

# RELATIONSHIP RESEARCH NEWS

OFFICIAL NEWS JOURNAL OF THE INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR RELATIONSHIP RESEARCH

Spring 2005

VOL 3, NO. 2

## PRESIDENT'S COLUMN

**Terri L. Orbuch**

### Greetings from the President

What a busy year we have had! And how quickly this year is moving!

I am very proud to announce that our next biennial conference (2006) on the Island of Crete in Greece is shaping up to be an outstanding event. Kostas Kafetsios (Chair, Local Arrangements), John Caughlin (Chair, Program Committee), and both of their committees have been working hard to make this a conference that we will never forget! I have seen the tentative agenda and there are a tremendous amount of informative sessions planned along with many fun happenings. The weather in Crete should be beautiful at that time of year, and I have heard that the location is gorgeous. Check out the photos of Crete on our website! In addition, as a demonstration of our organization's commitment towards excellence and opportunity, IARR will be providing a reduced conference registration fee for those scholars who live in impoverished countries.

Along with this exciting 2006 conference, IARR will be sponsoring two mini-conferences and a new scholars workshop over the next several months. The first is located in Vitoria Brazil, July 1-3, 2005. Vitória is home to Federal University of Espírito Santo. The conference planner is Agnaldo Garcia. The second IARR-sponsored mini-conference will be held at Indiana University-Purdue University in Indianapolis, July 21-24, 2005. Sandra Petronio is organizing this conference. We expect an excellent turnout at both conferences, and I hope you will be able to attend one or both of these events. Lastly, IARR has always been dedicated to assisting and involving new scholars in the field. Nancy Eckstein (Chair, Mentoring Committee) has developed a

wonderful workshop for new scholars to be held in Indianapolis (July 19-21). The information on these events is located on our website ([www.iarr.org](http://www.iarr.org)).

I also would like to announce a few organizational changes. We have formed a new committee called the Media Relations Committee. This committee was developed to establish contact with the media in order to encourage positive and favorable connections between relationship scholars and established media outlets. This committee will assist IARR members in the dissemination of their scholarship to the public via media channels. As some of you may know, I feel strongly about the mission of this committee, since I have been very involved in the media on a weekly basis here in the Metropolitan Detroit area. Please contact me if you would like to be a member of this committee.

The Publications Committee announces the appointment of Rebecca Adams as the new Editor of Personal Relationships. We want to recognize and express our sincere appreciation to Susan Sprecher for her dedication and outstanding service as outgoing editor (2001-2005). Thank you Sue! After several years, Lisa Baker is stepping down as IARR web site coordinator and Ben Le has been appointed to fill this position. We want to thank Lisa for her commitment and service to our organization! For those of you who know me, technology is not my strongest area of expertise. Fortunately we have people in our organization who are responsible for creating several exciting new developments. Currently, our membership directory can be found on-line with the ability to send fellow members an email message directly from the directory. Also, this spring we will conduct our first ever election on-line. I have been assured that it will run smoother than our last two U.S Presidential Elections.

Recently, there was a news story in the U.S that I followed very closely. The story involved the right-to-die case of Terri Schiavo and her family. For those

*continued on p. 3*

## INSIDE THIS ISSUE OF RELATIONSHIP RESEARCH NEWS

### PRESIDENT'S COLUMN

by Terri L. Orbuch ..... 1

### FROM THE EDITOR'S DESK

by Susan Boon..... 3

### FEATURE ARTICLE:

*Mentoring* ..... 4

### STUDENT & NEW PROFESSIONALS COLUMN:

*Affirmative Action?*

by João Moreira ..... 16

### THE LIGHTER SIDE OF RELATIONSHIPS:

*Faculty Only*

by David Kenny ..... 18

*My Confrontation with A Relational Ethnographer*

by Dan Canary ..... 19

### RETIRED PROFESSIONALS COLUMN:

*Charades, Anyone?*

by Paul Wright ..... 21

### NET NEWS:

by Ben Le ..... 23

### BOOK REVIEWS:

*Communication among Grandmothers, Mothers, and Adult Daughters* by Michelle Miller-Day

by Robert Milardo ..... 24

*Maintaining Long-Distance and Cross-Residential Relationships* by Laura Stafford

by Erin Sahlstein .....26

### TEACHING TIPS COLUMN :

by Maureen O'Sullivan .....28

### ANNOUNCEMENTS .....30

**JSPR REPORT:** by Paul Mongeau .....31

**PR REPORTS:** by Susan Sprecher.....32

by Rebecca Adams .....32

### CONTENTS OF UPCOMING JOURNALS:

*Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*.....33

*Personal Relationships*.....35

### MEMBER NEWS & UPDATES .....36

### CONFERENCE ANNOUNCEMENTS .....37

2005 Mini-Conferences .....37

2006 IARR Conference .....41

### CALLS FOR PAPERS .....42

### LIST OF IARR BOARD OF DIRECTORS & COMMITTEE CHAIRS .....46

### RELATIONSHIP RESEARCH NEWS

#### Editor

Susan Boon  
University of Calgary

#### Associate Editors

Kristin Beals  
University of California, Irvine

Jonathan Bowman  
Michigan State University

Sandra Faulkner  
Syracuse University

Christine Lomore  
St. Francis Xavier

Greg Morrow  
Edinboro University

Maureen O'Sullivan  
University of San Francisco

Beatriz Ventorini  
Universidade Federal do Espirito Santo-Brazil

Laura Winn  
Wayne State University

*Relationship Research News* is published twice a year, once in September and once in April. Contributions are very welcome and will be published as space permits. Announcements, letters to the editors, cartoons/humor, teaching tips, and other information relevant to IARR members are all appropriate. If you would like to contribute a feature article or personal commentary, please submit a brief (one paragraph) description to the editors first (please do not send manuscripts). Submit all materials to Susan Boon, Department of Psychology, University of Calgary, 2500 University Dr. NW, Calgary, AB T2N 1N4, Canada; sdboon@ucalgary.ca. The deadline for final copy is September 1 for the Fall issue and April 1 for the Spring issue. (Inquiries regarding Feature Articles are welcome at any time.)

of you who are not aware of this situation, a young woman named Terri Schiavo suffered brain damage in 1990 when her heart stopped briefly from a chemical imbalance believed to have been brought on by an eating disorder. She left no living will. The courts ruled that her feeding tube should be removed. Her parents argued that their daughter never made a right-to-die declaration and would not want to be, in their words, "starved to death." They disputed the conclusion upheld by other courts that she was in a persistent vegetative state. Schiavo's husband argued that she had said, before her illness, she would not want to continue living if she were in such a condition. The legal fight between the two sides has lasted over a decade. Besides the obvious basic necessities for survival, we need to remember the importance of relationships in our lives. It is through our positive relationships that we sustain and support ourselves mentally, emotionally and physically. As all of us know, studies have consistently shown that healthy relationships lead to healthy minds and bodies.

Our mission as an organization is to promote the scientific study of interpersonal relationships. Relationships are the basic building block upon which we can grow as individuals. I want to thank you for allowing me to represent this organization as your President. I feel like I grew up in this organization, both symbolically and professionally. I cherish the relationships I have made within our group. I encourage all of us to pause for a moment and spend some time thinking about the positive relationships in our lives.

Now if you will excuse me, I would like to go hug my children.



Terri L. Orbuch  
IARR President

## FROM THE EDITOR'S DESK

by Susan Boon  
University of Calgary

*T*his issue of *Relationship Research News* brings important news on conferences and changes in our board and journal editors. It also includes calls for papers for a number of conferences, including the upcoming IARRC in Greece. In addition, we have the usual fare—reports from our President, the editors of our journals, and the website Chair, as well as columns from our Lighter Side contributors and Retired Professional, a couple of book reviews to keep you abreast of the content of some of the most recent books written by IARR members, and of course Dr. Socrata Tibbs-Chips' responses to your questions about teaching. This issue also marks Joao Moreira's last column as the Student and New Professional representative on the Board. A special thanks to Joao for his years of service in this role.

We also bring you a special feature on mentoring. John Holmes received the IARR Mentoring Award at the Madison conference last summer. As one of his former students, I benefited directly from his skills as mentor and advisor and it was his receipt of this award last year that inspired me to seek contributors to a feature article on this topic. I hope that what you read in this feature will inspire you to develop and refine your mentoring skills in whatever capacity you may serve as mentor for others in your professional and personal lives. In addition, I hope that it will inspire those of us who have experienced great mentors to take a few moments of our time to thank them for their contributions to our lives.

Before I sign off, I'd like to repeat my request for help in putting together feature articles for upcoming issues of the bulletin. We're currently

seeking contributions on two topics that we think will be of interest to our membership: (a) funding for relationship research and (b) the ethics of studying relationships. If you have tips for writing grant proposals that you'd like to share with your IARR colleagues or would like to comment on challenges you've faced in securing funding for your research, please send us your thoughts. We are particularly interested in hearing from those who've experienced tension between the desire to "follow their heart" and seek funding to pursue questions that are of intrinsic interest to them and subtle or not so subtle pressures to follow an externally-imposed research agenda because "that's where the grant money goes." Submissions on other funding-related topics are also welcome. Our interest in featuring ethics and relationship research emerges from conversations that took place at the Madison conference about some of the difficulties and hurdles that researchers are encountering in their efforts to study important and socially significant relationship issues. Issues of ethics engendered considerable discussion in at least two symposia I attended and it became clear to me that, as a field, we could benefit from each other's experiences in the ethics review process. Perhaps some of us have found effective means of dealing with ethical issues with which others of us still struggle. We could feature those strategies in an upcoming newsletter. Perhaps a candid discussion of the obstacles we encounter in the ethical review process would help identify areas where we might work to educate members of ethics committees about the nature of our research.

For each of these feature articles, we especially encourage submissions by international members and members from disciplines that are under-represented in IARR membership. Please direct your submissions by electronic mail to Susan Boon at [sdboon@ucalgary.ca](mailto:sdboon@ucalgary.ca) or by regular mail to Department of Psychology, University of Calgary, 2500 University Dr. NW, T2N 1N4, Canada.

Thanks once again to my editorial team for their support in pulling this issue of the newsletter together. We hope you enjoy it.

## FEATURE ARTICLE

### MENTORING

*F*eatured below is a collection of short pieces on and about the art of mentoring. The Canadian Oxford Dictionary (1998) defines a mentor as "an experienced and trusted adviser or guide" (p. 906). I think you'll find the contributions below offer a more fully developed and multi-faceted definition of mentors, mentoring, and mentorship than that provided in the simple dictionary definition above.

When I first began to think seriously about pulling together a special article on this topic late last summer, I sent e-mails to various IARR members in hopes of soliciting their recommendations for people who might be worthy of the distinction of great mentor. I was delighted with the responses I received. First, there was no lack of distinguished nominees, many of whom were willing—despite very busy schedules—to contribute their thoughts on various aspects of the mentorship process. You will read these thoughts below. Second, it was inspiring to find that nearly everyone I asked could point to an important mentor in their professional lives. I have always felt that IARR members are friendly and collegial; it was uplifting to see that, beyond being friendly at conferences, many members have touched other members' lives in important and lasting ways.

When the contributions began arriving in my inbox a few weeks back, I was again delighted with what I received. There is a wealth of ideas and a richness of perspectives in what people wrote that far exceeded my expectations at the outset. Each of us can learn something from what the contributors have written. Each of us can benefit from the wisdom, practical insight,

and enthusiasm for mentoring that these pieces convey.

The various contributors include recipients of IARR's and other societies' awards for mentoring, as well as individuals recommended to me as mentors in my informal poll of members in several of the different disciplines represented by our organization. I also invited Rowland Miller, as Chair of the Awards Committee, and Nancy Eckstein, as Chair of the Mentoring Committee, to submit pieces reflecting their unique perspectives on and interests in mentoring. The contributions are arranged in no particular order, sandwiched between Rody's comments regarding what can be learned from considering the list of past recipients of the IARR Mentoring Award and Nancy's description of the goals and objectives of the Mentoring Committee. Please take the time to read what each of the contributors below has written and then, in Maureen Keeley's words, consider how you might "pay it forward" in your own interactions with students and colleagues and the world beyond the academy.

I'd like to end this introduction with a special thank you to all of those who helped in various ways as I pulled together this collection of short essays. Thanks especially to those who feel so passionately about the importance of mentoring that they took time out of their very busy schedules (and at the end of term, no less!) to share their experiences with the rest of us.

Susan Boon  
Editor, RRN

### Who's a Great Mentor?

### Rowland Miller, Chair of the IARR Awards Committee

Our field is privileged to be populated by scholars who are both very clever and very generous. IARR is full of unselfish leaders who have had enormous impact on their younger colleagues, and every two years your Awards Committee is asked to select one winner of our Mentoring Award, which recognizes an outstanding mentor in relationship science. It's an imposing task, and as we gear up for a new cycle of IARR awards, I invite you to ponder with me the attributes of a great mentor.

One learns much by considering the award's history and by inspecting the list of our past winners. The IARR Mentoring Award was inherited from INPR. ISSPR did not have such an award, and even INPR did not begin granting one until 1997, years after it had become a mature organization. Since then, these revered colleagues have been named our outstanding mentors:

- 1997 in Oxford, OH: Joseph Veroff
- 1998 in Norman, OK: Barry Wellman
- 2001 in Prescott, AZ: Steve Duck
- 2002 in Halifax, NS: Thomas Bradbury & Caryl Rusbult
- 2004 in Madison, WI: John Holmes

(Now, I should note that our institutional records and memory for our early years tend to be a bit scattered. If this list is inaccurate in any way, please let me know!) All of the winners are influential trainers who have played a leading role in developing a new generation of relationship scientists. They have all supervised, steered, and shaped younger scholars who have gone on to have notable careers. Each has intellectual descendants who have advanced our profession.

And, of course, that's the nature of the award. But I suspect that the winners are distinguished by qualities that go well beyond a simple count of their productive students. Consider that, of

all our awards, this is the one for which self-nominations are least appropriate. My guess is that each winner has had especial impact on his or her students, and that's an effect to which those younger colleagues should speak. Most of us hold our mentors in high regard, and we're grateful for their efforts in guiding and protecting us, so mere thanks are probably not enough. Great mentors transform their students. Selflessly and tirelessly, they have uncommon influence, doing more than usual and working harder than others to create whole scholars out of their raw recruits.

Steve Duck wryly suggested to me that we should give the Mentoring Award to the trainer who produces the most newcomers who would win "Most Improved" awards, and he had a point. Great mentors do more than produce students who become famous; they consistently have impact that makes all of their students more than they were. Some great mentors also have influence beyond their own programs, providing professional leadership and workshops and other training opportunities that enrich the profession as a whole.

So, great mentors are colleagues towards whom we can all feel grateful. This fall, we will again pursue the difficult task of singling out one of our colleagues for special recognition as an exceptional trainer, and I hope that you will keep this award in mind. Your Awards Committee will welcome nominations by groups of colleagues or students, and I encourage you to share with me your thoughts about the award.

### **Reflections on the Experience of Mentoring**

**John Holmes (Psychology)  
University of Waterloo  
Recipient of the IARR Mentoring Award**

When Susan Boon suggested to me that I consider writing a short piece on my experiences as a mentor, I was a bit hesitant. Partly that reflected my concern that attempts at trying to deconstruct and analyze the experiences would only result in my creating a post hoc "story" that

might not at all have captured my thoughts and goals at the time. Not only did I not have any grand plan in mind to guide my mentoring efforts with graduate students, but I can't truly say that I remember having even a vague approach in mind. Life as a supervisor just seemed to unfold as it did, with little in the way of systematic planning on my part. Despite this lack of clarity, I do know that I love the actual experience of working closely with my graduate students and have found it very fulfilling. So here are my thoughts on what I think made it a meaningful experience for me, and perhaps for them.

In her very kind letter nominating me for the International Association of Relationship Researchers Mentoring Award in 2004, Sandra Murray noted that I "mentored largely without the student's awareness." She explains that, "John rarely told me (or his other students) what to do, or exactly how to do it." Sandra's comment certainly fits my view that I didn't have any clear ideas about advising! And it would help explain the occasional student who finds me difficult to work with because I won't provide the direction he/she thinks is needed. But more seriously, I do think Sandra captures what makes being a mentor personally rewarding for me. I love the actual process of discussing ideas, the give and take, of trying to think creatively and generatively about important theoretical questions. Indeed, Sandra went on to say, "John spent an inordinate amount of time with me talking about ideas, and helping me shape these ideas into concrete studies." Of course, that was a two-way street with talented students like Sandra, and it was often unclear who gained the most from our discussions.

So in a nutshell, the whole point in pursuing a career in research is to study important and interesting questions. My goal has been to try to inspire students to identify ideas that they find stimulating, through trying to model intellectual curiosity and excitement about ideas in discussions. Then, over time, I do my best to gently help students separate their good ideas from the bad ones. I say gently because it is so important not to undermine their confidence in

their input into the intellectual process. It is really critical to encourage a true discussion, one in which I expect students to struggle and flounder, as I do, in the difficult and taxing process of creating theoretical ideas. This certainly means that I must squelch the occasional temptation to pontificate on an issue, which my colleagues know me to have.

Ian McGregor, in the nominating letter, said that, "I am particularly appreciative that John was willing to let me ask my own questions, without being constrained by his own agenda. I think he truly believed that if it wasn't fun for the student it wouldn't be fun for him, and thus, wouldn't produce anything creative. He was committed to nurturing intrinsically motivated students." I hope that is true, because it sure feels right to me. My proudest moments are seeing my ex-students confidently making their way in their academic careers with a strong sense of intellectual self-efficacy and pride in their own ideas. That's what makes it all seem worthwhile.

### **Multiple Mentors**

**Esther Kluwer (Psychology)  
Utrecht University, The Netherlands**

When I was asked to write down my thoughts on mentoring, I immediately thought of my own mentoring, or the lack thereof. In Dutch academia, the number of women in higher positions (associate and full professor) is deplorably low. A few years ago, only 4% of the full professors were female and the numbers have probably risen barely since then. Being an associate professor (and the only female one in my department), this means that I primarily have male colleagues and, thus, male mentors or role models. Sure, I learn many valuable things from them: How to publish in top journals, how to write successful grant proposals, how to work day and night. But there are just some things they do differently. In my case, they don't have small children so they don't have to juggle the demands of work and family life. They don't have to take their kids to the doctor during office hours, stay home because they're sick or pick up

their kids from day care. I am not complaining; my colleagues are very lenient and understanding of my other duties in life. But they don't always make good mentors in that particular respect.

Recently, I started collaborating with a colleague in a different department. She is five years older, a full professor with three children and, although not a social psychologist, an excellent mentor or role model when it comes to combining a career with a family. From her, I learn that life will get easier when my children sleep through the night, when they are all in school and know how to dress themselves. More importantly, I learn from her to keep my sense of humour and not take my work too seriously all the time. So I guess the bottom line for me is to have multiple mentors: One for work-work issues and one for work-family issues.

### **What Is Mentoring?**

**Patricia Noller (Psychology)  
University of Queensland, Australia**

One of the most fulfilling aspects of working as an academic is the opportunity (and responsibility) to help younger academics achieve their life goals. In this technological age when there are so many different ways of communicating, mentoring is possible at a range of levels. Mentoring may involve providing information electronically to someone on the other side of the world, or helping a graduate student sort out and operationalize their research ideas, or years of working together with the academic in the next office who was once my student and is now a highly valued colleague.

Sometimes I find myself mentoring by email, particularly to those in less developed countries, providing information about research methods and questionnaires, as well as about ways of analyzing data. At other times, mentoring will involve a phone call or face-to-face session, dealing with the concerns of a graduate student who is having problems articulating hypotheses, recruiting participants, choosing measures,

analyzing data, explaining results and so on. Supervision of graduate students is my favorite part of the work, partly because my students stimulate and challenge me, but also because I am conscious of influencing the next generation of university staff and students. Inviting a graduate student to become involved in writing a book chapter or journal article can also be an important aspect of mentoring, provided we work with them and don't put the burden on them to help us meet our deadlines.

Mentoring can also occur at conferences over a cup of coffee, over lunch, or even during a noisy sock hop. It is part of working with someone who is on study leave and wanting feedback on their research ideas, or on the paper they would like to get published. Reviewing for journals is also an aspect of mentoring, as we provide suggestions that we believe will make a particular paper clearer and its impact greater. We may never know the person being mentored on those occasions, but we mentored nevertheless. It may help us to be more positive about this aspect of the work if we recognize that we are actually mentoring.

For those of us who are involved in the annual appraisal of academic staff, these sessions can also be times for mentoring: helping individuals to evaluate their performance over the previous year, formulate realistic goals for the coming year and work out ways to achieve those goals. Taken seriously, these times can be both encouraging and challenging, and have an important impact on an individual's career.

What then is mentoring? Mentoring may be formal or informal, for a short time or a long time, face-to-face or involve some electronic means of communication; it may involve giving advice or facilitating the other person in working through their own issues; it may focus on encouragement or challenge, or both. Whatever the means, the goal of mentoring is always to help individuals set goals and achieve those goals, and move on in their careers. There is nothing more fulfilling than to see those we have mentored established in successful careers and enjoying the various aspects of their lives.

## **Mentoring Graduate Students in Psychology**

**Thomas Bradbury (Psychology)  
UCLA**

### **Recipient of the INPR Mentoring Award**

Although I view the mentoring of graduate students as a central task in my daily professional life, I confess that I do not spend too much time thinking about my mentoring philosophy, nor do I have any conscious strategy about how a mentoring relationship should proceed. When pushed, however, I would say that the following points probably capture my approach pretty well:

*First, I mentor students from the perspective that few careers are as satisfying as those in academic research or closely related enterprises. I truly believe that the academic lifestyle affords an ideal blend of personal flexibility, intellectual engagement, travel and time away from the office, and interaction and collaboration with other dedicated professionals. Like all professionals we take the bad with the good (too many reviews to write, too many emails, too many committee meetings, too many really rough drafts), but the fact remains that being able to pursue an intellectual agenda is a pretty good deal – only tenured academics and supreme court justices are guaranteed employment for life. I want my students to see and appreciate this lifestyle so that perhaps they can enjoy it when they have the PhD (and maybe tenure) in hand.*

*Second, I mentor students from the perspective that few topics are as important to study as those involving how human beings form and maintain deep and committed connections with one another. The questions that fascinate us are those for the ancients, yet we are privileged to have the tools and resources to shed light on the mysteries of human intimacy in all of its guises. A great deal pivots on the quality of our interpersonal relationships – whether we are depressed or not, the quality of our parenting,*

our motivation to take care of our physical health, and so on – and good science can enable more people to share in the benefits that good relationships bring. I try to help students see the significance of what we study, and to develop an abiding respect for the power of human connection.

*Third, I mentor students with the opinion that what we do as scientists has to matter, either in the sense that it breaks open some theoretical argument or helps to resolve some empirical dispute, or in the sense that it leads to improvements in the interpersonal lives that people lead – or both.* Without denying the importance of publishing as a means of getting tenured and stabilizing our lives, as best we can, we must avoid the temptation to write papers and edit books that merely advance our personal agendas. (See ‘too many reviews,’ above!) Our phenomena are too important, our resources are too few, our time is too limited, and suffering is too common for us to conduct research that does not hit the heart of the problems that we study. I try to help students find a good axe to grind, to put themselves in the center of some theoretical or empirical quandary, and then move the arguments ahead.

*Fourth, I mentor students from the perspective that ideas come from many academic and non-academic sources, and that we have to learn to understand and appreciate what scholars in other disciplines have to say to us and integrate them into our thinking.* Though it is not always easy, we have to avoid the tendency to be insular. Psychology is sometimes described as a field in which everyone is on stage and no one is in the audience clapping, and this is a tendency we have to work to overcome. In practical terms, this means that I encourage students to read aggressively, broadly, even promiscuously.

*Fifth, in the same vein, I mentor students with the opinion that ideas have been accumulating for some time in our field, and that we must look to the history of our disciplines to understand where ideas come from, how earlier scholars have grappled with these ideas, how they evolved, and what wisdom we can extract from classic articles and studies.* I have always found

it remarkable that all of our secrets are out in the open, in published form. Unlike, say, a stock trader or a businessman or even a surgeon, all of our big tricks are available for all to see – this is the cornerstone of science, of course. No one in academic research really advances without showing exactly how they do what they do—how they moved from an original idea, to a specific hypothesis, to a particular method, and on through a conclusion. A journal article coalesces a remarkable amount of information, and I try to help students learn how to follow a thread through a literature and how we need to follow the various trails through the literature to understand how we can best proceed.

*Sixth, I mentor students with the assumption that making headway in the study of human intimacy requires specialized tools and methods, and that they must acquire these tools in order to be competitive and successful.* Having a bigger repertoire of tools means having more ways to solve more problems, and so I see the need for a strong methodological repertoire as essential to graduate students’ futures. The days of conducting cross-sectional research with simple self-report measures and non-experimental designs is largely behind us now, and having an influence in the future of our field will require facility with complex methods and procedures. I cannot provide students with all of these tools myself (and thus I benefit from sending my students to outstanding colleagues here at UCLA), though I do try to encourage students to see the special value in studying relationships using observational methods, interviews, and multiwave longitudinal designs.

*Seventh, I mentor students with the view that becoming a fully-fledged scholar of intimate relationships typically requires support from intramural and extramural sources, and that over the long haul mastering the funding process is at least as important for their careers as publishing journal articles.* The unfortunate reality is that conducting research of consequence typically requires time and resources, and I encourage students to see that they can make their lives much easier by securing their own support. The benefits of outside funding are evident once students have a

faculty position, of course, but the benefits of funding prior to earning the PhD are also tremendous, in the sense that financial support enables students to not teach, to focus more on their own studies, and to travel to conferences that they may not have attended otherwise. Practically, this means that all of my students are encouraged to write at least one grant proposal of some kind during graduate school.

*Eighth, I mentor students from the perspective that developing an identity as a scholar takes time and that the process is not always linear.* Interests change, plans change, results do not pan out, and so forth, and so it is important for student and mentor alike to remain flexible. Taking a developmental perspective also means that I encourage students to start thinking very early about what their identity will be in 5 or 6 years, when the PhD is nearly complete. What is it they want to say they have been doing for all this time? What will impress them, and their future employer? What do they want to see in their CV? In the 50-minute job talk that will seal their fate with a search committee? What studies and findings do they want to report? While pushing this point, I also try to emphasize that graduate school is a very special time, and one of the few times that they can truly revel in their ignorance and ask all the questions they can without having to pretend to know all the answers. The opportunities to reveal one's true ignorance (or perhaps the inclination to do so) really subside when you take on a faculty position, so I encourage students to appreciate the luxury of not having to know all the answers while they still have the chance.

*Ninth, I mentor students with the assumption that, like me, they have quirks and foibles, and that it is important to understand and respect these.* Some people can write brilliantly but have more trouble with the analyses, some can interact well with research participants but struggle some with the formal research process, some cannot code interaction tapes well but are great with theoretical insights, and so forth. The trick is to take a measure of students and to not allow what a student cannot do interfere with what he or she can do. Along these same lines, it is important for me as a mentor to recognize

that students are searching to develop their own identity and not merely to replicate or take on my identity. No one wants to study what I study, in the way I study it, on the kind of career trajectory that I have adopted, nor should they. I am not thrilled when very talented students opt out of academic research altogether and take clinical positions, but we all have our choices to make and there are many ways to make contributions to our field.

*Tenth, I mentor students with the assumption that if they are responsible and dedicated, and see a project through to completion, then they should be first-author on any resulting manuscripts.* Graduate school is really the time for students to cut their teeth on the process of publishing, and as a mentor I try to provide the scaffolding that can make this happen. This process has to be de-mystified for students, and if this does not happen in graduate school then it will hinder students as they progress. Also, students benefit far more than me from first-authored publications, and in the end we are all better off when the student achieves the kind of position he or she wants when the PhD is complete.

Let me end with three thoughts. First, I have been exceptionally fortunate to work with remarkably talented graduate students and post-doctoral fellows. Any success they have achieved is due to their hard work and dedication, and I myself have benefited – as a mentor and as a scholar—in countless ways from them. Few professional accomplishments are as satisfying for me as seeing one's graduate students set up labs, publish papers, and earn grants on their own.

Second, I have been exceptionally fortunate to work with remarkably talented mentors in graduate school, most notably Frank Fincham through most of the 1980s. In a real sense I am simply passing on the wisdom that Frank and others instilled in me. And even now I continue to depend upon and cultivate mentors because, after all, getting the PhD is far from the only professional challenge for which we need advice, guidance, and support.

The final point I want to make relates to my first, and it concerns why, exactly, academic research can hold such appeal. A bright and ambitious undergraduate was in my office last month, considering her career options and plans. She asked me why we do not turn out dozens upon dozens of PhD's each year, in the same way a law school or medical school does. How could this be? And shouldn't we be training more people all at one time? The answer, I believe, is that every PhD that is earned represents a unique relationship between a student and at least one mentor, and that these relationships require great investments of time, energy, patience, and dedication on the part of student and mentor alike.

### **Great Mentors**

**Frank Boster (Communications)  
Michigan State University  
Recipient of the Michigan State  
University Distinguished Faculty Award**

I was fortunate to have two outstanding mentors. One was John E. Hunter. Jack was a psychologist at Michigan State University. The time that he spent with me and the patience that he exhibited in those interactions was remarkable. But, more important than any story about us is a story that he told me about one of his graduate school experiences.

He was taking a course in quantitative methods at the University of Illinois in the second semester of the first year of his graduate program. He was 22 years old, did not have a master's degree, and had never published an article. Lee Cronbach, clearly one of the most prestigious and influential psychologists in history, was teaching the class. The topic of the day was generalizability theory, and the brash young Hunter came up to Cronbach after class and said, "Your generalizability theory is completely wrong and I can prove it." Cronbach replied, "Come back to my office." Hunter did. Cronbach walked to the chalkboard in his office, picked up a piece of chalk, gave it to Hunter, laid down on the couch, and said, "Go to it." As

Jack told the story they argued after every class for the remainder of the semester. At the end of the semester Cronbach said, "Hunter, we haven't resolved this yet, so I am hiring you as my research assistant this summer." According to Jack they argued all summer as well.

Certainly Jack took this lesson to heart and he passed it on to his students. Scholarly prestige does not trump truth. The quality of your arguments matters. Listen to others' ideas carefully, respectfully, and with skepticism. Do not be awed by authority.

Gerald R. Miller was a professor in the Department of Communication at Michigan State University. Because of the frequency of our interaction and the numerous acts of kindness in which he engaged, it is difficult to pick out one story. Instead, I can list a few of the many things that he did that made a difference. Were he alive he would discount their importance, but they had a huge effect on me.

He had an uncanny ability to sense when my assistantship money for the month was running low because when I was broke he would invite me to his house for dinner. When I had an article come out in print, there would be a congratulatory note from him in the mail within a few days. He gave me outstanding advice on jobs for which I should apply, jobs for which I should not apply, what job offers to accept, and what job offers to reject. His letters and follow up telephone calls were the biggest reasons that I received the job offers that I received. He encouraged me after disappointments such as article rejections. Even as a graduate student he told me when I was wrong and explained why without ever making me feel as if I were anything less than a valued colleague.

Both of these men are dead. I try to honor them by advancing the same spirit of scholarly excellence and humaneness that they exhibited when they were alive. They both received the Distinguished Faculty Award at Michigan State. I received it in 2003, but I do not think of myself as having won it. It is their award.

## Mentoring

**Steve Duck (Communications)**

**University of Iowa**

### **Recipient of the INPR Mentoring Award**

Even those people who write books about it seem to have trouble deciding what mentoring actually is. Clearly, it has some element of active support for the work of others and in this sense, most Ph.D. advisers are mentors, some good mentors and some *tormentors*. However, above and beyond this, it appears that there is an emphasis on the facilitation of someone else's career and development in ways that go beyond normal teaching. Some examples of this would be the provision of opportunities to co-author papers, the mentioning of names to editors who are seeking readers for journal papers, the encouragement of people to submit their work to conferences, and a warmth in helping people to understand that the true quality of their work may be better than the authors imagine or can see for themselves. In this latter respect, the much maligned, hapless beings who serve as reviewers for journal articles are often uncredited mentors who help authors to say things more effectively than they otherwise had done.

Although we tend to think about mentoring in terms of people being good or bad at supporting their own students, and perhaps spreading their good works somewhat beyond the range of their own department, there is a very significant mentoring effect served by people who are good at their work in the profession generally. Many people, whether they be aspiring graduate students, young scholars or even the well-established, are often significantly guided by the excellent work of particularly good researchers and thinkers. In this respect those excellent colleagues are mentors for the rest of the profession, whether they do it actively and knowingly or not. They show people what is possible through energy and excellence and therefore guide the rest of us.

Therefore it becomes obvious that mentoring is to be measured partly through its initial

intentions and its local effects, which can be particularly significant, but also partly through its results, whether these are direct or indirect and whether they are local or brought. Furthermore, it becomes clear that anybody can be a mentor for anyone else in the same discipline or area and one does not have to have a direct personal relationship with the people involved in order to help their careers to develop. All that is required is that one pays attention to the possibilities for developing others' work as well as one's own. This is the major contribution of those editors who pull together collections of work by people we had previously not been seen as major contributors, but whose chapters in edited collections successfully bring them into that position. The editor who has neatly spotted the possibility of a significant contribution from someone who has previously not been noticed is serving as a mentor, although we do not normally perhaps think of it that way. Since editors offer themselves rather than being born into the role, is possible for anyone who is particularly attentive and active in listening at conferences to become an editor of valuable collections of chapters and hence to serve in this mentoring role.

Mentors can also provide opportunities for a larger body of people not all of whom go on to become researchers in their own right but who may come to understand the value of a comprehension of relationships in their actual lives. For example, by developing favorable attitudes in university administrations towards the possibility of relationship courses being significant contributions to scholarship, many people in our profession have provided opportunities for people to study things that were previously not regarded as wholly legitimate academic pursuits, and were hence confined to the small corners of larger departments. Nowadays through the efforts of many separate people in different places, we see that relationship courses are a blooming, buzzing profusion, thanks to the activities of these unsung mentors.

As the above paragraphs indicate, I think the possibility of extending our concept of

mentoring beyond the traditional recognition of a superb Ph.D. adviser is a rather important step to take. It helps us to recognize a broader range of ways in which we can help one another to develop careers and in which the community as a whole can become involved in mentoring each other.

### **The Tao of Mentoring...**

**Pepper Schwartz (Sociology)  
University of Washington**

There are numerous ways to be a mentor—I wouldn't dream of thinking that mentoring could be a one size fits all kind of thing. However, since we only really know the kind we do (or the kind we received) I can only write about what I think has worked for me in terms of creating long term friendships and collegueship with students as I have tried to help them carve out their professional paths.

I think there are several simple, but essential, elements to the faculty-graduate student relationship. First of all, I think you have to like each other. At least I need to like, and respect, the student so that I want to spend time with him or her, and I think I could not feel this way if I didn't sense that the student in question felt the same about me. This might be a uniquely female approach to the process, but I don't think so. While some faculty and students have a very formal relationship while the student studies under the professor, I believe that the most successful kind of mentoring also has a satisfying personal component.

Second, they have to be capable of taking advice without umbrage, and the mentor has to be able to give it without being brutal. While these guidelines may not always work in every single transaction, they should be maintained most of the time. Perhaps more important, when a violation has occurred, (in reality, or in perception), the two people have to be able to talk about it, understand, apologize if necessary, and get over it.

Thirdly, the relationship needs time—casual talking time together, project time, and time spent giving written feedback. There is no such thing as the "One Minute Mentor" and this means that both people need to figure out a way to fit into each other's sometimes difficult schedules. Students need to feel they can get advice or feedback from you in a timely manner—(or have the right to complain, without prejudice, if they have not heard from you when they need to). Faculty need to be able to create due dates and rewrites, etc. that get observed—or again, be able to discuss what went wrong.

Fourthly, and perhaps most important, a real mentor lets a student into his or her life. They show them what professional life looks like, how deadlines are met, how choices about professional production are made, how failures get fixed or accomodated. Furthermore, they talk them up at professional meetings, help them meet important personal and intellectual contacts at all kinds of events, and help them get acquainted with other faculty in the department and University. An extraordinary amount of professional socialization and networking goes on in professional meetings and in random social contact with other academics that a mentor might take for granted but is invaluable to a student.

Fifth and final, mentoring doesn't end. Just like parenting goes on and on, but in new and increasingly more respectful and individuated ways, so mentoring goes on after a student has received their degree. Like all deep and important relationships, it is not severed simply because a transition has taken place.

In the best of all possible outcomes, one has a deep, almost familial, relationship with the person you have helped become a motivated intellectual and a professional behavioral scientist.

### **Paying It Forward**

**By Maureen Keeley (Communications)  
Texas State University-San Marcos**

Bill Bailey, my undergraduate advisor and mentor stopped me in 1984 and asked me if “I had ever considered going to graduate school because I would be a great teacher of Interpersonal Communication.” After I laughed and said “Are you crazy? I could never go to graduate school. I’m not that smart.” He smiled and told me “Never to say never.” Months later, just as I was saying goodbye to Bailey (as he likes to be called), he smiled and said “See you soon, you’ll be back. You’re smarter than you realize and you are meant to be a teacher.” He really smiled the day that I walked back through those doors at the University of Arizona to begin my Master of Arts degree in Communication. I would not be sitting here with my Ph.D. teaching classes in the area of Interpersonal Communication if this caring professor had not stopped me and told me that he believed in me and that I should believe in myself. He also continued to give me that support throughout my challenging MA program. Bailey taught me to recognize talent in my students and to always be sure to encourage and enlighten those students of their talents because everyone needs someone to believe in them.

Judee Burgoon became co-director of my thesis at the University of Arizona. At first she didn’t see what Bill Bailey had seen and was skeptical of my credentials as well as my potential for success in the rigorous program. Judee gave me a chance to prove her wrong and to “violate her expectations” and when I did, she became one of my strongest supporters. She also taught me a great deal about how to become a critical thinker and how to persevere through demanding challenges with determination and a willingness to work harder than I ever knew I was capable of doing. Judee taught me that students sometimes need an opportunity to prove you wrong and she taught me to demand a lot from my students (and myself) because of the potential heights that can be reached.

Steve Duck became my teacher, advisor, and mentor in 1991 as I began my journey towards a doctorate following a 4 year break from graduate school. He believed in me from the 1<sup>st</sup> moment and he never looked back. It was wonderful to be a “recruit” for the first time in my academic

career and it was amazing to have this brilliant man as my teacher. Steve taught me many things. I discovered the importance of writing about things that I am passionate about and to write in a voice that engages people while challenging them to think about the importance of Relational Communication in their daily lives. I learned the importance of thoughtful feedback. I also benefited from his generosity as he gave almost all of his graduate students the opportunity to publish and to participate in scholarly debate in his classes and in the network (formerly known as INPR) that he created in large part to mentor graduate students and young scholars in the field of Relational Communication.

Donovan Ochs was my teaching advisor and mentor as I taught Rhetoric and Speaking classes at the University of Iowa. I observed a Master Teacher who had a heart of gold. Don taught me the importance of empathy and compassion. Don sat with me one day after a devastating score on a Statistical Exam which I unfortunately found out about the day before my qualifying exams. Quite frankly, I could barely breathe and I was filled with doubt and insecurity as I faced these career deciding exams. Instead of telling me I was crazy, to get over it, and then closing the door, he invited me in to sit with him and talk. Over the next hour and numerous Kleenex later, he gently got me to tell him my accomplishments by asking a series of questions. He gave me back the confidence that I vitally needed if I was going to successfully complete those important exams. In addition to compassion, Don taught me that students need help at times to discover (or find their lost) confidence and he also taught me that life needs balance and fun in the midst of the chaos and hard work.

Steven Beebe is the chair in the Department of Communication at Texas State University—San Marcos where I am currently an Associate Professor teaching classes in the area of Interpersonal Communication. In addition to being an extraordinary leader of my department and teacher, he also mentored me through an identity crisis regarding my research. To make a long story short, he gave me the encouragement

to follow my heart and to focus my research interests and energy on the project that I am currently working on. His encouragement then and now have helped me to work on a program of research that has both pragmatic and scholarly value. Steve has taught me to focus on the positive, to trust my intuition, and to do work that *I* believed in.

Clearly, I have not walked alone these past 20 years as I have traveled my academic journey. I have often thought about how I could thank these mentors of mine and then I knew...I had to "pay it forward." It is only by "paying it forward" that I can ever begin to repay the debt that I owe them. None of us would be where we are today without a teacher, a guide, a mentor—in fact, if you are as lucky as I have been, you will have more than one mentor. We all need someone to believe in us; someone to nurture and channel our talents, strengths, and gifts; and we all need someone to help us overcome our fears and weaknesses. Time, dedication, and energy are additional gifts that all of my mentors gave to me. Their guidance and mentorship were given selflessly—they knew that I couldn't return "in kind" to them, but perhaps they hoped that someday I would mentor my own students and colleagues. I try every day to remember the lessons from these individuals when I am faced with a person that is in need of a mentor because it is indeed my time to "pay it forward." I smiled today as I had two former students come back to thank me because I had "taught them well," I had "made a difference in how they think," and I had "changed their lives" through my classes and through the talks that we had had over the past two years in my office. I smiled today because I am repaying my debt by "paying it forward."

### **The Mentoring Committee**

**Nancy Eckstein  
Chair, IARR Mentoring Committee**

My world has been full of mentors – willing and unwilling people who, whether they have realized it or not, have influenced and continue to influence my thoughts, research directions, teaching practices, and writing style. They have often encouraged me when I have been discouraged, prevented me from emotional and impulsive actions, and continue to provide an overall steady, stabilizing force in my life of academia. The majority of these mentors do not have the "official" title of mentor and yet, when I am talking about them to others, I find myself using that word to describe their role in my life. Often times hesitancy prevents me from approaching experienced scholars I want to seek out and ask for "help" or "mentoring" in a specific area of weakness I am trying to strengthen; I think they do not have time in their already busy schedules for one more demand on their lives. And yet, rarely have the individuals who knowingly or unknowingly played the role of mentor in my life ever refused to impart their knowledge, advice, or encouragement. The selflessness and vision many of these individuals possess of growing and training young scholars to be successful academics is what makes them outstanding people. The very concept of being a mentor is an exciting and fulfilling adventure, for it is through the "giving" of our own experiences and knowledge to others that we ourselves continue to grow as scholars, teachers, and most importantly—people. With this idealistic vision of the importance of mentorship, the primary goal of the mentoring committee comes into view: To provide and facilitate the training, growth, and encouragement of any individual seeking to advance their teaching, research, writing, or disciplinary involvement so that they may realize their full potential as scholars.

With these goals in mind the Mentorship Committee embarks upon their mission with a determination to meet the needs of those seeking mentorship. My first step in organizing the committee was to locate individuals from varying disciplines to serve. With a good mix of psychologists, sociologists, family studies, and communication scholars the committee was asked to identify goals they wanted to see accomplished this year. These goals were then

categorized (sounds like a study) into subcommittees with members agreeing to serve in the areas that excited them most.

One of the primary goals this year is to expand the IARR Mentoring Committee Website Link which will provide teaching tools for various relationship classes such as class exercises, sample syllabi, textbook suggestions, reading articles, links to teaching websites, and an advice and support column that will seek out senior scholars to answer questions of young scholars. A second goal of the committee is to provide organized mentoring events during the IARR bi-annual conferences that are specifically focused toward new scholars and are of a more applied nature such as panels on teaching relationship courses, methodology, improving scholarly writing, establishing a research program, interviewing panels, and of course the important social and networking opportunities! Third, the Mentorship Committee will continue to implement the New Scholars Workshop (Indianapolis- July, 2005; St. Paul - 2006) geared toward graduate students and scholars within their first five years of teaching.

A fourth goal of the Mentoring Committee is to establish mentoring networks. These networks will actively recruit seasoned scholars and pair them with junior scholars seeking a mentor in a specific area such as research, writing, or teaching. Fifth, a committee has been organized to compile a directory of key journals available in the different disciplines and provide an identification of them as national, regional, or state journals. Although many young scholars are aware of the journals available to them within their own disciplines, many are not aware of the key journals in other disciplines. Because IARR is an interdisciplinary organization, this will help facilitate an awareness of the research being done in other disciplines. Editors will also be contacted and encouraged to use junior scholar reviewers so that young scholars can begin to become involved in the publishing process. New scholars who express an interest in being a junior reviewer will be put in touch with editors. Although we understand much of this is already available, the committee would like to actively facilitate the implementation and use of

the many opportunities available to young scholars that they may not be aware exists. As part of this, the national organizations for each discipline will be listed with links to their homepages available at the Mentoring Committee website link. Finally, the Mentorship Committee would like expand its visibility by making both young and senior scholars aware of the many opportunities available to them. Strategic plans are underway to extend a specific welcome to new Ph.D.'s in varying disciplines and invite them to become involved in IARR.

The Mentorship Committee is excited about the upcoming term and looks forward to being a valuable asset in encouraging the development of mentoring partners, mentoring activities, and mentoring tools. Be ready—the Mentorship Committee wants to involve you!! ☺

---

## **STUDENT & NEW PROFESSIONALS COLUMN**

### **Time for Affirmative Action?**

by João Moreira

Coming to my last New Professional column, I found myself reflecting on what would be the most significant thing to say to students and new professionals, as well as to rest of the membership, as I step down from the Board. After reviewing my previous columns and thinking back about my relatively long career as a “new professional,” it quickly became clear that I would have to go back to an issue that I have raised several times in the past, but which seems to be a continuing problem at IARR: the lack of diversity, especially in geographic, ethnic, and cultural terms.

I would like to start by saying that although these are not the only lines along which to consider diversity, it is my impression that the problem is not so serious in what concerns gender, sexual orientation, or age, for example. Of course, I admit that other people may feel otherwise, but I would like to focus on dimensions mentioned in the previous paragraph, and to share some of my personal perceptions of the problem.

It is obvious that there is a degree of diversity in the membership, and it becomes particularly visible when looking at students attending IARR (and precedent societies') conferences. At these meetings I have had the pleasure of interacting with many African, Latino, Asian, European, etc. students. At later conferences, I would meet new students, and some of my old acquaintances, that were attending again, now perhaps as truly "New Professionals." But there was a disturbing aspect to this: Nearly all of the Black, Latino, Asian, etc. people were new students attending for the first time. The ones returning from previous years were almost invariably White, and of North American origin. The problem seemed, therefore to be not one of attraction, but one of *retention* of ethnic and cultural minority people.

In other words, I get the feeling that many of these minority students are not making the transition from casual student attendees to full members and habitual presences at meetings. Also, with very few exceptions, they are not making it into committees and other important functions at IARR. Do we happen to have a "glass ceiling" at IARR?

It is equally disturbing to consider other aspects in which we may be cutting back on diversity, and how this is particularly salient at the highest levels. It is difficult to find any of the IARR Awards being given to anyone that is not a North American White person (just look at this year's awards, announced in the previous newsletter). Some colleagues also believe that the number of articles published in PR and JSPR by colleagues from outside North America is minimal.

Two caveats at this point. First, I don't think it is necessary to delve much into justifying the need for diversity. With increasing people mobility, culture will become a crucial issue in the decades to come, and intercultural relationships are quickly increasing in number, thus becoming a fundamental area for study. This cannot appropriately be done almost *exclusively* by North American Whites, at the risk of losing relevance for most of the potential participants and consumers of the information thus produced. This lack of perceived cultural relevance may lead, in addition, to the appearance of more internationally slanted or regional associations that compete with IARR. Second, you may have noticed that I am using a lot of hedges (at least, I think I am...). This is because, first, these are really raw impressions that I have been getting across the years, some of which are shared by others, but which are not backed by hard data. Second, because I do not think there is any intent of discrimination from people with responsibilities within IARR and, on the contrary, most people would welcome a greater degree of diversity in membership, conference attendance, awards, and publication. For example, when it comes to regional diversity and European scholars' representation in particular, my feeling is that because of the wide majority of North American people in most committees, the ways things are done and the criteria used tend to be typically American, inadvertently hindering recognition of people of different origins.

My intention, finally, boils down to the question of what should be done. In my opinion, what is really necessary is the adoption of the "Affirmative Action" attitude. Although most of you are probably more familiar with the concept than I myself am, I would like to clarify what I mean (and what is actually meant by it). It is simply meant that instead of just lying back and waiting for the problem to go away, we need to take action in that regard. First of all, it would be important to check whether the problem *actually exists*. Some data should be collected, formally or informally, to check whether these kinds of feelings are based on fact. Second, if the problem is found to be real, we should then seek

its *causes*. Maybe minority people meet with financial difficulties, maybe they have difficulty finding mentors, maybe they do not feel comfortable with the social side of conferences, maybe they have difficulty with the English language, etc. Depending on factors found to be possible bases for the problem, different types of action could be discussed, put to practice, and evaluated. If possible, these should not include the establishment of quota or artificial benefit systems. Achievement should be based on merit, but we must assure that everyone gets the same chances as everyone else. Again, not everyone would agree with this but, anyway, this is *my* column!

Although these questions should be cause for concern for all of the Association, and particularly to the Board, they have particular relevance for us Students and New Professionals, for several reasons. First, because they have to do with our individual career prospects, especially for minority students. Second, because they will affect the relevance of the field in the increasingly intercultural years to come. Finally, it also pertains to us directly, as we are in a privileged position to help the Association understand what is going on and work toward achieving the fundamental goal of diversity.

---

**IARR Members:**

**Submission deadline for Fall issue  
of RRN**

**September 1, 2005**

**THE LIGHTER SIDE  
OF RELATIONSHIPS**

**Faculty Only**

**by David A. Kenny**

*T*his column is written for faculty and I ask all students to stop reading. Believe me, what follows is pretty boring as it deals with issues of percent contribution to TSA plans and the formatting of PTR forms.

Now that I have gotten rid of the students (students never read anything they do not have to), we get to what the column is really about. It has been brought to my attention by my crack staff (is crack an adjective or a noun?) that some faculty members are telling students honestly and clearly what they think of their papers. They write marginal comments on papers such as: "This sucks," "You should consider a career change to writing graphic novels," "You do not create a 10 page paper by changing margins and fonts," and "At least, you did not waste any good ideas in this paper." While being direct may be the most honest strategy, you are going to face whining students who are going to complain about you to your department or area head. Also, you need students to come up with studies, run those studies, enter your data, analyze the data, write up the study, have them be second authors, and go to Starbucks to get you a lowfat mocha frappuccino with no whip cream. The smart and successful faculty member is never direct, and this column is going to show you how to indirectly communicate to students.

We all know about metacommunication: the communication underlying the actual communication. In making comments on student papers use some of the phrases that indirectly communicate our real feelings:

- Say "Citation" when you mean to say "Do not recycle your harebrained ideas as scientific."
- Say "Transition" when you mean to say "This idea can only have come out of your posterior."
- Say "Statistical assumptions satisfied?" when you mean to say "Your undergraduate

- assistant must have clicked on the wrong box in SPSS.”
- Say “Great results!” when you mean to say “You must have made up the data.”
- Say “You need to write the abstract” when you mean to say “There is no way in the world I could ever write a summary of this.”
- Say “You have a creative way of expressing yourself” when you mean to say “I have no idea what you are saying.”
- Say “Tightly argued” when you mean to say “At least I did not have read 20 pages of your turgid prose.”
- Say “Take a broader perspective” when you mean to say “Not every reader is a 25-year old yuppie from the east or west coasts of the United States.”
- Say “Did you run spell check?” when you mean to say “My name is Kenny not Kenney.”
- Say “Good point” when you mean to say “Everything before this sentence was nonsense.”
- Say “Too bad, low power” when you mean to say “How did you ever expect to get statistically significant results, when due of your laziness you ran only 15 participants?”
- Say “You have done so much work on this, I should not be coauthor” when you mean to say “I do not want my reputation to be flushed down the toilet.”

Junior faculty also need to learn how to read a paper quickly. Many a time I have had a pressing obligation (e.g., a 5-hour golf game or a three-martini lunch with my dean), and I need “to read” a 20 page paper in 5 minutes. Here are some ideas: Just look at the formatting of the paper and comment on that; e.g., suggest changing the format of the headings and the references, and then say “I will read this paper when you change it to the appropriate style.” If it is in the right style, just say “I plan to submit this paper to a journal in another discipline and this paper needs to be changed to the appropriate format for that journal.” Also write a few question marks next to the Method section and then say, “I cannot read further because the method is not clearly stated.”

But what do you do if you only have a minute? Here are some tips. Send an email and say that you misplaced the paper. Another quickie is to write at the top of the paper: “We need to talk about the paper.” Also put random check marks or periods through out the paper. Finally, there is the never-fail strategy: Write on the first page the following: “Excellent and insightful treatment of the topic!”

---

## My Confrontation with A Relational Ethnographer

by Dan Canary

Following a presentation I recently made, an acquaintance in a different discipline confronted me about the methods I use to study personal relationships. She said that lab observations and surveys say little about how people develop and maintain close relationships.

“Look, Daaaan [she pronounces my name with disdain], you really know nothing and don’t know that, because your discipline is bogus.”

“Gee Kaiser [I call her *Kaiser*, though her real name is *Mary*], you must be in love with yourself.”

“Now Daaaan, don’t take this personally--you’re simply not smart.”

“OK, Kaiser, sorry. What is your point?”

“Well, I think you should do something interesting, you know, using *relational ethnography*.”

“What is *relational ethnography*? I’ve never heard of that.”

“Now Daaaan, just because you haven’t heard of it doesn’t mean it doesn’t exist.”

I tried to remain polite: “Point taken. Please tell me what relational ethnography is.”

So she told me how she researched personal relationships by actually entering them. Over the past five years, she had developed and destroyed a dozen relationships of various sorts: romantic, friendship, even sibling.

“How did you develop a sibling relationship?” I asked.

Kaiser answered, “Well, first I had to persuade my parents to divorce and set-up my mother with this guy, his name is Sam, whose son was in my Interpersonal Misery seminar. It took a lot of work, but I eventually became a sister to the Son of Sam.”

I was impressed, of course, but had to ask, “How did you get this past IRB?”

She answered, “What’s an IRB? And who cares anyway? This is *my* research.”

“Well, weren’t some people *hurt*?” I asked.

“Don’t be so naïve. Of course people were hurt, but that is the nature of relationships. Besides, I was hurt most of all, especially when I broke up with Gregory. It seems like a dream now, but I was very close to *going native*—I had forgotten my research agenda and fell in love. So we got married and had children and moved to Indiana, of all places. Then one day I was re-reading my log and realized that my marriage and family were getting in the way of my research. So I left them and moved back home. It was the only ethical thing I could do. However, sometimes, I do miss my baby girl.”

I replied, “Don’t take this personally, Kaiser—I don’t like you.”

“No worries!” she said with a smile and added, “I now have over 10,000 pages of field

notes, drawings, and hundreds of video tapes of real intimate moments. You will *never* get that kind of data using surveys.”

I responded, “No, but I’m not employed by *The National Enquirer* either! I hope you at least use pseudonyms.”

“Of course not! Using real names is critical to this kind of research because real names reflect the real, lived experience of real, live people in real dead relationships. Besides, using pseudonyms would be deceiving my readers, and I want to remain ethical.”

“I bet,” was all I could muster. “So, where do you want to publish this?”

Kaiser thought for a moment and said, “Oh, either *Personal Relationships* or the *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*. But that will depend on their impact ratings next year.”

“I have heard of those journals,” I said. “But why wait for next year?”

She replied, “I am just now developing this interesting relationship and want to use it in my report. Besides, really important ideas take time to gel.”

“So what is the name of your next victim?” I was fed-up.

“Toby.”

I had to ask, “What kind of relationship is it—romantic, friendship—what?”

Kaiser replied, “Pet.”

---

## RETIREED PROFESSIONALS COLUMN

### Charades, Anyone?

by Paul Wright

*M*any thanks to all those readers of *Relationship Research News* who e-mailed to say they rejoiced with me on the near-euphoric closing note of my fall, 2004 column. I shall be forever grateful to both of you. You will recall that I had announced the discovery of my situated identity as a PR retiree. And you may also recall my oblique but definite promise to reveal in a subsequent column (i.e., this one) what that newly discovered identity was. So the time has come to pay up.

I must admit that following through on my promise is a task that I face with a certain amount of fear and trepidation –and embarrassment! It turns out that what I *thought* was my situated identity as a PR retiree was considerably more quixotic than the real thing. This disquieting realization came to me as I thought through how best to spell out the details of that identity.

“Okay,” I said to myself, “Let’s get down to specifics.” “Specifics?” I asked. “What specifics?” Oops! Big problem. I had thought about my “retiree identity” in only the broadest of terms. In brief, it boiled down to this: I would be a relationship research retiree who maintained a respectable level of scholarly productivity.

This modest identity was, some will recall, a drastically scaled-down version of a lofty aspiration to use the unencumbered time of retirement to go out (as they say) in a blaze of glory... to show, in effect, that I had saved my best for last... to make a delayed but

incontestably gigantic contribution that would revolutionize the field and set the tone for many PR scholars for generations to come.

There were two other potential identities I had considered but either rejected as unappealing or abandoned as hopelessly out of reach. One of these was to make a clean break, put PR involvement behind me, and concentrate on other things. Not appealing. The other was to call it a career but to stay connected and relationally involved as a “grand old man.” Ha! Fat chance. Out of reach for reasons stated in my previous column, and a few more that are best kept to myself.

“So,” (you ask) “‘respectably productive PR retiree’ is not your ‘real’ aspired-to retirement identity. What, then, is the ‘real’ one, and how did you find out what it is?” Let’s deal with the second question first.

Those amongst us with symbolic interactionist leanings propose, and I believe validly, that a situated identity is not something that a person, strictly speaking, “discovers.” Rather, it is built up and maintained over time by the way the person conducts her/himself in a reasonably delimited sphere of activity, i.e., by what (s)he does and says, how (s)he does and says it, who (s)he does and says it with, and by the apparent impact of those doings and sayings on relevant others. The “discovery” part happens when the person reflects on what it all means and says, “Aha! That’s the kind of person I am.”

Given this, my task was clear. For purposes of fulfilling my promise to recount the full implications my self-ascribed situated identity, I scrutinized my “doings and sayings” in building and enacting that identity. The discomfiting truth was not long coming: my real retiree identity was not even as laudable as the modest one I had claimed. In fact, I blush to admit, it was downright unlaudable.

Presently I will spell out that identity in unvarnished terms. But first, a bit of

perspective. In the course of scrutinizing my own situated identity, I also scrutinized those of PR scholars whom I knew well and who had retired before me. (Hey! Don't laugh. There were a bunch of them. I'm not *that* old). I found basically two "brands" of retiree identities among them.

The first includes those PR retirees opting for a "clean break." They are simply retired PR scholars who have little or no specifiable identity as such.

The second includes those retirees enacting what can only be called a fusion of the "grand old person" and the "continuing scholarly productivity" options. When I scrutinize *in toto* PR retirees who are certifiably grand old persons, they are also retirees maintaining an impressive level of productivity. When I scrutinize *in toto* PR retirees maintaining an impressive level of productivity, they are also certifiably grand old persons. In terms of numbers, there are quite a few of them. It is probable, however, that they rarely consider themselves grand old persons. That's a status conferred upon them implicitly by the words and actions of admiring colleagues.

And then there's me. I was a PR retiree who maintained a meager level of scholarly productivity but who, through carefully orchestrated (but usually unconscious) tactics of impression management, projected an image of being noticeably more than minimally productive. There. I said it. Worse yet, I could think of no other PR retiree with this particular brand of situated identity. That may mean that I was one of a kind. Or it may mean that others having a similar identity are so good at enacting it that no one recognizes it. No matter. I'm the one I have to live with, right?

So what does one do with such an unsettling bit of self-insight? Or, more specifically, what did *I* do with it? Three things. First, I decided that I would drop the charade. Charade? What charade? Aren't we talking about a situated

identity here? Isn't a situated identity simply what it is? Well, the way I figure it, when I realized that I was using impression management tactics to project an image that didn't really match the facts, it was less like establishing an identity than erecting a façade. And you know what? I never did like the game of charades.

Second, I will henceforth continue the "doings and sayings" that will maintain what I can legitimately claim as a PR retiree identity—one who continues to be (very) modestly productive, who makes a contribution here and there, and lets it go at that. Like Popeye used to say in the cartoons I liked as a kid, "I yam whut I yam." So why try to make it more than it is?

Third, I will forgive myself for having become involved in the game of charades in the first place. Honest, folks, it all started innocently and with good intentions. What happened was that I set out to do the things that one would have to do to be a "respectably productive retiree." When I started doing those things, people started noticing them and, frankly, making a big deal of them. That spelled my doom. I started adjusting my "doing and sayings" to set people up to make the "big deal" reaction. The appearance overtook the substance. 'Nuff said?

Now, having worked through this unmasking of my Goffmanesque<sup>1</sup> "retiree self," I feel it only fair to reveal what my major impression management tactics were—at least the ones I am aware of. There were four of them, all centered around one sure sign of scholarly productivity, i.e., writing and publication.

The first may be called the "talking about prospective writing in a particular way" ploy. Let me illustrate this tactic by comparing the way I answered a question often posed to PR retirees with the ways other retirees answer it. The question is, "Are you doing any writing

---

<sup>1</sup> Some of you remember Erving Goffman, don't you? Please say yes.

these days?" Or, alternatively, "What kinds of writing are you doing these days?"

The retiree who has made a clean break answers, "Writing? None. I don't do that kind of thing any more. I've taken up art. You know. Oils, pastels, water colors." (actual case).

The PR retiree who is a grand old person maintaining a high level of productivity answers, "well, Irwin and I are making good progress on a book we started recently, and I'm writing up findings from some research I did with a former student. We hope to submit it for publication soon." (another actual case).

But how did I answer that question? First, let me tell you how I came, very soon, *not* to answer it. Until I learned better, I would say, "I've been thinking about writing a book." This did not work, especially for people who knew me well. I'd get this "look," after which they would say, "Oh," and start talking about something else. No words, really, but what the "look" said was, unmistakably, "Well, big whoop. You've been 'thinking about' writing a book for thirty years. C'mon man, defecate or abandon the receptacle."

A different kind of answer was clearly called for. So, without really thinking much about it, my standard response became, "Well, I'm working on a book idea." This simple variation consistently prompted a generally positive and affirming response from the questioner. Perhaps the words "working" and "idea" connoted a certain amount of effort and definitiveness. Whatever. It was definitely better than "thinking about writing a book."

I am about out of my allotted space, so I will simply name the other three tactics and discuss them in more detail in my next column. They are 1) the "dog-eared legal pad" tactic, 2) the "being seen in the right places doing the right things" tactic, and 3) the "talking about one's meager publication record in the right ways" tactic. This assumes, of course, that there will

actually be a "next column." Who knows? After this self-unmasking, I may be drummed ignominiously out of IARR. Or worse yet, there may be other PR retirees out there who are into playing charades. If so, they may put out a contract on me to keep me from revealing any further secrets. Only kidding (I hope!).



## Net News

by Ben Le

**I** would like to announce that I've assumed the role of IARR website administrator, filling the position held by Lisa Baker for the past few years. I'm sure that everyone in the organization appreciates the fine job that Lisa has done in launching and maintaining the IARR website, and will join me in thanking her for her service to the organization. We're all proud of the way the website represents the organization, with much of the credit attributable to Lisa's efforts.

As I transition into the "webmaster" position, there won't be many immediate changes to the structure or appearance of the website, other than day-to-day maintenance and posting of timely announcements. However, as time permits (i.e., over the summer), I'll be examining how to best facilitate the evolution of the site as the organization continues to grow. Using Lisa's

work as a foundation, I hope to streamline the website, while supplementing the current content of the pages.

If you have any announcements you'd like posted on the website, edits to specific pages, or other suggestions or comments regarding the website, please direct them to me at ([ble@haverford.edu](mailto:ble@haverford.edu)).

I look forward to the opportunity to sustain and increase IARR's Internet presence, and to working with the members of the organization in my new capacity as website administrator. Please don't hesitate to contact me if you have any website-related questions or comments.

---

## BOOK REVIEWS

### *Communication among Grandmothers, Mothers, and Adult Daughters*

By Michelle A. Miller-Day (2004). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum. 254 pp.

Reviewed by Robert M. Milardo  
Human Development & Family Studies  
University of Maine

This is a study of three generations of women, mothers and daughters, in six families. It is a refreshing look in some ways, as mothers are neither vilified for everything that can go wrong in a child's life, from a misadventure in romance to "her latest bad haircut" (p. 5), but then neither are these relationships without turbulence. The youngest generation of daughters is largely comprised of young adults typically ranging in age from 18 to 25; the oldest generation of grandmothers ranges from 58 to 82. They are all white, presumably heterosexual, and live in the same mid-western community and interact with one another at least weekly. Two of the

five families are rooted in wealth as we learn grandmothers employ housekeepers and groundskeepers. One grandmother raised her 5 children as a single parent and successful businesswoman. I would have preferred greater detail on their social locations, their husbands, family incomes and ties with other kin.

In many ways it is a collaborative study of the curious scholar who resided with one of the participant families for much of the 8 months over which the study took place. There were in depth interviews, sharing of relational artifacts (e.g., photo albums), observations in homes and community settings, and a three-day home stay with one member of each family. The families and lives of the women who participated are surprisingly varied with instances of normative successes in marriage and parenting as well as distinct challenges represented by instances of significant illness, teenage pregnancies, substance abuse, serial divorce, and attempted suicide. In three of the families there is considerable conflict mixed with constant threads of intimacy. One mother and daughter, Gina age 50 and Georgie age 25, are in their words the best of friends, and lunch daily. Are fathers and adult sons ever this intimate?

The challenge to any qualitative study is to find the story line that fairly describes the voices and experiences of participants, and frames this description in an interpretive framework, preferably one that generalizes to theory, or in the language of grounded theory methods a movement from the *open coding* of essential themes to the *selective coding* of the core theoretical story line. In this study, the theme of contradictions as relational phenomena becomes the primary organizing principle. If in quantitative work multivariate analyses are often the most insightful and best represent complex social phenomena, here too multiple themes are clearly emergent from the mix of interviews and observations. Miller-Day wisely uses a dialectical perspective to capture the complexity of maternal relationships, and their many inherent contradictions.

Five central themes are used to organize and present the major findings, including the

relational contradictions of stability and change, connection and separation, openness and privacy, the inevitable misalignments of lived experience and normative expectation, and the tension of the powerful parent paired with the occasionally acquiescent requirements of a child of any age. Perhaps these are themes present in all parent and child relationships.

Mothers occasionally struggled with maintaining their significance and contribution as central mentors for adult daughters while at the same time allowing for change in their relationships. We learn, for instance, that pregnancy and child birth represent potent turning points in their relationships, important for mothers and grandmothers but in different ways. Adult daughters rely on their mothers for advice and aid in child-care, while at the same time expecting some degree of independence. Grandmothers reflect on the *second chance* their newly adopted role permits as they become third-parties able to nurture an involvement in the lives of their grandchildren, while not being entirely responsible for their daily needs. At times, grandmothers play important roles in mediating disputes between the subsequent generations of mothers and daughters, and for both generations they are important sources of support. But these are not clean relationships in which expectations are easily met; rather a picture emerges of intimacy that is far more textured. Women often found great solace in their relationships with grandmothers, but at other times found them controlling. Mothers occasionally become emotionally dependent on their daughters at a young age, or more commonly they recount instances of adult daughters being unavailable when needed. Daughters occasionally have high expectations for maternal approval that is not entirely forthcoming. And yet in the management of relational contradictions, with ample opportunity for transgressions and outright conflict, they manage to maintain their relationships over long periods of time. Mothers and daughters in this study interacted at least weekly.

Miller-Day comes to understand the connections linking these women in terms of two extremes. One form of maternal relationships includes

those that were *enmeshed* where the life-long process of individual differentiation is viewed as threatening, and relational change is eschewed, in contrast to those that were *connected* where the life-long process of individual differentiation is incorporated into the changing patterns of relationships involving other women and children. Curiously the men in the lives of these women are absent. Perhaps they were out playing golf. I wondered. Are the central interdependencies of three generations of women independent of husbands, fathers, and brothers?

The book ends boldly in presenting a theory—*the necessary convergence of meaning*—that offers an explanation for how a pattern of enmeshed maternal relationships is transmitted and maintained across generations. Within this perspective power and control are central features driving relational dynamics in which common meanings converge when one partner's beliefs are privileged, while others subjugate their own beliefs and preferences for fear of loss.

There is much to commend in this thoughtful, detailed study of the lives of three generations of women. We come to understand the essentials of intimate relationships more richly than prior to our entry, to appreciate change and transition and perhaps most importantly that strong interdependencies exist within and across generations. In these instances, relationships are best understood as multiple units. The simple inclusion of three generations enriches our understanding of each pair relationship. Consequently I do wonder how the other women in these families play into these relationships. How aunts and sisters influence maternal relationships of all generations? And as a man, and perhaps out of self-interest and certainly heaps of curiosity, I do wonder about the husbands, fathers, and brothers and how they might influence, and be influenced by intimate relations.

---

***Maintaining long-distance and cross-residential relationships***

By Laura Stafford (2005). Mahwah, NJ; Erlbaum, 2005, 154 pp.

Reviewed by Erin Sahlstein  
Department of Communication Studies  
University of Richmond

Laura Stafford, approximately fifteen years after publishing her first discussion of long-distance relationships (LDRs), has produced a book-length review of the research entitled *Maintaining long-distance and cross-residential relationships*. She thoughtfully brings together scholarship from a range of disciplines and relational contexts in order to provide a benchmark to inspire new lines of inquiry. Her book is necessary and timely given the critical mass of research produced and many recent historical events (e.g., military deployments to Iraq and Afghanistan) directly relevant to the discussion. Primarily constructed as a review of the research, *Maintaining long-distance and cross-residential relationships* should serve as a fundamental source for long-distance scholars.

Stafford initiates the book by providing a rationale for the continued study of LDRs. With rising numbers of distal ties due to advancements in communicative technologies and increased mobility of our population, Stafford has no problem establishing a basis for LDR scholarship. Her rationale serves as a preview to the book, addressing the increasing numbers of LDRs, their varied types, and the means by which they are developed and maintained. She also presents an ideological argument for studying LDRs; they contradict many deeply held beliefs concerning close personal relationships. In what, I believe, is one of the most interesting sections of the book, Stafford presents four primary cultural assumptions (i.e., United States' assumptions) that should be considered when studying LDRs.

- 1) Frequent face-to-face communication is necessary for close personal relationships.
- 2) Geographic proximity is necessary for close personal relationships.
- 3) "Family" is supposed to share a residence.

- 4) Shared meanings and understandings are necessary for close personal relationships.

Stafford argues that these assumptions situate the study, maintenance, and success of LDRs, which is important to recognize but has rarely been directly addressed by researchers. Readers will want more extensive discussions of these assumptions but Stafford's attention to these issues should stand as a springboard for future research (e.g., What frequency of face-to-face communication is necessary to be considered a close personal relationship? Do partners perceive physical distance in similar/different ways across LDR types? How do families maintain a sense of family when faced with physical distance? What shared meanings and experiences matter most when developing close personal relationships?). The four assumptions are revisited throughout the book when research findings suggest their relevance; however, Stafford emphasizes an objective review of the literature over cultural critique in the remaining chapters. Future scholarship could and should attend to possible similarities and differences across cultures with regard to these four assumptions as well as how long-distance relationships are specifically perceived by cultural members.

In chapter two, Stafford addresses theoretical approaches to LDRs. LDR research across disciplines and content areas is overwhelmingly atheoretical, with very few exceptions. Stafford addresses this issue by discussing theories of relational maintenance specifically (i.e., Social Exchange Theory, Relational Dialectics, Behavioral approaches, and Shared meanings approach) due to their centrality to the study of close personal relationships. She then presents theories that she proposes are directly relevant to the study of LDRs (i.e., Attachment theory, Family Solidarity theory, Family Life-Span theory, and Systems Theory). Each theory is given brief attention but considering the level of theory utilized in LDR research, Stafford's descriptions and applications are quite productive. Surprisingly, she did not present Uncertainty Reduction Theory although LDR scholars have used it, and citing space

limitations, Stafford does not exhaust the theories/approaches that could be used when studying LDRs. She does, however, force the reader to consider how to use theoretical approaches for different questions, which is important at this stage in the research's history.

Stafford organizes the bulk of the book around *contexts* of distant relating. She begins with a review of dating relationships (i.e., high school, college, premarital, heterosexual couples). Although fairly similar to other summaries of long-distance dating relationships (LDDRs) research, she does discuss two new issues important to not only LDDRs but LDRs in general. First, she addresses what can happen when LDDRs become proximal relationships. Reviewing the results of a recent study she conducted with colleagues, Stafford illuminates the multiple reactions couples can have to becoming geographically close. Stafford also deconstructs the assumption that stability is a good measure of relationship success by highlighting that some LDDRs are likely maintained (thus potentially delaying termination) due to factors such as idealization and infrequent face-to-face contact, neither of which is necessarily indicative of a good relationship. Stafford's discussion of these topics introduces new interpretations of LDDR maintenance that should spark useful and interesting research.

The next five chapters are devoted to adult romantic relationships (e.g., commuter marriages), parent-child relationships (e.g., children of divorced parents), intergenerational relationships (e.g., grandparent-grandchild relationships), peer relationships (i.e., siblings and friends), and computer-mediated relationships (e.g., meeting partners online). Her reviews of the research areas are extremely helpful for future researchers. She provides thorough summaries and interpretations of the scholarship in each chapter, with suggestions for future research inserted when applicable. She offers her overall analyses and suggestions in the final two chapters. In chapter 10 she addresses practical implications of the research for each relational type as well as current limitations of LDR research. The final chapter is focused on

presenting new and revised propositions for the study of LDRs and relational maintenance.

Readers will appreciate Stafford's detail regarding the content and results of research but will likely wish she had given the same attention to methods. Scholars have utilized an assortment of procedures and measures to study LDRs yet have used primarily questionnaires and interviews to collect data. Unique considerations and constraints are present when conducting research on distance relationships that are not distinctly addressed by Stafford or other scholars. For example, LDR partners may not see one another frequently, which could impact how they discuss their relationships with an interviewer. Researchers also need creative options for securing participation from both (or multiple) partners in these relationships as well as for gathering data. LDRs have unique factors that need consideration when designing and implementing studies. A chapter devoted to these issues would have significantly added to the practical value of the book.

Stafford's contribution cannot be underestimated, however. She incorporates hundreds of sources and offers a comprehensive, interdisciplinary examination of the research to date. Anyone interested in distance and relationships will value having one source for six related areas of research. I strongly recommend *Maintaining long-distance and cross-residential relationships* for upper-division undergraduate and graduate personal relationships courses. The book is appropriate for instructors who wish to review LDRs without laboriously choosing a set of representative readings on their own. Stafford's writing style is quite accessible, which makes the ideas helpful for both students and the general public interested in LDRs. I expect *Maintaining long-distance and cross-residential relationships* will be most useful for those initiating lines of LDR research.

## TEACHING TIPS COLUMN

### Talking about Teaching with Dr. Socrata Tibbs-Chips

by Maureen O'Sullivan

#### Dear Gentle and Not-So-Gentle Readers:

You are invited to submit your questions, ideas, rants, raves about teaching to Dr. Socrata at [osullivan@usfca.edu](mailto:osullivan@usfca.edu).

#### AVAILABILITY

Dear Socrata,

I am bummed! On my recent teaching evaluations, my students complained that I was not available. But I am scrupulous about keeping my office hours, and am always available if a student wants to make an appointment with me. I think it is so unfair. What's going on?

Puzzled Payson

Dear Payson,

There is reality and then there is students' perception of reality. What your students are saying is that you are not available to them when they want you to be available to them, usually 4:30 on a Friday afternoon. I shared an office suite with a colleague who spent every hour he was not in class seeing patients behind his closed office door, while I sat faithfully keeping my office hours. No one came to my office during office hours, but the office and I were there. Nonetheless, my therapist friend got great evaluations on availability, while I was an also-ran. How do you do it? I asked. His secret? He went to class five minutes early and just

hung out. He would start idle chit-chat with students near his desk at first and then gradually each class meeting he would go to another part of the room. Even more importantly, he would end each class with an interesting topic, one that hopefully had engaged the students' interest. Then he would hang around for 5 or 10 minutes after class to respond to questions, carry on the conversation, or whatever the students wanted to do. Over time, the students in the class, and their friends who were not in the class, learned where Professor Therapist would be when and so he became very available to them. This strategy worked wonders for me as well.

Availably yours,  
Socrata

#### MOVIE QUOTE

Dear STC,

In a recent movie there was a great scene, where a pretty female student goes up to a middle-aged professor and says "I really need to get a good grade in this class. What can I do? I will do ANYTHING." ANYTHING was accompanied by wet-lipped, eye-locking, chest-thrusting, and noticeably deep breathing. The professor leaned over and whispered in her ear: "Study!" Do you know what movie that was in? I want to show it at an upcoming department meeting to add a little levity.

N. Gage.

Dear N. Gage,

The always interesting Ann Weber reported on the SPSP listserv that Kevin Spacey gave this great retort in "The Life of David Gale" and then a while later, she came back on-line to say that someone had written her that this line also occurred in "The Eger Sanction" with Clint Eastwood, a sort of academic "Make my day!" Note that this is not research with original sources on my part, I merely pass along what e-mail and the good graces of Ann Weber placed in my mailbox. Hope you find what you are looking for in one of these sources.

Cinematically yours,  
Dr. T-C

### **CLASS PERSONALITY**

Dear Dr. Tibbs-Chips,

My teaching evaluations are so confusing to me. I recently taught two classes back-to-back. In one, the class energy was enormous – lots of student interaction, lots of questions, lots of laughing. One student passing the room said to me “Gee, I wish I had taken that class.” The second class was Mortuary Mall, Caskets ‘R Us – the proverbial pin could be heard across the room. Out come the class evaluations, and which class gave me the higher rating? You got it, Morticia and friends in the second class! What’s going on here?

Yours truly,  
Mavis Eavis

Dear M.E.,

Some years ago, I had the same situation. I had two upper division psychology classes in which the students completed personality tests as part of the course and then wrote a self-analysis reflecting their agreement with the test scores, the reliability and validity of the tests, etc. What I found was that the lively, fun class was almost all extroverts and the Death Warned Over class was almost all introverts. I surmise that the extroverts were having so much fun with one another that they didn’t think I had much to do with it, so my ratings were only good, not great. The introverts didn’t say a word to anyone but me, and those words were all about the course. And so their positive feelings about the course were connected with me, not the other students. Since that experience, I have accepted that classes have personalities just like people do and that there are limits to how much the climate of the course can be shifted. But if you have a sense of the class “personality” you can choose examples, group activities, and the like that are more compatible with the style of most of the students. Competitive games for extroverted

groups, creative individual reports for introverted groups. Teasing and joking to correct extroverted malfeasances. Private, quiet, elliptical corrections for the introverts.

Cyclothymically yours,  
Dr. Tibbs-Chips

### **SERVICE LEARNING**

Dear Dr. Tibbs-Chips,

My college just instituted a requirement for “service learning.” All the students have to take a course in which at least part of the course involves doing community-based service work that is related to the course. My department chair just told me that I had to develop the course for our department.

What kind of community service is relevant to a relationships course? How does one find volunteer opportunities for one’s students? How can the teacher know what is going on in the agency? How many hours per course should a student volunteer? And should one grade this activity, or just require a certain number of hours? Help!

Desperately yours,  
In over my head!

Dear IOMH,

Service learning is, indeed, sweeping the country, so to speak. But relationships courses are among the easiest to fit into this rubric. Pity the poor medieval history prof trying to add a service learning component to his seminar on the Great Plague (I know, I know, the local public health department!)

Back to service learning in a relationships course. Nationwide, most service learning courses require 15 to 20 hours of volunteer work in the community for a semester course. For a course on relationships, almost any social or psychological agency will provide fodder for class discussion – hotlines (social networks and the lack of same, why do people call strangers

when in trouble), homeless shelters (where are friends and family, why is there no other assistance), abused women's shelters and hotlines (why are these relationships so long-lasting, albeit punishing), schools (how do you act towards children, how do they act towards you, towards one another, towards the teacher), hospitals (what kind of recreation activities can one do, what function do such activities play in the maintenance of health, what is your role in this setting).

Sites for volunteer work can be found through internet listings, by calling agencies near your campus, by inquiring of friends and family members about agencies they are connected with. Call the volunteer coordinator and see what kind of volunteers they are looking for; describe your students and see whether their free time and free help would be of use to the agency. Ideally, "best practice" in service learning is based on a model in which the community agency and the professor works together to provide a learning experience for the student. But often the mere experience of "real life" reflected on in class discussion and students' papers can provide enormous learning for students and greatly enliven class learning. Most agencies will provide overall grades on their volunteers and will verify how many hours they volunteered. It is your decision whether you want this to influence the class grade or not.

You mentioned that your college has just instituted service learning as a requirement for all students. There is evidence that some students resent being required to do community service and this resentment is reflected in reduced course evaluations. This is particularly true at the initiation of such a requirement. Once the requirement becomes part of the college culture, resentment should diminish, although I know of no research on the question.

There is a voluminous literature on service learning. If you want some readings, just contact me at [osullivan@usfca.edu](mailto:osullivan@usfca.edu).

Yours for good works,  
Dr. T-C

## ANNOUNCEMENTS

### Publications Committee Report.

by Julie Fitness  
Chair, Publications Committee

**T**he Publications Committee is delighted to announce the appointment of Rebecca Adams as the new Editor of Personal Relationships. Rebecca obtained her PhD in Sociology from the University of Chicago in 1983, and is currently Professor of Sociology at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro. Her particular research interests are in adult friendship and aging, and she has a long and distinguished publication record in this and related areas (including 3 books). Rebecca brings a wealth of knowledge and experience to the PR editorship and the committee is confident that she will do a magnificent job.

The committee would also like to take this opportunity to most sincerely thank outgoing PR editor Sue Sprecher for her outstanding service over the last four years. Under her stewardship the journal has been going from strength to strength, with a steadily increasing number of submissions and consistently high quality articles. Speaking as one of her Associate Editors, I would also like to personally thank Sue for her inspirational leadership in the role of Editor. She works long and hard with authors to attain the very highest standards of scholarship and has actively encouraged the involvement of graduate students in the reviewing process. She has also been a model of efficiency in the processing of some hundreds of manuscripts over the years, and has been an unfailing source of encouragement to all throughout her term. It has been a joy to work with Sue.

Finally, the Publication Committee would like to thank outgoing Website co-ordinator, Lisa Baker, for her hard work and commitment to making the IARR Website accessible, attractive, and up-to date over the last few years. Happily, we have an incoming Webmaster, Ben Le, who brings both experience and commitment to the job. Sincere thanks to both Lisa and Ben for their service in this important role.

## JOURNALS UPDATE

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

by Paul A. Mongeau,  
Editor

*The Journal of Social and Personal Relationships* remains quite healthy. We received just over 200 submissions in 2003. This represents about a 20% increase over previous years. Submissions received thus far in 2004 are about even with the same period in 2003. Moreover, not only is the *quantity* of the submissions up, but the *quality* of the research is strong as well. Finally, I've recently heard from SAGE that the journal's circulation (including both conventional and electronic subscriptions) is "up substantially."

One of the wonderful things about being editor of JSPR is the ability to read terrific relationships research performed by scholars from across the globe. What strikes me, as I look at the tables of contents of the February through October 2005 issues, is the diversity within the contributions. Articles in these issues will come

from four continents: Asia (i.e., Israel, Japan, Jordan, and Taiwan), Australia, Europe (i.e., England, Finland, and The Netherlands) and North America (Canada and the US). Moreover, there is considerable diversity in the relationship contexts that these scholars focus upon. Articles focus on marriages (current, terminated, heterosexual, and same sex), dating relationships, friendships (both same sex and other sex), twins, siblings, managers, nonresidential stepmothers, social networks, as well as relationships between fathers and sons; adopted children and their birth parents; teachers and students; parents and children; and between mentors and mentees. Of course, these issues present research on a broad variety of relationship events and processes. There should be something (and hopefully a lot) for everybody in the upcoming issues.

Finally, our wonderful editorial team continues to evolve. Stan Gaines and Kory Floyd both stepped down as Associate Editors at the first of the year. Larry Erbert (University of Texas at El Paso, US) and Ruth Sharabany (University of Haifa, Israel) began their tenure as Associate Editors in the fall (in the northern hemisphere). Robin Goodwin (Brunel University, UK) will be beginning his service in a few months. Finally, Valerie Manusov has indicated her desire to step down as soon as a successor can be found. (Any volunteers from the Communication discipline?) So at this point, the team of Editorial Assistants receiving new manuscripts includes Duncan Cramer (Loughborough University, UK), Sally Lloyd (Miami University, US), Valerie Manusov (University of Washington, US), Stephen Marks (University of Maine, US), Ruth Sharabany, and Larry Erbert. It would be impossible to overstate my appreciation for the help that these people have provided me as editor.

### A Report on *Personal Relationships*

by Susan Sprecher,  
Editor

**M**y team and I are nearing the end of our four-year term as active editors of the journal. We will receive new submissions until the end of May. Beginning on June 1, new submissions will go to the new Editor, Rebecca Adams. (Her contact information is included in the article that follows this one.) Our team will continue to handle the resubmissions of manuscripts initially submitted during our term and will fill issues at least through 2006, and possibly into 2007.

We have had a four great years serving as the *PR* active editorial team. We have enjoyed working with authors, the editorial boards, new scholar reviewers, ad-hoc reviewers, Blackwell publishers, and IARR officers and the Board of Directors. We know that the journal will be in good hands with Rebecca Adams as the next Senior Editor. We plan to work with her so that the transition goes very smoothly.

The number of general submissions each year to *PR* is hovering around 100, which is about 20 more than when we began our term. There were 108 submissions in 2003 and 102 submissions in 2002 (this is excluding the submissions to the special issues). At the time this is being written (late March), we have had 22 submissions thus far in 2005. The lag time between final acceptance of a manuscript and its publication is running around 9-12 months. We estimate that the acceptance rate is around 20%.

Blackwell publishers continue to be pleased with the health and growth of the journal, and we are generally pleased with them as our publishers.

I want to thank the seven associate editors with whom I have worked over part or all of the past four years: Walid Afifi, Graham Allan, Ximena Arriaga, Julie Fitness, Leanne Lamke, Dan Perlman, and Steve Wilson. Associate Editors often don't get as much attention as the Senior Editor, but they do nearly as much work.

The contents for the June and September issues of the journal can be found later in this newsletter. If you have any questions about the

journal, do not hesitate to contact me at: [sprecher@ilstu.edu](mailto:sprecher@ilstu.edu)

## **The Future of *Personal Relationships***

**Rebecca G. Adams  
Editor-Elect,**

**A**s of June 1, I will begin a three-year term as Editor of *Personal Relationships*. I am honoured to have been appointed and am looking forward to a productive term building on the fine work of Sue Sprecher, her team, and their predecessors. Sue and I have already begun to work on the transition, and I am confident it will go smoothly.

During my tenure as Editor, I will work towards many of the same goals as my predecessors, striving to maintain high standards in terms of both product and process, to increase the international diversity of authors and populations studied, to process manuscripts in a timely way, to involve new scholars in the review process, to improve the journal's impact rating by publishing stellar articles and by making sure they are accessible, and to increase subscriptions to the journal. I also hope to broaden the audience for *PR* by encouraging the submission of theoretical syntheses, meta-analyses, and critical assessments of the status of the field; increasing the variety of methodologies represented by finding new ways to encourage submissions from anthropologists, sociologists, and maybe even historians such as by actively soliciting articles in which comparative, historical, and contextual analyses are presented; and building on Sue Sprecher's efforts to bring personal relationship research to the public.

From my perspective, the editorial process should not only lead to the publication of the most carefully crafted, theoretically based, methodologically sound, and interesting manuscripts submitted, selected to advance the

field through replication, augmentation, or innovation, but should also provide all submitters with constructive criticism and encouragement. In other words, the editorial role not only involves delivering a product and shaping the field as a consequence, but also entails the mentoring of authors and helping them hone their skills.

So as of June 1, please send submissions to: Rebecca G. Adams, Editor of *Personal Relationships*, P.O. Box 26170, University of North Carolina at Greensboro, Greensboro, NC 27402-6170. I will eventually set up an email account dedicated to the *PR* and post it on the web page, but for now, please send electronic submissions to Rebecca\_Adams@uncg.edu. If you are interested in serving as part of my editorial team as a reviewer or possibly as an associate editor, please send me your contact information, your areas of theoretical, substantive, and methodological expertise, and your curriculum vitae. Please note that new scholars, international scholars, and scholars from research areas underrepresented in the IARR membership are particularly encouraged to volunteer.




---

## Contents of Upcoming Journals

*Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*,  
Volume 22, Number 2, April, 2005

YACOUB KHALLAD

Mate Selection in Jordan: Effects of Sex, Socioeconomic Status, and Culture

SHEILA MACNEIL & E. SANDRA BYERS

Dyadic Assessment of Sexual Self-Disclosure and Sexual Satisfaction in Heterosexual Dating Couples

MARIAN M. MORRY & CHERYL HARASYMCHUK

Perceptions Of Locus Of Control And Satisfaction In Friendships: The Impact Of Problem-Solving Strategies

NORAH E. DUNBAR & JUDEE K. BURGOON

Perceptions of Power and Interactional Dominance in Interpersonal Relationships

CATHERINE L. BAGWELL, SARAH E. BENDER, CRISTINA L. ANDREASSI, TRACY L. KINOSHITA, STACI A. MONTARELLO, & JASON G. MULLER

Friendship Quality and Perceived Relationship Changes Predict Psychosocial Adjustment in Early Adulthood

GLENN GEHER, RYAN BLOODWORTH, JOSEPH MASON, CHRISTOPHER STOAKS, HEATHER J. DOWNEY, KRISTIN L. RENSTROM, & JUAN F. ROMERO  
Motivational Underpinnings of Romantic Partner Perceptions: Psychological and Physiological Evidence

KUEI-HSIANG HAN, MEI-CHIH LI, & KWANG-KUO HWANG

Cognitive Responses to Favor Request from Different Social Targets in a Confucian Society

*Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*,  
Volume 22, Number 3, June, 2005

JESS K. ALBERTS, CHRISTINA G. YOSHIMURA, MICHAEL RABBY, & ROSE LOSCHIAVO  
Mapping the Topography of Couples' Daily Conversation

MARGARET LINDORFF  
Determinants of received social support: Who gives what to managers?

WILLIAM D. BARTA AND SUSAN M. KIENE  
Motivations for Infidelity in Heterosexual Dating Couples: The Roles of Gender, Personality Differences, and Sociosexual Orientation

CHRIS SEGRIN, MELISSA E. TAYLOR, AND JULIE ALTMAN  
Social Cognitive Mediators and Relational Outcomes Associated with Parental Divorce

PAMELA QUALTER AND PENNY MUNN  
The Friendships and Play Partners of Lonely Children.

SIMON LAROSE, ANNIE BERNIER, AND NATHALIE SOUCY  
Attachment as a moderator of the effect of security in mentoring on subsequent perceptions of mentoring and relationship quality with college teachers

CAROLYN WEISZ AND LISA F. WOOD  
Social Identity Support and Friendship Outcomes: A Longitudinal Study Predicting Who Will Be Friends and Best Friends Four Years Later

***Journal of Social and Personal Relationships,***  
**Volume 22, Number 4, August, 2005**

LISA M. DIAMOND AND ANGELA M. HICKS  
Attachment Style, Current Relationship Security, and Negative Emotions: The Mediating Role of Physiological Regulation

MATTHIJS KALMIJN & MARJOLEIN BROESE VAN GROENOU

Differential Effects Of Divorce On Social Integration

SHANNON E. WEAVER AND MARILYN COLEMAN

A Mothering But Not a Mother Role: A Grounded Theory Study of the Nonresidential Stepmother Role

THAO N. LE

Narcissism and Immature Love as Mediators of Vertical Individualism and Ludic Love Style

MARIAN M. MORRY

Relationship Satisfaction as a Predictor of Similarity Ratings: A Test of the Attraction-Similarity Hypothesis

ANNA MURACO

Heterosexual Evaluations of Hypothetical Friendship Behavior Based on Sex and Sexual Orientation

VARPU PENNINKILAMPI-KEROLA, IRMA MOILANEN, AND JAAKKO KAPRIO

Co-Twin Dependence, Social Interactions, and Academic Achievement: A Population-Based Study

LARISSA REMENNICK

Cross-cultural Dating Patterns on an Israeli Campus: Why are Russian Immigrant Women more Popular than Men?

***Errata***

The following entry was inadvertently left out of the table of contents listing for *JSPR*, 21, number 5

SAHLSTEIN, E.

Relating at a Distance: Negotiating Being Together and Being Apart in Long-Distance Relationships.

In addition, the reference to Jill Gilbertson should have read Jill Quandt in the entry for Dindia et al. in Volume 21, no. 5.

*Personal Relationships,*

Volume 12, Number 2, June, 2005

**SPECIAL ISSUE ON *EMOTIONS*. GUEST EDITORS: JULIE FITNESS AND SALLY PLANALP**JULIE FITNESS & SALLY PLANALP  
Introduction to the Special IssueMARIO MIKULINCER & PHILLIP SHAVER  
Attachment Theory and Emotions in Close Relationships: Exploring the Attachment-Related Dynamics of Emotional Reactions to Relational EventsMARGARET S. CLARK & ELI J. FINKEL  
Willingness to Express Emotion: The Impact of Relationship Type, Communal Orientation, and Their InteractionBEVERLEY FEHR & CHERYL HARASYMCHUK  
The Experience of Emotion in Close Relationships: Toward an Integration of the Emotion-In-Relationships and Interpersonal Script ModelsMARC A. BRACKETT, REBECCA M. WARNER, & JENNIFER BOSCO  
Emotional Intelligence and Relationship Quality Among CouplesDAVID SBARRA & ROBERT EMERY  
The Emotional Sequelae of Non-Marital Relationship Dissolution: Analysis of Change and Intraindividual Variability over TimeLAURA K. GUERRERO, MELANIE TROST, & STEPHEN YOSHIMURA  
Romantic jealousy: Emotions and Communicative Responses

JUDITH FEENEY

Hurt Feelings in Couple Relationships: Exploring the Role of Attachment and Perceptions of Personal Injury

MICHAEL R. CUNNINGHAM, STEPHEN SHAMBLIN, ANITA BARBEE, & LARA K. AULT  
Social Allergies in Romantic Relationships: Behavioral Repetition, Emotional Sensitization, and Dissatisfaction in Dating CouplesJOHN K. REMPEL & CHRISTOPHER BURRIS  
Let Me Count The Ways: An Integrative Theory of Love and Hate*Personal Relationships,*

Volume 12, Number 3, September 2005

JENNIFER S. RIPLEY, EVERETT L. WORTHINGTON JR., DAVID BROMLEY, AND STEPHANIE D. KEMPER  
Covenantal and Contractual Values in Marriage: Marital Values Orientation Toward Wedlock or Self-actualization (Marital VOWS) ScaleJOHN P. CAUGHLIN AND MARY E. RAMEY  
The Demand/Withdraw Pattern of Communication in Parent-Adolescent DyadsANTHONY SCINTA AND SHELLY L. GABLE  
Performance Comparisons and Attachment: An Investigation of Competitive Responses in Close RelationshipsTOBIAS GREITEMEYER  
Receptivity to Sexual Offers as a Function of Sex, Socioeconomic Status, Physical Attractiveness, and Intimacy of the OfferCATRIN FINKENAUER, TOM FRIJNS, RUTGER C. M. E. ENGELS, AND PETER KERKHOF  
Perceiving Concealment in Relationships Between Parents and Adolescents: Links with Parental Behavior

VALERIE E. WHIFFEN

The Role of Partner Characteristics in Attachment Insecurity and Depressive Symptoms

## MEMBER NEWS & UPDATES

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

New member **JAMES GILES** (University of Guam) announces the publication of his new book, *THE NATURE OF SEXUAL DESIRE*, Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers, 2004. This book presents an intercultural and experiential account of sexual desire along with new theories of gender, the sexual process, romantic love, and orientations in love. Here it is shown that sexual desire is an existential need, which has its roots in desires for vulnerability, care, and the experience of gender. James Giles' research on love and sexual desire has recently been presented by Ruth ("Dr Ruth") Westheimer and Sanford Lopater in their highly acclaimed text book *Human Sexuality* (2003).

**SUSAN HENDRICK** (Texas Tech U) has recently been named a Paul Whitfield Horn Professor of Psychology at Texas Tech University. Named after the first president of Texas Tech, it is the highest honor the university bestows. There are approximately 30 Horn professors currently, across the university (e.g., Arts and Sciences, Fine Arts, Business, Agriculture, Law, Engineering, Education). Susan is very honored by this and appreciates the support of all the close relationships colleagues who supported her. Congratulations, Susan!

**JOAO MOREIRA** (U Lisbon, Portugal) would like to announce the recent publication of his

book entitled "QUESTIONÁRIOS: TEORIA E PRÁTICA" [Questionnaires: Theory and Practice], available only in Portuguese. It is intended to be of use to those who need to construct, translate or adapt scales and questionnaires for research or applied purposes. Joao is pleased to report that it is being regarded quite positively in the Portuguese research community and also selling rather well. He hopes an English translation can be considered in the future. An area dedicated to the book can be found in his personal website (again only in Portuguese).

**STACEY NAIRN** (now at the University of Prince Edward Island) successfully defended her dissertation in June and has since moved to lovely Prince Edward Island where she is an assistant professor in the Department of Psychology.

**PEPPER SCHWARTZ** (U Washington) is thrilled to announce that she will receive the American Sociological Association's National Award for Public Understanding of Sociology this August in Philadelphia. This award recognizes outstanding sociologists whose contributions further public understanding of sociology. She has also been elected President of the Pacific Sociological Association. Congratulations, Pepper!

**ANN WEBER** (UNC Asheville) will be honored this May with a 2005 Board of Governors Award for Excellence in Teaching, the highest teaching honor bestowed by the state of North Carolina (comes complete with a big medallion and a cash prize!). As many of you will know, Ann is a former recipient of the Outstanding Teacher Award from the International Society for the Study of Personal Relationships (1998), and the UNC Asheville Distinguished Teacher Award (1998). She has also been a frequent nominee for university teaching awards. Ann would like everyone to know that she could not have won any recognition at all if not for the mentoring, support, and genuine *friendship* she has been awarded by her cherished IARR colleagues. In her own words, "I'm personally so touched by it, and deeply grateful." Congratulations, Ann!

**ELAINE ZELLEY** (La Salle University) and co-author Marianne Dainton recently published **APPLYING COMMUNICATION THEORY FOR PROFESSIONAL LIFE: A PRACTICAL INTRODUCTION**, Newbury Park, CA: Sage. This 2005 text focuses on the practical uses of communication theory and introduces case studies to better allow students to apply the material to workplace situations.

## 2005 MINI-CONFERENCES UPDATE

### PERSONAL RELATIONSHIPS RESEARCH IN SOUTH AMERICA

**IARR Mini-Conference  
Vitória, Brazil  
July, 1 to 3, 2005**

**Submitted by Agnaldo Garcia  
Brazil**

**A** Mini-Conference on personal relationships will take place in Vitória, Brazil, on July 1-3, 2005, with the support of the Federal University of Espírito Santo (UFES) and IARR. The theme will be "The Interdisciplinary and Intercultural Nature of Relationship Research: The South American Dimension", but scholars from other areas are also invited to submit proposals.

This will be the first IARR activity in South America. The South American participation at IARR activities has just started and the first IARR member from the continent joined the association three years ago. So, this mini-conference will be a good opportunity to promote IARR activities in the area. South

American scholars and graduate students will be welcome to the event to present research on personal relationships. This mini-conference will give a new impulse to relationship research development in Brazil and South America and certainly may be seen as part of IARR's mission as an international research organization.

The conference will give opportunity to Brazilian and South American scholars, representing different investigation areas (Psychology, Social Sciences, Nursing, Management, and so on), to present research on personal relationships. The conference welcomes submissions from other countries, from North America, Europe, Oceania and Asia. We would appreciate very much the presence of IARR members from other countries, presenting works or not presenting, as a way to motivate and foster personal relationship research in our continent and, particularly, in Brazil.

#### **The Conference Program – A Preview**

At the conference, the situation of personal relationship research in South America (and, particularly, in Brazil) will be discussed, including an appraisal of scientific publications of South American (and specifically Brazilian) authors in national South American scientific journals, international Latin American journals and international journals. Relationship research abstracts published in the proceedings of important conferences in South America (and specifically in Brazil) related to this research area will be discussed. Publications in Spanish, Portuguese and English will be included. South American universities and research groups, belonging to different areas, working on personal relationships will be presented.

The accepted abstracts will be published with the support of the Federal University of Espírito Santo. The publication will include a South American Bibliography on Personal Relationships and, specifically, a Brazilian Bibliography on Personal Relationships. Both will serve as important instruments to foster international cooperation and help IARR members to have a deeper involvement with Brazil and South America.

A symposium on the Interdisciplinary Nature of Relationship Research will discuss the contribution of different investigation areas, such as Psychology, Social Sciences and Health Sciences to relationship research. Representatives of different areas will present some notes on the characteristics of relationship research in a determined area, followed by a general discussion of ways to integrate these research lines, with special attention to the present situation in South America. Another symposium on the Intercultural Nature of Relationship Research will discuss the importance of intercultural or trans-cultural investigations for relationship research, with a special reference to the participation of South America in these studies.

### **The Conference Site**

Vitória, the capital of Espírito Santo State, is a small and charming coastal city with beautiful beaches and a population of about 300,000 inhabitants. Vitória was founded in 1551 and it is located in the southeast part of Brazil (the richest Brazilian region), not far from other important cities (such as Rio de Janeiro, São Paulo, Belo Horizonte and Salvador) (about one hour flight). As a tourist town, Vitória is well prepared to receive visitors. There are several hotels, restaurants and points of interest in the city. An interesting point to visit is the “Convento da Penha” (in fact, in Vila Velha, a few minutes from Vitória), an old church from the sixteenth century, on the top of a hill. Beautiful beaches can be seen in Vitória and Vila Velha. In Vitória, one can taste the “Moqueca Capixaba”, the state dish of Espírito Santo. It is of Amerindian origin and consists basically of layers of fish steaks, tomatoes, fresh coriander leaves, onions and red pigment powder (*colorau*). Part of Vitória is on an island and it is possible to navigate around the island in a schooner. UFES is situated on the continental part of Vitória. The climate in Vitória is always warm. The average temperature in July is 72°F. Further information about Vitória, including photos, may be found in the official site of the city at [www.vitoria.gov.es.br](http://www.vitoria.gov.es.br).

The population of Espírito Santo State is about 3 million inhabitants. Part of this population came

from other states such as Minas Gerais, São Paulo, Bahia and Rio de Janeiro. Espírito Santo, decades ago, also received immigrants from different European countries, especially Italy and Germany. A relatively well preserved Atlantic Forest, famous for the orchids and humming birds, is part of the state landscape. There are also some preserved areas for native populations (Brazilian Indians). Recently, petrol industry has become an important economic factor in the state. The citizen who is born in Espírito Santo is called “capixaba”. Paper mills and steel plants are among the main companies in the state. The huge Brazilian government company Petrobras is expanding its activities in Espírito Santo.

Brazil is the largest country in Latin America with great potential in all areas. Brazil is famous for Carnival, one the most important festivals on Earth, football (soccer) and samba, the typical Brazilian music/dance. People visiting Brazil cannot resist drinking some ‘caipirinha’, a typical drink, or tasting ‘feijoada’. The language spoken in Brazil is Portuguese. Brazil’s population is about 183 million inhabitants and it is a democratic republic. Brazilian president (presently Luís Inácio ‘Lula’ da Silva) is elected to administer the country for 4 years. The Brazilian Congress is formed by Senate and Chamber of Deputies.

The mini-conference will take place at the “Hotel Canto do Sol” ([www.hphoteis.com.br](http://www.hphoteis.com.br)), a traditional hotel in Vitória, in Camburi Beach, with 164 rooms and not far from UFES. The conference activities and meals will take place at the hotel, which offers an amazing view of Vitória bay. At the front of the hotel, there are some typical beach restaurants. The hotel is located in the district of Camburi, an area that has experienced an important economic development in the last years, with a great number of new residential and commercial buildings, shopping areas and it is not far from Vitória airport (about 3 miles).

### **UFES – The Federal University of Espírito Santo**

The *Federal University of Espírito Santo* – UFES ([www.ufes.br](http://www.ufes.br)) is one of the several

federal universities in Brazil, which are responsible for most of scientific research in the country (together with state universities). UFES is the most important university in the state, offering 44 undergraduate courses and several graduate courses to about 12,000 students. The Graduate Course in Psychology (master's and doctor's levels) is periodically evaluated by federal organs and it has received very good marks in the last evaluations. UFES supports the IARR mini-conference in Vitória and news about the conference has been published in the latest editions of the university bulletin.

### UFES Relationship Research Group

The UFES Relationship Research Group is the first South American group to join IARR. The group received the name "*Relacionamento Interpessoal: Um Enfoque Interdisciplinar*" (Interpersonal Relationship: An Interdisciplinary Approach) and it has been registered at the National Council for Scientific and Technological Development (an official organ for research administration in Brazil). Its members come from different areas from our University, such as Psychology, Management, Nursing and Law. The research group also includes graduate and undergraduate students conducting research projects on personal relationships.

The group is, at present, conducting research on themes such as: a) childhood friendship at school; b) friendship relations of children with different mental deficiencies; c) friendship of elders living with the family or in institutions; d) relationships between children and animals (dogs); e) women's friendships; f) personal relationships and personnel management; g) mother - adult daughter relationships; h) friendship and the adolescent with diabetes and cancer; i) virtual communities and friendship relations in adolescents; j) the relationship between children and toys representing living creatures (dolls, toy animals).

### Call for Submissions and Conference Fees

The Call for Submissions (including papers, symposia, posters and roundtables) is available at the IARR website. Submissions must be sent electronically by April 30 to

[agnaldo.garcia@uol.com.br](mailto:agnaldo.garcia@uol.com.br). Submission requirements are detailed in the Call. The registration fee for the mini-conference will be approximately 40.00 USD to USD 50.00 for professionals and 25.00 USD to USD 35.00 for graduate and undergraduate students. The registration fee includes meeting facilities, coffee breaks, two lunches and two dinners.

### IARR Members

	Till May 31 <sup>st</sup>	After May 31 <sup>st</sup>
Students	USD 25.00	USD 30.00
Professionals	USD 40.00	USD 45.00

### Non-Members

	Till May 31 <sup>st</sup>	After May 31 <sup>st</sup>
Students	USD 30.00	USD 35.00
Professionals	USD 45.00	USD 50.00

### Flights, Accommodation and Tourism

Airlines in Europe and North America usually offer international flights to the Brazilian cities of São Paulo or Rio de Janeiro. In both airports, there are several flights to Vitória. Those coming to the mini-conference will find good prices at the "Hotel Canto do Sol" in Vitória. The hotel rates are (considering the exchange rate of USD1.00 = R\$ 2.70): R\$ 90.00 (about USD 33.35, single) and R\$ 110.00 (approx. USD 40.75, double). In both cases, a tax of 5% will be added.

The hotel site for further information and reservations is [www.hphoteis.com.br](http://www.hphoteis.com.br). (The site is in Portuguese, so do not hesitate to contact us and ask for help, if necessary). There are also other hotels in Vitória (rooms from about US\$ 15.00 to US\$ 65.00, single, per night). Brazilian currency is "Real" (the plural is 'reais'). The exchange rate is subject to some fluctuation, but in the last weeks it has been about USD 1.00 =

R\$ 2,70. (Price in dollars will depend on dollar/real exchange rate at the time of payment). For those coming from other countries, Brazilian prices, in general, will be probably very attractive due to current exchange rates.

Transportation from Vitória Airport to “Hotel Canto do Sol” will be provided for those coming to the conference. The organizing committee will be at the disposal of IARR members to help them in any respect concerning the participation at the mini-conference. We are working to offer the best conditions for those attending the event, including information and help concerning accommodation, transportation, and so on. We are confident that IARR members can make an important contribution to relationship research in South America and also enjoy a pleasant trip to Brazil.

We are also planning some options for those interested in visiting Vitória. These options will be informed in the next weeks. Further information about IARR Vitória mini-conference, including registration details, will be publicized at [www.iarr.org](http://www.iarr.org). Please direct any inquiries to Agnaldo Garcia, Chair of the Conference Planning Committee, at: [agnaldo.garcia@uol.com.br](mailto:agnaldo.garcia@uol.com.br).

## **EXPLORING RELATIONSHIPS IN HEALTH OR HEALTH OF RELATIONSHIPS**

**IARR Mini-Conference  
Indianapolis, IN, USA  
JULY 21-24, 2005**

**Co-Sponsored by:**

**Indiana University-Purdue University,  
Indianapolis (IUPUI)  
Clarian Health Partners  
Indiana University Medical Group  
Purdue University Department of  
Communication**

## **College of Liberal Arts and IUPUI Department of Communication Studies**

**Submitted by Sandra Petronio**

**C**ome to Indianapolis, IN (USA) this summer and learn about relational factors affecting health, relationships among health care providers, family relationships and healthcare, ethical considerations and health relationships, confidentiality, disclosure impact on health relationships, privacy in health, race, gender, and health relationships.

We are pleased to announce that the conference offers four very special KEYNOTE SPEAKERS:

*Julia Heiman, Ph.D.* (Indiana University), a leader in sex research and the new Director of the Kinsey Institute, will talk about her vision of sex, gender, and reproduction in the next generation.

*John Caughlin, Ph. D.*, (University of Illinois) recent recipient of the IARR Miller Award for Early Career Achievement, will present his important research on communication about secrets in family relationships.

*Howard Giles, Ph.D.*, (University of California, Santa Barbara) renowned scholar of intergenerational/intercultural communication will talk about issues involved in elder abuse.

*Stanley W. Crosley* is the Chief Privacy Officer at Eli Lilly & Company, Lilly Corporate Center. He will talk about global privacy issues related to the healthcare industry.

Indianapolis, Indiana (US) is beautiful this time of year. On Thursday evening July 21, 2005, you will be treated to a special reception at Cedar Crest, the home of IUPUI Chancellor Charles R. Bantz. Cedar Crest is the historic home that belonged to J.K. Lilly, the son of Colonel Eli Lilly, founder of Eli Lilly Pharmaceuticals.

Do not forget the Sock Hop on Saturday night and the opportunity to interact with colleagues. More information will be available on the IARR website as the conference date approaches.

The site of this conference is on the campus of IUPUI (Indiana University-Purdue University, Indianapolis). IUPUI merges programs from two great universities and is an internationally recognized university in its own right located in the heart of downtown Indianapolis. Beyond that, the city of Indianapolis features many restaurants, theaters, art galleries, museums, hotels, sports, and shopping. Indianapolis is the seat of government, has a population of 806,454 people and is a happening place. The University Place Hotel (conference site) offers rooms for this conference at the rate of \$113.00 for a single and \$128.00 for a double per night. We also have university housing available at the approximate rate of \$65.00 per day, per person for a two-bedroom option and \$50.00 per day per person for a four- bedroom option. Conference Fee is \$115.00.

Indianapolis has a major airport, and is easily accessible from air, train, bus, and interstate travel.

Check the IARR website for further details!

**IARR Members:  
Check the website for more  
conference information:**

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

**2006 IARRC**

### **3<sup>rd</sup> International Association for Relationships Research Conference Rethymnon, Crete, Greece 6-9 July 2006**



KFB.1 Eros, Hebe, Herakles, Hymenaios

**Submitted by John Caughlin  
University of  
Chair of the Local Arrangements  
Committee**

**O**n behalf of the International Association of Relationship Research, the Conference Planning Committee, and the University of Crete, we invite you to attend the 2006 IARR conference. The conference will be held in Greece on the beautiful island of Crete at the Rethymnon campus of the University of Crete. (For more information about the location, check out the conference webpage: [http://www.iarr.org/conferences-2006IARRC\\_info.htm](http://www.iarr.org/conferences-2006IARRC_info.htm).) IARR conferences attract leading relationships researchers from around the world and from multiple disciplines. These scholars will come together for symposia, papers, posters, round tables, interest groups, keynote speakers, and networking in this splendid Mediterranean town with a long and remarkable history. The conference begins late in the afternoon of Thursday, July 6, and ends on Monday, July 10.

**Invited presentations** will be given by William Cupach, Cigdem Kagitcibasi, Mario Mikulincer and Phillip Shaver, Terri Orbuch, Caryl Rusbult, and Theo van Tilburg.

**Program & Local Arrangements:** John Caughlin, Program Committee Chair, can answer your questions about the Program. John's email address is: [caughlin@uiuc.edu](mailto:caughlin@uiuc.edu).

Please direct questions about submissions to:  
[IARR2006@listserv.uiuc.edu](mailto:IARR2006@listserv.uiuc.edu) .

Kostas Kafetsios, the Local Arrangement Chair, can address questions about local arrangements. Please contact [k.kafetsios@psy.soc.uoc.gr](mailto:k.kafetsios@psy.soc.uoc.gr).

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

Detailed information about the conference and how to submit appear below. (They will be available soon on the IARR web site [www.iarr.org](http://www.iarr.org).)

The deadline for submissions is **December 1, 2005**. Submissions should be sent via email to: [IARR2006@listserv.uiuc.edu](mailto:IARR2006@listserv.uiuc.edu) .

## CALLS FOR PAPERS

### New Scholars' Workshop International Association for Relationship Research Mentorship Committee

July 19-21, 2005

Submitted by Nancy Eckstein

**Location:**

IUPUI (Indiana University-Purdue University, Indianapolis), Indianapolis, IN

**Definition of a New Scholar:**

Individuals in a Ph.D. program or first five years of employment post-Ph.D.

IAAR is pleased to announce that the New Scholars' Workshop will now begin to accept submissions. The workshop will give developing scholars the opportunity to interact with established scholars in one-on-one consultations. Featured speakers will address issues on

- 1) The How & Why of Networking, Mentoring, Relationships, and Social Support
- 2) Ideas for Teaching Relational Classes
- 3) Conducting Research in a School that Emphasizes Teaching
- 4) Publishing Relational Research
- 5) Interviewing & Job Skills

In addition, new scholars will have the opportunity to present current research proposals, projects, and papers to established scholars and peers for feedback and discussion.

**Applications are to include:**

- (1) A title page with the applicant's name, address, university or company affiliation, email address, phone number, and status in grad school or faculty position title.
- (2) A one-page abstract of a personal research project to be presented at the New Scholars' workshop. The project can address any topic in relationship research and be at any level of completion, including initial conceptualization, measurement of variables, data analysis, or completed projects. The abstract is to also include a paragraph that details two issues the new scholar would like to work on, or have addressed by the established scholars conducting the workshop.
- 3) Members of the IARR Mentorship committee will evaluate the submissions for quality and suitability.
- 4) Send your application materials electronically as a word document or email

attachment to Dr. Nancy J. Eckstein

nancy\_eckstein@yahoo.com

**5) *Deadline for submissions is May 5, 2005***

Enrollment is limited to 25 New Scholars. The cost of the workshop is \$125.00. This includes two (2) nights housing (19<sup>th</sup> & 20<sup>th</sup>) in the newly built campus apartments, two (2) breakfasts, (2) lunches, and one (1) dinner.

This workshop is sponsored by IAAR and organized by the mentorship committee. For more information, contact Dr. Nancy J. Eckstein, Communication Studies, Bethel University; email nancy\_eckstein@yahoo.com or call 507-635-5882.

**Please encourage your students and new faculty members to participate in this workshop.**

---

**Society for Asian and Comparative  
Philosophy**

---

***“Self-Other Relations:  
Immanent-Transcendent?”***

**OCTOBER 20 – 23, 2005  
Asilomar Conference Grounds,  
Pacific Grove, CA (near Monterey, CA)**

**Call for Papers  
Abstract Deadline: May 1, 2005  
Notification of acceptance by June 1, 2005**

We invite panels and papers on the theme "Self-Other Relations: Immanent-Transcendent?" The theme is deliberately kept very broad so as to accommodate a great variety of approaches. Possible topics congruent with the theme might be: relations between friends, between

husband/wife, parents/ children, neighbors and strangers, humans and god(s). You can think of many additional variations. The point is not to exclude any topics, but merely to give some guidance in reflecting on the conference theme.

The SACP website now accepts online abstract submissions. If you wish to submit an abstract for the SACP conference online, please go to [www.sacpweb.org](http://www.sacpweb.org).

If you wish to submit your abstract by email or postal mail, then please send the following information to both Fred Dallmayr and Lori Witthaus.

Fred Dallmayr, President  
[dallmayr.1@nd.edu](mailto:dallmayr.1@nd.edu)  
Department of Political Science and  
Philosophy  
Notre Dame University  
746 Flanner Hall  
Notre Dame, IN 46556

Lori Witthaus, Secretary/Treasurer  
[witthaul@gvsu.edu](mailto:witthaul@gvsu.edu)  
Department of Philosophy  
Grand Valley State University  
One Campus Drive  
210 Lake Superior Hall  
Allendale, MI 49401

Proposals should include the following: Name, Title and Academic Institution (if applicable), Position (Prof, Grad. Student, Independent Scholar), Postal Address, Telephone Number, Email Address, Paper or Panel Title, and an abstract of 250 words.

For more information about the 2005 SACP Conference, please visit the SACP Website.

SACP Website  
<http://www.sacpweb.org>

**THE INTERNATIONAL  
ASSOCIATION FOR**

## RELATIONSHIP RESEARCH CONFERENCE

**July 6– 10, 2006**  
**Rethymnon, Crete, Greece**

### Submission Formats

Submissions related to interpersonal relationships (broadly defined) are due **December 1, 2005**. Reviewers will evaluate the submissions for quality. A description of the types of submissions and the procedure for submitting is presented below:

**Paper:** An oral presentation (about 10-13 minutes) that investigates a topic from an empirical or theoretical perspective.

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

**Posters:** A visual presentation on a poster illustrating research from an empirical or theoretical perspective.

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

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

### Submission Requirements

1. For **papers**, **posters**, and **roundtables**, submit a 1000 word summary (not including references or tables) and a 100-150 word abstract. For **symposia**, submit a 500-1000 word overview and a 100-150 word abstract for each paper. For **interest groups**, submit a proposed agenda for the meeting and a 100-150

word abstract (proposed interest groups must be jointly submitted by at least three co-organizers).

2. Submissions must be sent electronically by December 1, 2005 to [IARR2006@listserv.uiuc.edu](mailto:IARR2006@listserv.uiuc.edu). You will receive an email confirming your submission within 72 hours. If you do not receive a confirmation within 72 hours, contact John Caughlin immediately at 217-333-4340 or [caughlin@uiuc.edu](mailto:caughlin@uiuc.edu).

3. Electronic submissions must be in the form of an attachment using Word, WordPerfect, or RFT format. *The file should be labeled with the last name of the principal author or organizer. Individuals with common last names should also include their initials.* If you submit more than one proposal, please send each in a separate email message and number each proposal (e.g., SmithJS1, SmithJS2).

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

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

**IARR Members:  
Check the website for more  
conference information:**

**Please go to [www.iarr.org](http://www.iarr.org) and click  
on “Conferences/Worskshops”**

**Keyword Descriptions**

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

## IARR BOARD

### OFFICERS:

#### Past President:

William Cupach  
wrcupac@ilstu.edu

#### President:

Terri Orbuch  
orbuch@umich.edu

#### Vice President:

Beverley Fehr  
b.fehr@uwinnipeg.ca

#### Secretary-Treasurer:

Chris Agnew  
agnew@purdue.edu

### MEMBERS AT LARGE:

Larry Kurdek  
Larry.Kurdek@wright.edu

Barbara Winstead  
Bwinstea@odu.edu

### NEW PROFESSIONAL REPRESENTATIVE:

João Moreira  
joamoreira@clix.pt

### JOURNAL EDITORS:

Paul Mongeau  
paul.mongeau@asu.edu

Susan Sprecher (*PR until May 30*)  
sprecher@ilstu.edu

Rebecca Adams (*PR effective June 1*)  
Rebecca\_Adams@uncg.edu

### NEWSLETTER EDITOR:

Susan Boon  
sdboon@ucalgary.ca

### COMMITTEE CHAIRS:

Chris Agnew (Finance Chair)  
agnew@purdue.edu

Ben Le (Website Chair)  
[ble@haverford.edu](mailto:ble@haverford.edu)

Rowland Miller (Awards Chair)  
miller@shsu.edu

John Caughlin (Program Chair)  
Caughlin@uiuc.edu

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

Robin Goodwin (Membership Chair)  
robin.goodwin@brunel.ac.uk

Leanne Knobloch (Future Conferences Chair)  
[knobl@uiuc.edu](mailto:knobl@uiuc.edu)

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

Kostas Kafetsios (Local Conference Chair, 2006)  
k.kafetsios@psy.soc.uoc.gr

Nancy Eckstein (Mentoring Chair)  
nancy\_eckstein@yahoo.com

Julie Fitness (Publications Chair)  
fitness@psy.mq.edu.au

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

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