpublishing.com/subs.asp?ref=1350-4126>

Thanks to all of you – authors, associate editors, editorial board members, ad-hoc reviewers, new scholar reviewers, publication committee (chaired by Anita Vangelisti), and readers – for your involvement and interest in the journal.

A Report on *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships* Submitted by the Editor, Mark Fine

JSPR is alive and well and seeking a new Editor! Under the excellent leadership of Anita Vangelisti, the search for the next Editor of *JSPR* has been very active and is still ongoing as this goes to press. Several excellent relationship scholars, from a variety of disciplines, have expressed interest in the Editorship, which is great. My term runs through the last issue of 2004, but the new Editor will begin receiving new submissions approximately on January 1, 2004.

The Journal itself is doing very well. Total subscriptions have remained steady in the past few years (approximately 1400, including IARR members); the number of manuscript submissions has remained high (approximately 165 in 2002, which is about the mean under my Editorship), our Impact Rating has remained extremely high, particularly for an interdisciplinary journal; we have an active, prompt, and thorough Editorial Board; and we are receiving high quality manuscripts from all of the disciplines reflected in IARR's broad mission.

We have had considerable turnover in Associate Editors. Dan Canary, Martha Cox, Larry Ganong, John Harvey, Susan Hendrick, Sandra Metts, Terri Orbuch, Dan Perlman, and Barbara Sarason have stepped down after exemplary service to the Journal and to IARR. These scholars deserve all of our thanks for making such an important contribution to relationship research. New Associate Editors Stan Gaines and Valerie Manusov are doing extremely well in their relatively new roles.

Two special issues have been recently published: 1) *Personal and Social Relationships of Individuals Living with HIV and/or AIDS*, guest edited by Kathryn Greene, Lawrence Frey, and Val Derlega, in the February, 2002 issue; and 2) *Race/Ethnicity and Interpersonal Relationships*, co-edited by Terri Orbuch and me, in the April, 2003 issue. The last special issue during my term will be on *Health in Personal Relationships and Families*, following-up on the theme of our last conference in Halifax, guest-edited by Carma Bylund and Steve Duck. The papers for this special issue, including two invited

ones, are almost finalized and the issue is tentatively scheduled to be published in February, 2004.

Thanks are also due to all of the members of IARR who have served as reviewers of manuscripts submitted to *JSPR*. They are the critical to the success of any scholarly journal.

Contents of Upcoming Journals

Personal Relationships

Volume 10, Number 2, June 2003

ARTICLES

WILLIAM ICKES, JEREMY W. DUGOSH, JEFFRY A. SIMPSON, AND CAROL L. WILSON
Suspicious Minds: The Motive to Acquire Relationship-Threatening Information

LYNN MAGDOL AND DIANE R. BESSEL
Social Capital, Social Currency, and Portable Assets: The Impact of Residential Mobility on Exchanges of Social Support

ESBEN STRODL AND PATRICIA NOLLER
The Relationship of Adult Attachment Dimensions to Depression and Agoraphobia

DEBRA L. OSWALD AND EDDIE M. CLARK
"Best Friends Forever?": High School Best Friendships and the Transition to College

JON A. HESS
Measuring Distance in Personal Relationships: The Relational Distance Index

AMY D. BELLMORE AND ANTONIUS H. N. CILLESSEN
Children's Meta-Perceptions and Meta-Accuracy of Acceptance and Rejection

LAWRENCE A. KURDEK
Methodological Issues in Growth-Curve Analyses with Married Couples

THOMAS B. HOLMAN AND MARK O. JARVIS
Hostile, Volatile, Avoiding, and Validating Couple-Conflict Types: An Investigation of Gottman's Couple-Conflict Types

Volume 10, Number 3, September 2003
Special Issue: Contextual Influences on Relationships
Co-editors: Dan Perlman and Catherine A. Surra

ARTICLES

CATHERINE A. SURRA AND DANIEL PERLMAN
Contextual Influences on Relationships: An Introduction

Changing Contexts, Changing Relationships

GEORGE LEVINGER AND ANN COTTON LEVINGER
Winds of Time and Place: How Context has Affected a 50-
year Marriage

The Cultural Context

DAVID P. SCHMITT AND 130 MEMBERS OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEXUALITY DESCRIPTION
PROJECT

Are Men Universally More Dismissing Than Women?
Gender Differences in Romantic Attachment Across 62
Cultural Regions

GLENN ADAMS AND VICTORIA C. PLAUT
The Cultural Grounding of Personal Relationships:
Friendship in North American and West African Worlds

**Relationships in Larger Social Contexts: Schools,
Communities, and Beyond**

SUNGEUN YANG AND KATHRYN D. RETTIG
The Value Tensions in Korean-American Mother-Child
Relationships While Facilitating Academic Success

ARIEL KNAFO

Contexts, Relationship Quality, and Family Value
Socialization: The Case of Parent-School Ideological Fit in
Israel

CAROLYN E. CUTRONA, DANIEL W. RUSSELL, W.
TODD ABRAHAM, KELLI A. GARDNER, JANET N.
MELBY, CHALANDRA BRYANT, AND RAND D.
CONGER
Neighborhood Context and Financial Strain as Predictors of
Marital Interaction and Marital Quality in African
American Couples

YOEL ELIZUR AND ARLETTE MINTZER
Gay Males' Intimate Relationship Quality: The Roles of
Attachment Security, Gay Identity, Social Support, and
Income

The Physical Context

ANDREW LOHMANN, XIMENA B. ARRIAGA, AND
WIND GOODFRIEND
Close Relationships and Placemaking: Do Objects in a
Couple's Home Reflect Couplehood?

Journal of Social and Personal Relationships

April, 2003 (Vol. 20, 2)

**Special Issue: Race/Ethnicity and Interpersonal
Relationships**

Co-Edited by Terri Orbuch and Mark Fine

Orbuch, T. L., & Fine, M. A. The Context of
Race/Ethnicity in Interpersonal Relationships: Crossing the
Chasm

James, A.D., & Tucker, M.B. Racial ambiguity and
relationship formation in the United States: Theoretical and
practical considerations.

Melby, J.N., Hoyt, W.T., & Bryant, C.M. A generalizability
approach to assessing the effects of ethnicity and training
on observer ratings of family interactions.

Savaya, R., & Cohen, O. Perceptions of the societal image
of Muslim Arab divorced men and women in Israel.

Carlson, C.I., Wilson, K.D., & Hargrave, J.L. The effect of
school racial composition on Hispanic intergroup relations.

O'Sullivan, L.F., & Meyer-Bahlburg, H.F.L. African
American and Latina Inner-City girls' reports of romantic
and sexual development.

Krishnakumar, A., Buehler, C., & Barber, B.K. Youth
perceptions of interparental conflict, ineffective parenting
and youth problem behaviors in European American and
African American families.

June, 2003 (Vol. 20, 3)

Jakob Hakansson & Henry Montgomery Empathy as an
interpersonal phenomenon

Jody Koenig Kellas & Valerie Manusov What's in a story?
The relationship between narrative completeness and
adjustment to relationship dissolution

Tamara D. Golish & Kimberly A. Powell "Ambiguous
loss": Managing the dialectics of grief associated with
premature birth

Cenita Kupperbusch, Robert W. Levenson, & Rachel
Ebling Predicting husbands' and wives' retirement
satisfaction from the emotional qualities of marital
interaction

Steven R. H. Beach, Jennifer Katz, Sooyeon Kim, & Gene
Brody Prospective effects of marital satisfaction on
depressive symptoms in established marriages: A dyadic
model

Tick N. Sim & Bernice S. M. Loh Attachment to God:

Measurement and dynamics

Keith Sanford Expectancies and communication behavior in marriage: Distinguishing proximal-level effects from distal-level effects (BRIEF REPORT)

August, 2003 (Vol. 20, 4)

Lawrence A. Kurdek Differences between gay and lesbian cohabiting couples

John B. Nezlek Using multilevel random coefficient modeling to analyze social interaction diary data

Robin M. Kowalski, Sherri Walker, Rachel Wilkinson, Adam Queen, & Brian Sharpe Lying, cheating, complaining, and other aversive interpersonal behaviors

Leslie A. Baxter & Lee West Couple perceptions of their similarities and differences: A dialectical perspective

Jeanne Flora & Chris Segrin Relational well-being and perceptions of relational history in married and dating couples

Mei-Chen Lin & Jake Harwood Accommodation predictors of grandparent-grandchild relational solidarity in Taiwan

NOMINATIONS SOUGHT

Publications Committee Seeks Nominations for Newsletter Editor

The IARR Publications Committee is soliciting nominations for editor of the *Relationship Research News* to succeed Kory Floyd and Kathy Carnelley, whose three-year term ends at the end of 2003. The new editor will work with Floyd and Carnelley on the September, 2003 issue of the newsletter. Self-nominations and e-mail nominations are welcome. Nominations need only include a brief letter of support describing the candidate's qualifications. Queries may be directed to any of the members of the Publications Committee: Julie Fitness (jfitness@psy.mq.edu.au), Heather Helms-Erikson (h_helmse@uncg.edu), Mike Johnson (mpj@psu.edu), Jeff Simpson (jas@psyc.tamu.edu), or Anita Vangelisti

(a.vangelisti@mail.utexas.edu).

Nominations should be received by June 1, 2003.

Nominations should be addressed to:

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

Margret M. Baltes Early Career Award in Behavioral and Social Gerontology

Dear Colleagues:

The Gerontological Society of America would like to solicit nominations for the Margret M. Baltes Early Career Award in Behavioral and Social Gerontology. Margret M. Baltes Early Career Award in Behavioral and Social Gerontology recognizes outstanding early career contributions in behavioral and social gerontology. The award will be given to a person from any discipline in the social sciences. Eligible nominees must have the PhD degree and must not be more than 10 years past the date the doctorate was awarded. International participation is encouraged. Nominations made by others or self-nominations are acceptable and not restricted to GSA members.

The award recipient will receive a plaque and a \$1,000 cash award and is invited to present a lecture at the GSA Annual Scientific Meeting in November 2004.

Send applications to Awards Coordinator, The Gerontological Society of America, 1030 15th Street, NW, Suite 250, Washington, D.C. 20005-1503. In addition to the Nomination Form, include a current curriculum vita and a nominating letter detailing the research and making the case for impact on and contribution to the field.

Due date is May 5, 2003.

For additional information, please visit the Gerontological Society of America website:

<http://www.geron.org/awards.htm#society-wide>

Frieder R. Lang

MEMBER NEWS & UPDATES

Congratulations to the following members for their outstanding recent accomplishments:

Jeffrey Adams has been promoted to associate professor with tenure in the department of behavioral sciences at High Point University.

Sofia Rivera Aragon has written a new book with fellow IARR member **Rolando Diaz-Loving**, entitled *La Cultura del Poder en la Pareja* (Couples Power Culture).

Bob Arkin was recently named editor of *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*.

Ximena Arriaga has been promoted to associate professor with tenure in the department of psychological sciences at Purdue University.

Laura Ault has begun a new job teaching at Holy Family University in Philadelphia. She is the moderator for the Social and Behavioral Science club and is also the cheerleading coach. She and her husband have just closed on their first home.

Brian Bigelow has published an article in *Risk Analysis* on the speeding attitude scale in profiling young drivers at risk. He has also had a paper accepted for presentation at the Canadian Psychological Association meeting on the dynamics of elder abuse.

John Birtchnell's new book, *Relating in psychotherapy: The application of a new theory*, came out in paperback in 2002 and was successfully launched in November at the Freud Museum in London (UK).

Dawn Braithwaite was recently appointed to the four-person Research Board of the National Communication Association.

Brant Burleson has received a fellowship from Purdue's Center for the Behavioral and Social Sciences which will support his writing of a book on supportive communication. He has also co-edited, with **John Greene**, the *Handbook of communication and social interaction skills*, published by

Erlbaum. The volume includes contributions from several IARR members.

Duncan Cramer from Loughborough University developed a 50-item relationship test for the BBC show "Test the Nation," which went out live on Saturday, March 22. Duncan briefly commented on the test throughout the show.

Lisa Diamond and **Jonathan Butner**, both of the University of Utah, received a Young Scholars Positive Psychology Grant from the John Templeton Foundation for a project on the co-regulation of positive affect in couples.

Pearl Dykstra has been appointed chair of family demography at Utrecht University. She continues her affiliation with the Netherlands Interdisciplinary Demographic Institute in The Hague.

Wendy Falato has accepted a position as assistant professor of communication at Northern Kentucky University. She has also received the Graduate Assistant Outstanding Teaching Award at Penn State.

Sandra Faulkner has accepted a position as assistant professor of communication at Syracuse University. She also has a book in press entitled *[Re]conceptualizing culture across the disciplines: Definitions of culture in the years since Kroeber & Kluckhohn*, published by Erlbaum.

Frank Fincham has been named a Distinguished Professor, a rank above full professor and the highest in the SUNY system, by the SUNY Board of Trustees.

Mark Fine, department of human development and family studies at University of Missouri, has wed **Loreen Olson**, department of communication at Cleveland State University. Congratulations to them both!

Eli Finkel has accepted an assistant professor position at Northwestern University.

Karen Fingerman has accepted a position as associate professor and Berner Hanley University Scholar in the department of child development and family studies at Purdue.

Kory Floyd has a new book, *Communicating affection: Interpersonal behavior and social context*, forthcoming from Cambridge University Press.

Barry Ginsberg's new book, *50 wonderful ways to be a single-parent family* (New Harbinger Press) is now in bookstores.

Wind Goodfriend has received the Outstanding Graduate Student Teacher of the Year Award from the department of psychology at Purdue.

Elaine Hatfield has recently appeared in a number of television documentaries, including those produced by the BBC, The Learning Channel, The Discovery Channel, and A & E.

Susan Hendrick has been awarded a President's Academic Achievement Award at Texas Tech. She also has a new book, entitled *Understanding close relationships*, being published by Allyn & Bacon.

Stevan Hobfoll has been appointed distinguished professor of psychology at Kent State University, one of four at the university. He has also received a grant for \$3.2 million from NIMH to study conflict resolution and PTSD among inner-city women with a history of abuse.

John Holmes has a new book, entitled *An atlas of interpersonal situations*, published by Cambridge University Press.

James Honeycutt has a new book, entitled *Imagined interactions: Daydreaming about communication*, published by Hampton Press.

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

Michelle Johnson has received tenure in the department of communication at the College of Wooster.

Sue Johnson has a new book on attachment processes in couple and family therapy, forthcoming from Guilford press and co-edited with **Valerie Whiffen**.

Luciano L'Abate has six books in press: *Intimate relationships and how to improve them* (Prager); *A guide to self-help workbooks for mental health clinicians and researchers* (Haworth); *Workbooks in prevention, psychotherapy, and rehabilitation* (Haworth); *Family psychology III. Theory construction, theory testing and psychological interventions* (University Press); *Homework in cognitive-behavioral therapy* (Brunner/Mazel); and, *Personality in intimate relationships* (Kluwer).

Frieder Lang was appointed full professor of developmental psychology at the Martin Luther University of Halle-Wittenberg, Germany.

Benjamin Le has been appointed assistant professor of psychology at Haverford College in Pennsylvania.

Sandra Metts received the Illinois State University 2002-3 Outstanding University Teacher Award.

Sandra Murray received the 2003 APA distinguished scientific award for early career contribution to social psychology.

Stacy Nairn has passed her PhD candidacy exam in the department of psychology at University of Calgary, and also received the faculty of graduate studies outstanding teaching award.

Susan Perry has a new book, *Loving in flow: How the happiest couples get and stay that way*, published by Sourcebooks.

Jim Ponzetti has been promoted to associate professor with tenure at the University of British Columbia. He also served as editor for the *International Encyclopedia of Marriage and Family* and has joined the editorial board for the *Journal of Intergenerational Relationships*.

William Rawlins has been selected to receive the W. Charles Redding Award for Excellence in Teaching by the department of communication at Purdue, and the School of Liberal Arts Educational Excellence Award.

Alan Reifman has been promoted to associate professor with tenure in the department of human development and family studies at Texas Tech.

Steve Rholes has begun a four-year term as chair of the department of psychology at Texas A&M.

Karen Roberto and **Rosemary Blieszner** are director and associate director, respectively, of the Center for Gerontology at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, which celebrates its 25th anniversary this year.

Wade Rowatt has received tenure in the department of psychology and neuroscience at Baylor University. He and his wife are proud parents of fraternal twin girls born October 7, 2002.

Lynda Sagrestano has been promoted to associate professor with tenure in the department of psychology at Southern Illinois University at Carbondale.

Pepper Schwartz was elected president-elect of the Pacific Sociological Association and was selected for the delegation for the Women's Center on Politics and Democracy to the Baltic States.

Todd Shackelford has been promoted to associate professor with tenure in the department of psychology at Florida Atlantic University. He has also been named chair of the department's new PhD concentration in evolutionary psychology.

Peter Smith has edited a new book, entitled *Violence in schools: The response in Europe*, published by Routledge Falmer.

Sharon Varallo has received tenure in the department of speech communication at Augustana College.

Kirsten von Sydow has accepted a position as professor of clinical psychology at University of Duisberg-Essen in Germany. Her son Jan was born in 2001.

Rebecca Warner has published a novel entitled *A. D. 62: Pompei*, under the pen name of Rebecca East, that engages a number of relational issues.

Rebecca Weston has accepted a position as assistant professor of psychology at Southern Illinois University at Carbondale.

Valerie Whiffen has received a grant from the Canadian Institute of Health Research to study detection and prevention of mood disorders in adolescents. She has also edited a book with **Susan Johnson** on attachment processes in couple and family therapy.

Monica Whitty has received a \$15,580 grant to study the progression of romantic relationships that initiate through an Australian online dating agency.

Jan Yager's book, entitled *When friendship hurts: How to deal with friends who betray, abandon, or wound you*, published by Simon & Schuster, has been sold for translated editions to Italy, France, Israel, The Netherlands, Japan, China, and Taiwan.

NEW MEMBERS

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

Sean Banks is a graduate student in family studies at the University of Arizona. His research focuses on the effects of stress in the relationships of dating couples.

Sherry Beaumont is associate professor and chair of the department of psychology at University of Northern British Columbia. Her research interests include parent-adolescent conflict, personality and identity development, and adult relationship styles.

Jonathan Bowman is a doctoral student in communication at Michigan State University. His research interests include

love and intimacy, friendship, gender, self-disclosure, and nonverbal communication.

Stacie Brown-Ralston is a doctoral student in communication at Wayne State University. She is studying interpersonal communication, parent-child communication, and youth psychology.

Jerry Button is a psychotherapist and relationship coach in Delray Beach, Florida. He leads workshops on affect regulation, personality, and the function of the self.

Katy Carpenter-Theune studies physical attractiveness, interpersonal communication, and taboo topics in personal relationships in the department of speech communication at University of Illinois.

Sharon Claffey is a graduate student in the department of psychology at Kent State University. Her work focuses on gender attitudes and spousal support.

Laurel Crown is a graduate student in human development and family studies at the University of Wisconsin. Her research interests include dating, intimacy, and abuse.

Scott D'Urso is a graduate student in communication at the University of Texas. He is interested in the use of communication technologies in the formation and maintenance of close relationships.

Kim Gatz is a communication graduate student whose interests include social support, stress, mental health, and culture/ethnicity.

Martin Goerke is a doctoral student in psychology at the University of Bielefeld in Germany. His interests include attachment, conflict, and attributions.

Ascan Koerner is assistant professor of communication studies at University of Minnesota. His research focuses on relationship schemas and models, and family communication patterns.

Kenneth Levy is assistant professor of psychology at Hunter College, CUNY. His work focuses on adult attachment, parent-child attachment, and emotions in close relationships.

Maria Lima is a doctoral student in psychology at Cardiff University in Wales. Her doctoral thesis is on self-persuasion in resisting temptation.

Brent Mattingly is a graduate in psychology at St. Louis University who is interested in studying the phenomenon of sacrificing desires within dating couples.

Richard Mattson is a graduate student in psychology at SUNY Binghamton. His work focuses on the cognitive and behavioral predictors of marital satisfaction and stability.

Don O'Meara is a sociologist at Raymond Walters College whose work focuses on cross-sex friendship and relationship themes in popular culture.

Susan Perry is a professional writer based in Los Angeles whose work focuses on positive psychology and intimate relationships.

Pam Reynolds is a psychologist at Monash University in Victoria, Australia. Her current work is on the measurement of connectedness.

Christine Rini is part of the Ruttenberg Cancer Center at Mt. Sinai School of Medicine. Her research interests include health, social support, stress, personality, and culture/ethnicity.

Michelle Roos is a graduate student in psychology at Wayne State University. Her work focuses on marriage and chronic pain, older couples, and depression.

David Sbarra is a graduate student in clinical psychology at University of Virginia. His research focuses on attachment, divorce, and emotion regulation.

Lois Scheidt is a graduate student at Indiana University whose research interests include emotions, social interaction, communication style, attraction, and flirtation.

Sean Seepersad is a graduate student in human and community development at University of Illinois. His research interests include attachment, intimacy, loneliness, self-disclosure, and shyness.

Virgil Sheets is in the department of psychology at Indiana State University. His research focuses on friendship, conflict, and sexual jealousy.

Janice Steil is in the Derner Institute at Adelphi University. Her research interests include gender, intimacy, marital health and satisfaction, and power.

Lisa Taylor is a doctoral student in human development and family studies at Auburn University. Her research focuses on relationship violence, adult attachment, and motivations for relational aggression.

Alexis Walker is the Jo Anne Leonard Petersen Chair in Gerontology and Family Studies at Oregon State University. Her work focuses on gender and family ties, particular in families in middle and later life. She also studies intergenerational relationships, retirement, and the division of household labor.

Valerie Whiffen is in the school of psychology at University of Ottawa. Her research interests include attachment, depression, families, marriage, and relational repair.

CONFERENCE ANNOUNCEMENTS

Update on the First IARR Co-Sponsored Special Topics Conference

Susan Sprecher

The planning committee and I are happy to report that we received over 75 submissions to the special topics conference on compassionate love. The conference is co-sponsored by IARR, the Fetzer Institute, and Illinois State University and will be held at The Chateau Hotel and Conference Center in Bloomington/Normal, Illinois, May 30 – June 2. Funding from the Fetzer Institute has made it possible to keep registration costs relatively low and yet provide hotel/conference amenities, including most meals during the days of the conference.

The keynote speakers and the titles of their talks are:

Phillip R. Shaver and Mario Mikulincer
Attachment and Altruism

Benjamin Karney
*Knowing and Adoring: A
Cognitive/Motivational Model of
Compassionate Love*

Susan S. Hendrick and Clyde Hendrick
*Keeping the Passion in Compassionate
Love*

Lynn Underwood
The Art of Compassionate Love

The program also consists of 41 oral presentations, 12 roundtable discussions, and 23 poster sessions. We expect approximately 120 people will attend the conference. We will also have many social opportunities for people to gather and discuss compassionate love research and/or be compassionate with each other.

We are also pleased to announce that conference fee waivers are being given to two students and to two non-American scholars. The ranking criteria included centrality to the conference theme and the quality of proposal and research. The winners of the student awards are Urmila Pillay (from Brunel University, UK; for the paper, "Social Support, Personality and Values – A Comparative Study

Among Indians, British Indians and British Whites”) and Alexandra West (from Australian Catholic University, for the co-authored paper, “Pro-Relationship Behaviors: A Within-Couple Analysis of Trust and Commitment”). The winners of the international awards are: Omri Gillath (from Bar-Ilan University in Israel, for the co-authored paper, “Attachment, Compassion, and Altruism”) and Barry J. Fallon (from Australian Catholic University, for the co-authored paper, “Pro-Relationship Behaviors: A Within-Couple Analysis of Trust and Commitment”).

For more updated information on the conference, please go to the following website:

<http://iilt.ilstu.edu/loveconference/>

We want to thank the following people for assisting the planning committee in evaluating submissions to the conference: Ximena Arriaga, William Cupach, Julie Fitness, Omri Gillath, Ben Karney, Lisa Neff, Leanne Knobloch, Rachel Nitzberg, Dory Schachner, Phil Shaver, and Paul Wright.

-- From Susan Sprecher, Chair of the Planning Committee (which consists also of: Dawn O. Braithwaite, Beverley Fehr, Frank Keefe, Kathleen McKinney, Pat Noller, Terri Orbuch, and Maria Schmeekle).

Madison ICPR Conference 2004

F. Scott Christopher

It is time for relationship scholars to return to Madison, Wisconsin!

Madison, the home of the first relationship conference in 1982, has been selected as the site for IARR’s 2004 International Conference on Personal Relationships. The conference will run from Thursday, July 22 through Sunday, July 25 – start planning now for an event you won’t want to miss.

Scott Christopher (Program Chair), Linda Roberts, and Denise Solomon (Local Arrangements Co-Chairs) invite you to experience summertime in Madison while you learn about cutting edge research in the field of personal relationships. Nestled between two lakes and thriving on its foundations as both the state capital and the home of the University of Wisconsin, Madison offers a unique combination of natural beauty and a vibrant urban culture. Headquarters for the conference, the Madison Concourse Hotel, is located in the heart of downtown and is minutes from the UW campus. Madison’s famous Farmer’s Market, the eclectic State Street pedestrian zone, and the historic

Memorial Union with its lake front terrace are just a short walk away. With a line-up of invited speakers that includes Anita Vangelisti, Laura Guerrero, Harry Reis, Michael Cunningham, and Robert Milardo, the conference program promises to rival the attractions of the city.

Watch for more information and a call for papers in the near future, and plan to join your colleagues from around the world in July 2004 as we begin our second decade of investigating personal relationships!

Future Conferences Committee

Terri Orbuch

On behalf of the FCC (Future Conferences Committee) and the IARR Board, I am happy to announce that the site of the 2006 conference will be **Bruges, Flanders, Belgium**. The city, immensely known in Europe, has been nominated the cultural capital of Europe in 2002. The actual physical site of the conference will be the Oud Sint Jan (Old Saint John) conference center. It is a luxurious meeting, event and congress centre that is located in the center of Old Bruges, very well settled within the wards of a medieval and nineteenth century hospital. Patrick Honout will serve as site chair for the conference. The dates of the conference still need to be scheduled. Thank you to all of the FCC members and to Patrick for their hard work in getting this arranged.

IARR BOARD

OFFICERS:

Past Presidents:

Michael Cunningham
michael.cunningham@louisville.edu

Harry Reis
reis@scp.rochester.edu

President:

Robert Milardo
rhd360@maine.edu

President Elect:

William Cupach
wrcupac@ilstu.edu

Secretary-Treasurer:

William Dragon
wdragon@cornellcollege.edu

MEMBERS AT LARGE:

Beth Emery
bemery@mtsu.edu

Terri Orbuch
orbuch@umich.edu

NEW PROFESSIONAL REPRESENTATIVE:

Caroline Rankin
ctrankin@mail.utexas.edu

JOURNAL EDITORS:

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

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

NEWSLETTER EDITORS:

Kathy Carnelley
kc6@soton.ac.uk

Kory Floyd
kory@asu.edu

COMMITTEE CHAIRS:

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

Dawn Braithwaite (Awards Chair)
dbraithwaite@unl.edu

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

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

Patrick Hunout (Local Conference Co-Chair, 2006)
Iscope@pi.be

Sandra Metts (Membership Chair)
smmetts@ilstu.edu

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

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

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

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

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

Susan Sprecher (Planning Chair)
sprecher@ilstu.edu

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

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

wdragon@cornellcollege.edu