

RELATIONSHIP RESEARCH NEWS

OFFICIAL NEWS JOURNAL OF THE INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR RELATIONSHIP RESEARCH

Spring 2011

VOL 9, NO. 2

PRESIDENT'S COLUMN

Greetings from the President

by Anita Vangelisti
University of Texas at Austin

In a time when we can connect with colleagues via Skype, text messages, and social media, some might argue that face-to-face meetings and professional conferences are outmoded. I disagree. I remember when Jeff Simpson accepted the New Contribution Award in 1998 for an article he wrote with Bill Ickes and Tami Blackstone.* Jeff graciously thanked the audience. Then he noted that the idea for the study emerged from a conversation that he and Bill had at while sitting on the beach at the Nags Head Conference. It's certainly possible that Jeff, Bill, and Tami would have come up with the same idea had they been talking via Skype, but my bet is that their face-to-face conversation, its spontaneity, and the relaxed atmosphere made all three of them a little more creative that day.

One of the most important ways that we connect with each other is through our professional conferences. Going to conferences not only provides us with an opportunity to learn about the latest research, it also allows us to establish and maintain our professional relationships. The new information we obtain and the old and new relationships we nurture when we meet enrich our research and our teaching.

In the coming months, IARR is sponsoring two mini-conferences. Both meetings promise to be exciting

experiences. As most of you know, the first of our two mini-conferences will take place July 7-9 at the University of Gdansk in Gdansk, Poland. The theme of the conference is *Relationship Development, Maintenance, and Dissolution*. The program will emphasize cultural changes that have influenced the initiation and maintenance of interpersonal relationships in recent years as well as other factors that affect individual and social functioning. An impressive slate of invited speakers will address these issues. The speakers include *Gail Goodman*, Distinguished Professor of Psychology and Director of the Center for Public Policy Research at the University of California, Davis; *Jacki Fitzpatrick*, Associate Professor in the Department of Human Development and Family Studies at Texas Tech University; *Mario Mikulincer*, Professor of Psychology and Dean of the New School of Psychology at the Interdisciplinary Center in Herzliya, Israel; and *Phillip Shaver*, Distinguished Professor of Psychology at the University of California, Davis. Conference participants will hail from a variety of disciplines including social psychology, developmental psychology, sociology, communication, and family studies and symposia will focus on issues such as the dynamics of social relationships, family systems, bonding in the early stages of socialization, sex roles, and changing values associated with social interaction.

The Local Arrangements Committee tells me that Gdansk is also a wonderful place to visit. The very old city has a fascinating history and is filled with beautiful sights. Those attending the conference will enjoy sandy Baltic beaches and evening walks through picturesque Old Town. The conference in Gdansk will include a welcome reception, a social night and dinner, and a tour to the Museum of Solidarity and to the famous Gdansk Shipyard where Lech Walesa and the Solidarity Movement started the peaceful transformation of Poland. There also

will be pre- and post-conference tours that will provide an opportunity to visit the open air museum in the Kashubian countryside and the 14th century Castle of the Teutonic Order in Malbork.

Our second mini-conference will be held at the University of Arizona from October 20-22nd. This conference, like the one in Gdansk, will attract a world-wide audience. The theme is *Health, Emotions, and Relationships*. Although other conferences highlight research on each of the three content areas described by the theme, this mini-conference will be unique in integrating medical, psychological, and relationship research. It will provide scholars and practitioners in psychology, family studies, communication, sociology, medicine, and related disciplines with an opportunity to integrate research done at the interface of health, emotion, and relationships. The invited speakers for the conference include *Linda Luecken*, Associate Professor of Psychology at Arizona State University; *Burt Uchino*, Professor of Social Psychology at the University of Utah; *David Kenny*, Professor of Social Psychology at the University of Connecticut; *Mark Whisman*, Professor of Psychology and Neuroscience and Director of Clinical Training at the University of Colorado; *Timothy Loving*, Associate Professor at the University of Texas at Austin; *Ted Robles*, Assistant Professor in Health Psychology at the University of California Los Angeles; *Michael Rohrbaugh*, Professor of Psychology at the University of Arizona, *Varda Shoham*, Professor of Psychology at the University of Arizona; *Karen Weihs*, Associate Professor of Psychiatry at the University of Arizona and a Medical Director at Psychosocial Oncology Services; *Anita DeLongis*, Associate Professor at the University of British Columbia, *Lane Beckes*, a post-doctoral fellow at the University of Virginia, Charlottesville; and *Brant Hasler*, a post-doctoral fellow at the University of Pittsburgh.

The University of Arizona is in Tucson, a city surrounded by majestic saguaro forests and dramatic mountain peaks. Tucson blends the beauty of the natural world with the excitement of a thriving city. The University is located at the center of Tucson in a culturally diverse and historic part of the city. Museums, student and professional performances, science and astronomy attractions, sporting events and state of the art facilities make the University of

Arizona a premier destination for visitors in the southwest United States.

I hope some of you will attend one or both of these two conferences. Maybe while you're sitting on a sandy Baltic beach near Gdansk or looking out over the wide open Sonoran Desert just outside Tucson, you and a colleague will come up with the idea for IARR's next New Contribution Award.

*Simpson, J. A., Ickes, W., & Blackstone, T. (1995). When the head protects the heart: Empathic accuracy in dating relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 69, 629-641.

INSIDE THIS ISSUE OF RELATIONSHIP RESEARCH NEWS

PRESIDENT’S COLUMN

Greetings from the President
by Anita Vangelisti.....1

FROM THE EDITOR’S DESK

by Marian Morry4

NEW PROFESSIONALS COLUMN

‘Don’t Change.’ An Assistant Professor’s Guide to Maintaining Enthusiasm throughout an Academic Career
by Laura Miller 5

FEATURE ARTICLES

How Do They Do It? Essays from Epic IARR Collaborators
by Leah Bryant 6
Digging Holes in the Sand: Finding Time to Manage in Academia
by Colleen Sinclair 11

HUMOR COLUMN

May I “Zuckerberg” you?
by David Kenny17

BOOK REVIEWS

Relational Competence Theory: Research and Mental Health Applications
Reviewed by David Ryback19

Close Relationships
Reviewed by Stacey L. MacKinnon..... 20

JOURNALS UPDATE

PR Report
by Lorne Campbell..... 21
Tentative Contents of Upcoming Journals..... 22

ANNOUNCEMENTS 23

2011 IARR Mini-Conference: Relationships-Development, Maintenance and Dissolution
2011 IARR Mini-Conference: Health, Emotion, and Relationships
2012 IARR Conference
2011 Interpersonal Communication and Social Interaction Conference
Call for Proposals 2013 Mini-conferences
Call for Proposals 2014 Conference

MEMBER NEWS AND UPDATES 28

In Memory of Brant Burleson
New Book: Close Relationships (2011)
New Book: Interdependent Minds: The Dynamics of Close Relationships (2011)
New Website: www.ScienceOfRelationships.com

IARR BOARD..... 30

RELATIONSHIP RESEARCH NEWS

Editor

Marian Morry
University of Manitoba

Associate Editors

Stacey MacKinnon
University of Prince Edward Island

Leah E. Bryant
DePaul University

Colleen Sinclair
Mississippi State University

Relationship Research News is published twice a year. Contributions are very welcome and will be published as space permits. Announcements, letters to the editors, cartoons/humor, teaching tips, and other information relevant to IARR members are all appropriate. If you would like to contribute a feature article or personal commentary, please submit a brief (one paragraph) description to the editor first (please do not send manuscripts). Submit all materials to Marian Morry, University of Manitoba, Department of Psychology, Winnipeg, MB, CANADA R3T-2N2; marian_morry@umanitoba.ca. The deadline for final copy is September 1 for the Fall issue and April 1 for the Spring issue. Inquiries regarding Feature Articles are welcome at any time.

FROM THE EDITOR'S DESK

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

Welcome to the Spring 2011 issue of *Relationship Research News*. In this edition of IARR's newsletter, we begin with Laura Miller's first New Professionals Column entitled 'Don't Change: An Assistant Professor's Guide to Maintaining Enthusiasm throughout an Academic Career.' Her advice is well timed for all of our new colleagues, whether they are beginning their first academic position or have been in their first job for a few years. Much of the advice though is also relevant for those of us who have been in our academic careers for a number of years and want to freshen up our teaching or research ideas. Our feature columns focus on (a) collaborations and (b) time management in academia. Leah Bryant's feature focuses on two of the more famous collaborations in our association, those between Phillip Shaver and Mario Mikulincer, and between Brian Spitzberg and William Cupach. Perhaps their experiences can help inspire new and productive collaborations among other IARR members. Colleen Sinclair's piece begins with an overview of the difficulties of finding time in our hectic lives. Paul Silva then provides some insight into how he finds time to write. Next, Anita Barbee and Michael Cunningham give us a sneak peak at their struggles to with time management in a dual academic family. Finally, Marian Morry examines how time management is important for the "play" side of our lives – mental and physical health, socializing, and vacations.

Moving to our book reviews, we provide reviews of *Relational Competence Theory: Research and Mental Health Applications* (L'Abate, Cusinato, Maino, Colesso & Scilletta, 2010) and *Close Relationships* (Regan, 2011). I would like to thank the reviewers, David Ryback and Stacey MacKinnon, for all their hard work. If you have a book you would like to see reviewed in a future edition of the newsletter, please contact Stacey MacKinnon at smackinnon@upei.ca.

In our regular columns, Dave Kenny reflects on Facebook and how it has affected the general population's images of friendship and may potentially impact our research on friendships. Lorne Campbell has provided an update as the Editor of *PR*, including an overview of the special issue on the *Mind-Body Connection*, EarlyView, and basic statistics for the journal.

Don't forget to read our announcements! Here you will see announcements for four, yes four conferences. Two 2011 IARR mini-conferences, the 2012 IARR conference, and a 2011 Interpersonal Communication and Social Interaction Conference that could be of interest to many of our members. As if that weren't enough, we also have a call for the 2013 mini-conference and one for the 2014 conference.

In our "Member News & Updates," we have two new books and a new website announcement. On a sadder note, we also have a memorial for Brant Burelson. If you have anything you would like us to include, please email myself, Marian Morry, at Marian_Morry@UManitoba.ca and I'll ensure it gets into our next edition.

Finally, I would like to give a special thanks to my editorial team for all their help in the production of this issue of the newsletter. We hope you will find much to enjoy in this issue of *RRN*.

**Submission deadline for the
Fall 2011 issue of RRN**

September 1, 2011

**Submit all materials
to Marian Morry**

Marian_Morry@umanitoba.ca

NEW PROFESSIONALS COLUMN ARTICLES

‘Don’t Change:’ An Assistant Professor’s Guide to Maintaining Enthusiasm throughout an Academic Career

by **Laura Miller**

**New Professional Representative
University of Tennessee - Knoxville**

A friend recently told the story of participating in her very first faculty meeting as an assistant professor. She recounts that her colleagues could not help but notice that, as a bright and shining new PhD, she was beaming and smiling from ear to ear for the meeting’s duration. After the meeting was over, her department head pulled her aside and said, very simply, “Don’t change.” Rather confused by his statement, she asked, “What do you mean?” He replied, “I hope you stay this excited for the rest of your career.”

Indeed, many new assistant professors arrive on a new campus with elevated levels of energy and enthusiasm. A recent degree and new office key in hand are just a few of the perks of making the exciting transition from graduate student to new professional. However, my friend’s department head may be on to something by urging her to maintain such eagerness for the entirety of her time in academia. Is such zeal even possible? If so, what strategies might one adopt to make an old job feel new again once the novelty has worn off? Several strategies to consider are outlined in the next section.

Moving beyond your comfort zone

Sticking to what works and what is comfortable is common in any profession in which wearing multiple hats is a requirement. However, utilizing the same teaching strategies, for example, year after year may create a sense of banality. Finding ways to shake up your syllabi may be the answer. Creating

new assignments, incorporating new teaching methods, and utilizing new technologies in the classroom may not only benefit your interest in the course, but your students’, as well. If an already busy schedule deters you from conducting a major course renovation, slightly tweaking course assignments can generate new perspectives without demanding too much preparation time. For example, instructors may be interested in adding a cultural component to existing assignments (e.g., have students research marital dynamics in other countries and compare them to those in the United States) or service-learning opportunities (e.g., have students volunteer at a local boys and girls club or homeless shelter and reflect on relationship development processes in such contexts).

In addition to varying classroom approaches, a change in scenery may generate fresh ideas on research, teaching, and integrating the two. Participating in new conferences in new places is a good way to move beyond the conference sites you are most comfortable with and try something new! Attend an international conference and utilize the travel time and new surroundings to discuss new research ideas in new ways with new colleagues. The ideas developed and relationships formed will most certainly add new elements to your own work.

Interdisciplinary networking

Networking is not over once you sign on the dotted line to accept your first job. In fact, making connections on campus and throughout the community may be an important aspect of becoming a new professional and maintaining a long, invigorating career. Networking with people outside of your home department may seem challenging upon arrival to a new campus, but most institutions offer a plethora of opportunities if you take advantage of them. Attending faculty luncheons, interdisciplinary talks, new faculty happy hours, professional development lectures, cultural festivities, and alumni events are excellent ways to broaden your campus network, discuss your research with new audiences, and create opportunities for interdisciplinary collaboration.

Developing community connections may be an additionally fruitful way to foster new projects, passions, and relationships. For relationship scholars, this may include attending community lectures on

healthy relationships, networking with community clinicians and therapists, and finding ways to promote relationship research in non-academic settings. Reaching out to community-based peers may not only facilitate new perspectives on relationship research, but it may also help in building lasting social relationships.

Celebrate milestones

Waiting until tenure to celebrate a satisfying and successful career will make for a very long probationary period; so, do not shy away from celebrating the stepping stones (big and small!) along the way. Rewarding yourself for published articles, conference presentations, completed semesters, positive student evaluations, awards, and funded proposals are just a few examples of occasions worth celebrating. Such celebratory events will bolster your sense of accomplishment and will offer opportunities for fun, positive encouragement, and rejuvenation.

“Don’t change.” Despite the simplicity of such advice, these words have motivated me to consider the perspective I hope to take for the remainder of my career. Is it possible to maintain excitement in the challenging years ahead? Absolutely! As new professionals, looking ahead to tenure and beyond may seem daunting, but remembering the initial excitement of the first job offer, the first published article, and the first draw to the academy may help us not “change” along the way.

FEATURE ARTICLES

How Do They Do It? Essays From Epic IARR Collaborators

**Edited by Leah E. Bryant
DePaul University**

According to the IARR website, “The International Association for Relationship Research (IARR) is an

interdisciplinary organizations [sic] that strives to...encourage collaboration among students, new scholars and experienced scholars.” Given the goal to encourage collaboration, it is not surprising that previous *Relationship Research News* articles have been devoted to this very topic. A recent article, in the Spring 2009 Newsletter, reported on collaborative efforts that were discussed at the Providence, Rhode Island IARR Conference in 2008. This article continues the conversation about collaboration with two essays from epic collaborators – “Analysis of a Collaborative Working Relationship” by Philip Shaver and Mario Mikulincer and “Finding the Password to Collaboration” by Brian Spitzberg and William Cupach. Both essays highlight not only topical fit for collaboration, but also the personal fit of the researchers. These essays provide a window into the personal side of how they do research. But first, what is the status of research collaboration, as evidenced in IARR’s two journals, *Personal Relationships* (PR) and *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships* (JSPR)?

At a roundtable discussion at the Providence, Rhode Island IARR Conference in 2008, Sandra Metts analyzed articles published in 1998, 2008, and 2007-2008 in the *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships* and *Personal Relationships* and found that 80% of those articles had multiple authors, almost a quarter of the articles had authors from different disciplines and over half of the articles were authored by individuals from different institutions (Relationship Research News, 2009). Some cursory calculations, not including special issues, demonstrate that the articles published in JSPR and PR in 2010, approximately 80% were by multiple authors!

There are many reasons for research collaboration. Some include, but are not limited to: increased access to resources (2 or more heads are better than one), division of labor increases efficiency, economy of space in research journals, increased likelihood of grant attainment, to increase the inclusion of cross-disciplinary content, external accountability, participating in course related research teams, etc. But in addition to the pragmatic reasons for research collaboration, there are more personal reasons that are described in the following two essays.

Analysis of a Collaborative Working Relationship

Phillip R. Shaver, University of California at Davis

Mario Mikulincer, Interdisciplinary Center (IDC) Herzlyia

Leah Bryant asked us, in her role as Associate Editor of "Relationship Research News," whether we would be willing to write a brief article about our research collaboration. To pique our interest, she said, "It goes without saying that in IARR circles you two set the bar for what it means to collaborate. Your collaborative efforts are legendary: Is it true that at conferences you get together and, using a laptop, generate an article or two? That's what Sue Sprecher and Bev Fehr told me!" Yes, Leah, it *is* true, and here's the backstage story, substantially adapted from a section in our 2007 book, *Attachment in Adulthood: Structure, Dynamics, and Change* (Guilford Press).

Our relationship can best be understood if we begin by explaining how we came, individually, to attachment theory, began to influence each other indirectly, and then, eventually, decided to work together. Both of us had been interested in psychoanalytic theory as undergraduate and graduate students, despite the hard knocks it has always received from critics. Anyone who is curious about what goes on in real people's diverse lives, or who reads novels or poems or watches artful films, realizes that the issues raised by psychoanalysts, beginning with Freud, are extremely important: sexual attraction and desire; romantic love; the development of personality beginning in infant-caregiver relationships; painful, corrosive emotions such as anger, fear, death anxiety, jealousy, hatred, guilt, and shame; intrapsychic conflicts, defenses, and psychopathology; individual and intergroup hostility; the brutality of war.

When we first encountered academic social and personality psychology, it seemed disappointingly superficial compared with psychoanalysis. But its strong point – and the weak point of psychoanalysis – was academic psychology's powerful empirical research methods. Psychoanalytic theorists seemed capable of endlessly inventing and debating

hypothetical constructs and processes without caring about operational definitions, sound psychometrics, or replicable empirical studies. Both of us began our careers as experimental researchers pursuing existing topics in the social-personality field (stress and learned helplessness in Mikulincer's case, self-awareness and fear of success in Shaver's case), but our interest in psychodynamics never abated. When John Bowlby's books began to appear, we realized that a psychoanalytic thinker could respect the full range of scientific perspectives on human behavior, seek empirical evidence for psychoanalytic propositions, and reformulate psychoanalytic theory based on empirical research. Mary Ainsworth's development of a laboratory "Strange Situation" assessment procedure, which allowed her to classify infants' attachment patterns and relate them to home observations of parent-child interactions, added to our confidence that an extension of attachment theory to adults and adult relationships was possible.

In the mid-1980s, Shaver and his students were investigating adolescent and adult loneliness (a consequence of Shaver's experience of grief following the death of his 28-year-old brother). They noticed both that attachment theory is useful in conceptualizing loneliness (as explained by Robert Weiss in a 1973 book and at a 1979 conference organized by Anne Peplau and Dan Perlman, which Weiss and Shaver attended) and that patterns of chronic loneliness are similar in certain respects to the insecure infant attachment patterns identified by Ainsworth and her colleagues in a classic 1978 book. Building on this insight, one of Shaver's doctoral students, Cindy Hazan, wrote a seminar paper suggesting that attachment theory could be used as a framework for studying romantic love – or "romantic attachment," as they called it in their first article on the topic (Hazan & Shaver, 1987: "Romantic Love Conceptualized as an Attachment Process").

That article caught the eye of Mikulincer, who had become interested in attachment theory while studying affect-regulation processes related to learned helplessness, depression, combat stress reactions, and post-traumatic stress disorder in Israel (another example of personal experiences guiding research interests). He noticed similarities between (a) certain forms of helplessness in adulthood and the effects of parental unavailability in infancy; (b) intrusive images and emotions in the case of post-

traumatic stress disorder and the anxious attachment pattern described by Ainsworth and her colleagues in 1978 and adapted by Hazan and Shaver; and (c) avoidant strategies for coping with stress and the avoidant attachment pattern described by these same authors. In 1990, Mikulincer and colleagues published a study of attachment patterns and conscious and unconscious death anxiety, one of the first studies to use the preliminary self-report measure of adult attachment style devised by Hazan and Shaver, and the first to show its connections with unconscious mental processes (measured with the psychodynamically inspired Thematic Apperception Test).

From then on, both of us (turning now to a first-person voice) continued to pursue the application of attachment theory to the study of adults' emotions, emotion-regulation strategies, close interpersonal relationships, and the accomplishment of various life tasks, noticing that we were both interested in the experimental study of attachment-related psychodynamics – the kinds of mental processes, including intense needs, powerful emotions and conflicts, and defensive strategies, that had captivated the attention of psychoanalysts from Freud to Bowlby. After exchanging email messages and conversing face-to-face at conferences, Mikulincer offered Shaver an opportunity to work together on studies of security-enhancement as a method of reducing intergroup hostility in Israel. This work, published in 2001 as “Attachment Theory and Intergroup Bias: Evidence that Priming the Secure Base Schema Attenuates Negative Reactions to Out-Groups,” revealed the advantages of close collaboration. These advantages include the vitality that arises when two engaged minds grapple with common issues and take advantage of each other's special skills – in this case, Mikulincer's exceptional talent for experimental design and Shaver's for writing in professional English. (Mikulincer was trained originally as an experimental psychologist, not specifically as a social or personality psychologist; Shaver has always been obsessively interested in graceful writing.)

Once we began working closely together, we found additional areas of similarity and complementarity, as always happens in good relationships. (The idea that it should be *either* similarity *or* complementarity, as sometimes debated in the social

psychology literature, is misguided.) Among similarities we found a deep appreciation of 20th-century art, modern fiction, films, and football (although it is soccer in Mikulincer's case and American football in Shaver's, a function of what we played and grew up with as boys) – and of course, as already explained, psychodynamic theories. Other similarities, which are important but too complicated to delve into very deeply here, include intense achievement motivation combined with distaste for egotism, a deep and perhaps neurotic split between the senses of ambition and sloth, and extended experiences with psychotherapy. (Regarding ambition and sloth, Shaver once asked Mikulincer what he thought would happen if he slowed down a bit, and Mikulincer replied that he would “lie down and do nothing,” a false but unalterable belief that Shaver shares.) Among complementarities we found that Mikulincer likes Method and Results sections of articles, whereas Shaver likes Introductions and Discussions – a great combination when writing articles during conventions. Another, perhaps more mysterious complementarity is that Shaver was raised as an Irish Catholic who later dated and married almost nothing but Jewish women, and Mikulincer was raised as a Jewish boy in a Catholic neighborhood in Argentina, where he was always curious about what was going on inside the local church. (He moved to Israel as a teenager.) Another complementarity is that Shaver's experience with therapy was in a neo-Freudian psychoanalytic institute in New York, whereas Mikulincer's experience was with a Jungian analyst in Israel. Without this variety of deep similarities and complementarities, our relationship probably would not have blossomed or deepened to the extent that it has, and we probably wouldn't have studied attachment aspects of religion or attachment-related themes in dreams.

So, what about writing articles in hotels at conferences, which we definitely do! Of course, we exchange messages and manuscript components all the time by email as well, but it's easier to make rapid progress in person, and because of family commitments (each of us has a wife and two children) and little leisure time, it's practical to meet at professional conferences that we would attend whether working together or not. Because we are both somewhat introverted, although in different ways, neither of us is a conference gadabout or

schmoozer anyway, so we attend crucial sessions of conferences but otherwise spend a lot of time in hotel rooms, coffee shops, and gourmet restaurants (another shared passion) working on grant proposals, research plans, and manuscripts. For some reason we can both sit in front of a shared laptop for hours, taking breaks only for stretching or walking to a nearby coffee shop (Mikulincer is an espresso addict, and the trips to coffee shops have turned Shaver into a soy latte addict). We often add two or three extra days to a conference just for working on writing projects, and during those days our work sessions are not interrupted by needing to attend or speak at conference sessions. We now co-host an annual conference in Israel that becomes a book each year, so we are accustomed to meeting during extra days around those conferences, which are conveniently located on the Mediterranean shore. Mikulincer has occasionally come to Davis, California, where Phil lives, for more than a week at a time, and this has also allowed us to make substantial progress on theoretical ideas and longer manuscripts and edited books. We have occasionally had special opportunities to travel together, in one case to visit the Dalai Lama in India, which have affected both our friendship and some of our research projects (which now include relationships between attachment theory's concept of secure attachment and the Buddhist concept of "non-attachment").

If there are other secrets to our successful collaboration, we don't know yet what they are. Some of them, as in all close friendships, are probably destined to remain mysterious. There are other very productive collaborations in the relationships field, as readers of this newsletter know, from Berscheid and Hatfield to Murray and Holmes. The kinds of similarity and complementarity probably differ across dyads, but in all such relationships we've witnessed, there is a special kind of mutual generosity and caring, and a delicate balance of individual ambition with shared limelight. Perhaps that is part of all well-functioning close relationships – another great topic for research!

Finding the Password to Collaboration

Brian Spitzberg, San Diego State University

William Cupach, Illinois State University

Baravelli: ...you can't come in unless you give the password.

Professor Wagstaff: Well, what is the password?

Baravelli: Aw, no. You gotta tell me. Hey, I tell what I do. I give you three guesses. It's the name of a fish.

Professor Wagstaff: Is it "Mary?"

Baravelli: [laughing] 'At's-a no fish!

Professor Wagstaff: She isn't? Well, she drinks like one! ...Let me see... Is it "Sturgeon"?

Baravelli: Aw, you-a crazy. A "sturgeon", he's a doctor cuts you open when-a you sick. Now I give you one more chance.

Wagstaff: I got it! "Haddock".

Baravelli: 'At's a-funny, I got a "haddock" too.

Wagstaff: What do you take for a "haddock"?

Baravelli: Sometimes I take an aspirin, sometimes I take a calomel.

Wagstaff: Y'know, I'd walk a mile for a calomel.

Baravelli: You mean chocolate calomel? I like-a that too, but you no guess it. [Slams door. Wagstaff knocks again. Baravelli opens peephole again.] Hey, what's-a matter, you no understand English? You can't come in here unless you say, "Swordfish." Now I'll give you one more guess.

Professor Wagstaff: ...swordfish, swordfish... I think I got it. Is it "swordfish"?

Baravelli: Hah. That's-a it. You guess it.

Professor Wagstaff: Pretty good, eh?

Groucho and Chico reveal good humor, patience, and impressive collaboration in this scene from *Horse Feathers* (1932), and yet, there is also a healthy competitiveness and inclination to prodding one another along. One of the challenges facing relationship science is identifying general principles upon which relationships function; the task is no less daunting in characterizing the nature of competent collaborations.

A brief synopsis is in order. We met a week or two before beginning our graduate careers, fresh from our B.A. institutions. As we both competed on the intercollegiate debate circuit, we may have met previously, but neither of us has ever been able to confirm this one way or another. Finding ourselves in common quandary, novitiates at the altar of learning and in competition with many students more advanced than ourselves, we were billeted together in a basement office fit better for the resident cockroaches than for human occupation. Our debate background led us to compete with the ideas of every seminar, whether authored by peer, author, or professor. We soon found ourselves debating each other, but as teammates in a tournament writ large in this new intellectual environs. Some three decades and 30 shared publications later, we find our collaborations now like the Marx Brothers would have found the comfort of a well-rehearsed script—always new nuggets to find, but generally familiar ground.

We find several elements facilitate our working relationship. Not surprisingly, these features mirror those that characterize relationship compatibility more generally. To begin with, we benefit from *shared time*. We have roomed together at conferences dozens of times. In so doing, we converse about the entire realm of the discipline, our mutual projects and plans, and our personal lives. We therefore share a mutual history, which as with successful relationships, enables a working vocabulary.

Our relationship is built on a foundation of *similarity*. Based on our training and parallel intellectual development we share a common language and common paradigmatic perspective. Our attention tends to be drawn to similar issues, and our academic interests naturally converge. We share the experience and value of working in terminal M.A. programs. A heavier teaching and mentoring load (compared to many colleagues in R-1 institutions) fosters a need for collaboration, and the economies of scale that attend such relationships. Of course sharing affinities for some non-academic endeavors (e.g., appreciation of fine wine) lubricates the working relationship as well.

Similarity of interests and values leads to *shared projects*. We each freely pursue and develop our

own ideas, looking forward to sharing them with each other. These shared ideas evolve into mutual projects that generate both mutual history and mutual interests. The fact that we are publicly recognized as regular collaborators, in turn, leads to joint invitations for us to work further together (such as with this brief commentary). The on-going success at collaboration has a self-fulfilling quality, creating a future horizon to our relationship.

Although commonalities bring us together, *complementarities* catalyze our success: one is more creative and poetic, and the other more detail-oriented and logically rigorous. One reads expansively, the other more comprehensively within the discipline. One is more methodologically expert, especially in design matters, whereas the other is more measurement-oriented. When one assumes the role of strategist, the other becomes tactician. And we are comfortable switching roles when it seems appropriate.

Finally, we believe there is no substitute for those elements so important to any relationship—*genuine friendship, trust, and enjoyment* in each other's company. Mutual respect and affection affords a comfortable and confident frame for a thriving working relationship. We have not needed to guess the password to our relationship, when we were both willing to offer it to the other, if only after a little fun.

References

Barbee, A. (Spring, 2009). Research Collaborations in IARR: Report on a Round Table Convened at the International Association for Relationship Research Conference held in Providence RI, USA, on July 17-20, 2008. *Relationship Research News*, 7. Retrieved from http://www.iarr.org/images/newsletter_sp09.pdf

International Association of Relationship Research (2009). *About IARR*. Retrieved from <http://www.iarr.org/About/index.html>

Mikulincer, M., & Shaver, P. R. (2007). *Attachment in adulthood: Structure, dynamics, and change*. The Guilford Press: New York, New York.

Digging Holes in the Sand: Finding Time to Manage in Academia

**edited by H. Colleen Sinclair
Mississippi State University**

Time management is an issue with which every academic struggles. To be a successful academic, you have to teach – which is scheduled – but you also have to mentor, advise, grade, write, review, participate in local and national service, attend conferences, read *Relationships Research News*, etc. Trying to carve out time in academia can often feel like one is digging holes in the sand, in that the ever-mounting sand hills of tasks postponed and tasks impending continuously slide in to fill your carefully (or sometimes desperately) dug hole. Accordingly, should you have time to read this Spring's newsletter, you will find that we have assembled some advice for not only managing to write, but also managing to have a life (family and fun). We chose to focus on managing (and protecting) the time you have rather than “making time.” As anyone who has tried to “make” time has likely discovered, there is no new time to be made.

Time for Writing and Other Fragile Creatures

**Paul J. Silvia
University of North Carolina at Greensboro**

In the academic year, as in life, there is a season for all things: a time to teach, a time to collect data; a time to mentor young minds, a time to grade the disastrous output of those minds; a time to serve on the Associate Vice Provost for Parking Service's Utilization Forecasting Committee, and that's basically it—then it's time to go home, cursing about parking during the long trek to your car. During these many seasons the bitter winter of writing often never arrives. Writing is cruel and tempting and vexing, like a mean mermaid. If anyone ever needed evidence that being a professor isn't a real job, the way the job treats scholarly writing is it. In the dark abyss of corporate employment, people actually do the things they were hired to do while at work. In the

shiny ivory tower, people do their core work—writing books, articles, and grant proposals—during the evenings, weekends, and summers. If a psychology department were like a VW/Audi dealership, they would post numbers for time spent writing, articles published, and grants submitted on a huge whiteboard, and a few months of bad numbers would get you fired.

I confess that I was inspired to become a professor because one of my undergraduate professors once explained to me why it isn't a real job. After 10 years as a professor, I'm more convinced than ever that our work only vaguely resembles gainful employment. Real jobs have more structure, more incentives, more performance-based assessment, and fewer committees. Publishing research is a big part of our jobs—for some of us, it is basically why we were hired and why we will or won't be promoted—but the structure of a day at the office doesn't afford time to write.

My approach to making time for writing follows from a bigger picture of time management that I've worked out over the years. My vision of time management isn't something I talk or write about much, in part because my thoughts about it are messy and incoherent, in part because the Vice Provost for Parking Services would get mad, and that's the guy with real power at any university. But here it is, for what it's worth.

A lot has been said about time management, usually by business gurus who are selling books, workshops, and productivity tools, whatever those are. (If a hammer is a tool for pounding nails, one wonders what gets pounded by a fresh box of file folders.) Many a reader of David Allen's *Getting Things Done* has bought a label maker and wasted a work day in an orgiastic binge of labeling—but at least visitors to my office now know that my white board is a “white board.” The time management lore, for the most part, has some good ideas: make to-do lists, set concrete goals framed in terms of behaviors, and save the brainless stuff for tired moments.

At the same time, most time management books suffer from the same few flaws. The typical book lacks humility—not an uncommon thing among writers of books for business people—particularly humility about how well we can control the events in

our world. There is structure, and there is chaos, and even your iPhone's mighty productivity apps can't keep a chaotic universe in abeyance. Time management is a struggle because of the random interruptions that happen randomly, like random things do. We can impose some structure over our workdays, but it's a fantasy to think that we could structure it all if we would only schedule more precisely, set goals more concretely, and label more diligently.

A different way to think about time management—one that I hope is more humble and realistic—comes from my undergraduate background in animal behavior. I've come to think of my work week as an ecosystem and my goals as animals that live there. And as the Discovery Channel has revealed, when a bunch of animals get together, someone is going to get eaten. Some of our goals are predators, and some of our goals are prey. The predatory goals always get accomplished because, by virtue of being important, urgent, time-sensitive, fun, or easy, they devour other goals. Here, as an example, are my week's usual predators:

- All things instructional: Teaching, grading, prepping lectures, weeping openly for the future of our nation's depleted human capital and for being part of the problem
 - Writing letters of recommendation that strain the limits of mendacity
 - Mentoring wayward graduate students, realizing that I have no idea how to teach them to do what I do, and secretly suspecting that that's for the best
 - Anything involving any administrator farther than 30 feet from my office
 - Research cataclysms, such as the software crashes, equipment failures, and personnel flakiness that might be dark harbingers of the project's likely failure
 - Reviewing manuscripts, grant proposals, promotion-and-tenure dossiers, book proposals, half-done books, and other reminders of the fact that I'm not doing my own writing
 - Getting coffee at the coffee shops next to the office
 - Writing memos, reports, documents, budgets, and other detritus of administrative obligations
 - The Internet, the meanest mermaid of them all

To be sure, the week's predators, like nature's predators, can be cute and cuddly. Even chinstrap penguins devour some other hapless animal. A predator is simply something that outcompetes something else—many predatory tasks are among the job's most meaningful duties. For example, the apex predator, the great white shark of the professoriate, is teaching. Teaching is central to what we do, and I enjoy it. It's the apex predator not only because teaching times are scheduled for us, but because we take it seriously.

To find your prey, just think about what gets killed during the work week. Here's my own endangered species list:

- Reading things other psychologists write—or anything not involving mermaids, princesses, or Clifford the Big Red Dog
- Preparing submissions for conferences, those magical places where I hear people talk about their research so I don't have to read it
 - Unstructured teaching and mentoring, such as shaping the lumpy clay of my first-year graduate students into erudite lumpy clay with publications
 - Thinking, pondering, mulling, reflecting, and contemplating about psychology, i.e., the ostensible duties of a professor that never happen
 - Writing, i.e., writing

Writing is the most woeful creature on this list. Time for writing is the giant panda of the professorial ecosystem—it would go extinct without intensive intervention by people who listen to a lot of National Public Radio. Writing is easy to put off and easy to do anywhere, so it's a fat target for even lowly predators—that's why a mangy beast like the Arts & Sciences Enrollment Management Committee can munch on your half-done manuscript.

Thinking about the work week in terms of competing goals shows us ways to make time for writing. As professors, we need to do for writing what naturalists and liberal tree-hugging do-gooders do for endangered animals: stick them behind big fences. Easily devoured goals need to be protected. Writing will rarely be urgent enough to outcompete other goals, so it needs its own space—a nature preserve for half-done manuscripts and rejected grant proposals, if you will.

I treat time for writing as a special time: I carve out time for it, and that time gets spent only for writing. Only the biggest predators, like illness, can devour it. Scheduling writing works because writing is no longer competing with your classes, administrative duties, and random goals that stumble into your inbox. For many years, I wrote between 8 am to 10 am each weekday. Once I became a papa, I shifted to 5 am to 6:30 am each weekday. The mornings work well for me, but most people I know who use a writing schedule pick more humane times, like 10 am to 12 noon three days a week. Four to six hours a week, scheduled like a class and treated with the same seriousness, will protect your time to write.

For me, the writing schedule is structure and everything else is chaos. I barely bother to plan the free time in my work day. The most important things always seem to get done, simply by virtue of deadlines and urgency. And many smaller things never get done, which I take as a sign that they weren't important enough to compete for time and action. It's good that we don't get everything done. Just as narrow streets and small parking lots discourage needless driving, limited time and chaotic weeks discourage committing to capricious projects and trivial ideas.

There's a certain perversity about this way of thinking about time management. In short, I think we should protect the most essential and fragile goals—writing, reading, and thinking—and then let everything else fight it out. Urgency, procrastination, and natural selection will ensure that the most significant tasks will happen: courses will be taught, manuscripts will be reviewed, letters of recommendation will be written, and chaos will work its weird ways. It might not be relaxing—such is chaos—but the writing gets written, and that's all that I hoped for anyway.

*(Note from Associate Editor: Anyone interested in more of Dr. Silvia's advice on writing is encouraged to check out his book *How to Write A Lot* available from APA books.)*

Balancing Careers and Family as a Dual Academic Couple

**Anita P. Barbee
Michael R. Cunningham
University of Louisville**

The solutions that we developed as a dual career academic couple are a function of our personalities and our situations, which requires some background. So, we will first provide a third-person biography, and then follow it with more personal commentary. The saga begins with Michael, who received his Ph.D. from the University of Minnesota in 1977, and spent his post-tenure sabbatical year (1984-1985) as a Visiting Lecturer at the University of Georgia, courtesy of his good friend, IARR member William Graziano. That is where he met Anita Barbee, who was in her 3rd year as a doctoral student in their Social Psychology Ph.D. program. Michael and Anita ran several research studies together, which produced the first of their joint publications on attraction, emotion and social support. They married a few months after Anita finished her doctoral exams, in Dec. 1985, and the next month Anita moved to the Chicago area to be with her new husband.

Moving a Southern Belle to Chicago in January was not a good idea, so Michael promptly sought a position at the University of Louisville (UofL), where they moved in Aug. 1986. Michael was promoted to Full Professor, and Anita spent the next few years completing her award-winning dissertation and coordinating Michael's Social Lab. She defended her dissertation proposal in Aug. 1987 while 2 months pregnant. The morning that their first son was born (April 8, 1988), Anita awoke with contractions at 5:00 am, but she still had one more revision to complete on her dissertation. So, she ignored the pain and finished the draft. Only then did she wake Michael to drive her to the hospital, where Robert was safely welcomed into the world. More than two decades of additional decisions that required the balancing of family and career needs were to follow.

Firmly believing the findings on attachment theory, and wanting to spend as much time with Robert as possible, Anita taught only a few classes a year as a

part-time Psychology Instructor at UofL for the next five years. When she was ready to return to full-time work, the regressive Chair of the UofL Psychology Department was afraid that a married couple would form a power block in “his” department, and refused to consider her for an open position. As a consequence, Anita continued to coordinate the Social Lab until 1993, when she took a grant-funded, non-tenure track research professor position at the Kent School of Social Work at U of L. Nonetheless, they continued to collaborate on research, and brought young Robert to INPR and ISSPR conferences. They bought a larger house in Louisville, and Anita became pregnant with their second son, Benjamin, who was born on July 30, 1994. In 1997, Anita returned to graduate school and received her MSSW in 2001. In essence, Anita switched careers in order to make forward progress, while maintaining her core identity as a relationship researcher.

Meanwhile in 2001, Michael was serving as INPR President and working with dedicated relationship researchers to forge the union of INPR and ISSPR into IARR. Closer to home, he was dealing with another self-interested department chair. That chair was determined to reduce UofL’s Psychology department to a narrow “Brain Sciences” focus, by killing the popular Social Psychology Ph.D. area. Capitalizing on his knowledge of Interpersonal Communication, acquired through IARR colleagues, Michael chose to move to the Communication department at UofL and has remained there ever since. In 2005, after 12 years in a non-tenure track research line, Anita was promoted directly to tenured Full Professor and Distinguished University Scholar, in which position she remains today. Michael and Anita continue to conduct research together and apart, especially on their \$4.8 million dollar DHHS grant to enhance teenage relationships, and reduce pregnancies, STIs and violence.

Robert is now 22 and finishing his undergraduate degree and Ben is 16 and a junior in upper school. At this point, it appears that Robert has interests in the history of science and the law, and Ben is interested in engineering and business. Having attended our conferences since birth, the boys report feeling too saturated in close relationships research to go into our field...but we’ll see!

The foregoing illustrates how our professional and personal lives have intertwined for the past 25 years of marriage, but says little about our tactics. How do we manage to have very demanding careers, raise delightful and successful children, and stay married? Well to us, being in a dual academic marriage from the same field has had many advantages. On the plus side:

a) We have been able to collaborate both personally and professionally.

b) While other faculty may have spouses who resent the fact that the workload only gets worse after graduate school, we both know the nature of the work we do. We can pinch hit for each other as we juggle meeting deadlines, picking up the children from various activities, and foraging for food.

c) Although we both work about 70 hours a week, our schedules are flexible. We have managed to ensure that we never teach classes in the same hour, so if one of us needs to pinch hit in the other’s class, or meet the needs of the children, we can do that.

d) Being in the same field helped us to be efficient in keeping up with new developments. We would take turns reading journal articles and briefing each other. Sometimes we took turns going to conferences, and sometimes we both attended, took our sons with us and took turns going into the talks.

e) Because of the fluidity of the work and schedule, we engaged in tag team parenting. We never had a rigid schedule for who would do what, but instead would make arrangements to cover transportation duty, or homework supervision, on a day-to-day basis, based on who had the greatest availability that morning, afternoon, and evening. Flexibility, tolerance for uncertainty, and access to a telephone all were key.

f) For longer term coordination, we email each other our calendar of deadlines, travel schedules, and our sons’ commitments (sport tournaments, drama practices, piano lessons, visits to colleges, ad infinitum), at least every couple of weeks. We feel a certain absurdity sitting next to each other on the living room couch, engaged in parallel play with our laptops, and communicating via email. But we knew that human memory is limited, so we prefer to use our verbal interactions for laughter and problem-solving rather than mundane details.

g) Our dual income has helped us outsource some housework, some meal preparation, child-care and school expenses.

h) In the early years of childrearing, one of Michael's students introduced us to her wonderful mother-in-law who had raised 6 children successfully and was helping out with 12 grandchildren. Her husband was retired, so we adopted them as paid baby sitters and surrogate grandparents. They cared for Ben as an infant and both children after school as needed, including when we went out at night, and when we traveled to conferences and could not bring the boys. They were lifesavers and proof that students can become part of an extended family, and another perk of the academic life.

i) Seeing us work on our laptops while supervising their homework inspired our sons to work hard on their own school work

Yet, to be completely honest, the dual career life is not without its difficulties:

a) It is difficult to get great positions for both members of a couple in the same city. The more similar the research specialty of the two people, the lower the chances that two jobs will be open at the same time. When the UofL Psychology Department was behaving badly, we considered moving to another university. But, finding one with two open positions that suited our professional goals, personal quality of life desires, and family interests was an equation that we never solved. We found ways to adjust to where we were, and avoided a long-distance relationship or uprooting the children.

b) Resiliency is a prerequisite for two people living in an academic pressure cooker. We learned when we both worked in the Psychology Department that there are some disadvantages to dealing with the same personnel and academic politics all day long. It worked out much better for us to be in different departments at the University, so that we can support each other, hear different stories, and be on slightly different cycles of calm and calamity.

c) There are few boundaries in a university position. Both of us like to be accessible to our students, respond promptly to emails from collaborators and journal editors, send out manuscripts, and do a hundred other tasks per week. Like many IARR members, we see that as normal. We had to force ourselves to take vacations, continue hobbies and make a life in the Louisville community.

The children helped rivet our attentions away from our own tasks. We both spend a great deal of time each week talking with them, watching them perform in sports and plays, working with them, and having fun with them.

d) We learned that there simply is not enough time for everything. Sometimes, we are both exhausted at the end of a busy week, and would rather sleep than do the journal reviews that we put off until the weekend. Despite outsourcing some of the housework, our house still has lots of books, journals, papers and other interesting objects piled high and all about. Let's put it this way, *Southern Living* magazine is not trying to break down our door to do a photo shoot of our home!

e) Due to our children's school commitments, we have not been good about taking out-of-town sabbaticals. But, we have seen other dual academic couples do that in a creative way- especially IARR members Val Derlega and Barbara Winstead, who taught on a ship that circled the globe one year while their children were young.

So what do we recommend to up and coming academic professionals in the field of close relationships?

a) Welcome children into your lives, if you can. They are a joy and worth every minute and every dollar you spend on them! They will make you a more perceptive relationship researcher, as well as a more grounded person, if you let them. Keep pushing the Academy to stop the tenure clock so you can have these children while you have the energy to raise them. It is a risk, but try not to wait until tenure to get started!

b) Just as the field knows from research on relationship maintenance, take time for fun with each other- have date nights, have a sense of humor when one or the other is under tremendous stress, and take time for friends, hobbies, community work and vacations. We often add a great family vacation to an IARR conference, thereby combining two sources of pleasure.

c) Outsource as much of the menial labor as possible, so you can focus on your children and each other with real quality time, instead of cleaning, cooking, and doing laundry.

d) Expand your social contacts to expand your career opportunities. All of the good things that have happened in our lives, including meeting each other,

getting our various positions at UofL, and working in IARR, have been aided and abetted by our friends and colleagues. Good friends are the secret ingredient in good luck!

e) Be an agent of change in your workplace. Encourage your university to be family friendly. Allow staff and colleagues to bring the children into the lab, the office, and to meetings. Allow and even encourage spousal hires. Give colleagues time off of the tenure clock to attend to family matters. And for more seasoned scholars, realize that the nicer you are to junior faculty, the nicer they will be to you when your parents become ill, or when you need time to attend to your own health needs.

All in all, it has been and continues to be a great ride. As the children continue their education and hopefully move toward independence and forming their own families, we will continue to work together and apart and look back with fondness to all those hectic days of having to do it all. We hope that our story provides inspiration and support to other IARR members, as you forge your own unique paths.

Time Management and Play

Marian M. Morry
University of Manitoba, Canada

Long ago, I realized that I was much more productive and happier if I took some down time to relax and enjoy myself. Similar to other areas of my life, time management plays an important role in play. Through a combination of scheduling and spontaneity, I ensure that I incorporate some down time in my day-to-day life. Like so many areas of our lives, there is a difference between spending more time doing something and being more efficient in our use of time. I aim for being efficient so that I can maximize the time I have for work, family, and play. I include a number of different areas in this section of play including mental and physical health, socializing with friends and family, and vacations. Below I have outlined what works for me; you need to find a way to incorporate play into your own life. Look at your schedule, decide when you are at your least productive work-wise, and ask yourself which aspects of play are most important and how you can incorporate them into your life. As you will see,

work, family, and play are not mutually exclusive; you can combine play and family or work and play.

Mental and Physical Health

One important aspect of play for me is mental and physical health. With my own schedule, I have found that it is best to exercise in the morning; this does mean getting out of bed at 6:00 am and exercising by 7:00 am. Just like writing time or class time, I have blocked off 1 ½ hours of my early morning three days a week in order to exercise. In regards to efficiency, my husband and I put a gym in our basement – no travel time and no waiting for equipment. I also include spontaneity in my exercise. Depending on the time of year and the weather, on weekends my husband and I will cross-country ski, bike ride, or walk. Being unplanned though this does not happen as often as it should. I would also include gardening in this section as it can contribute to both mental and physical health. This one is more ad hoc than the others depending on the time of year, weather, or status of the flowers and vegetables. By having a combination of planned and spontaneous activities, I ensure that I have some time for my health but am flexible based on what is going on at work.

Socializing with Friends and Family

In regards to socializing, I again try to do a combination of scheduled and spontaneous events. For example, on non-exercise days I have coffee with a friend/colleague twice a week – some work, some play. To accommodate this down time in my work schedule, I begin working an hour earlier on these days. I also “book off” Friday nights to spend with friends and family. Most Fridays, a group of us will get together for drinks and dinner. This event rotates from house-to-house spreading the preparation around. On Fridays when there is no get together, my husband and I use the time to go out for dinner; a form of planned spontaneity. Socializing also involves time with my husband. We both love to cook, so we plan our weekly menus and share in the cooking (yes sometimes there are too many cooks in the kitchen!). We also abandon our plans and go to the lake for dinner with friends, join in a celebration, or sit on a patio on a warm summer night.

Vacations

Vacations and tourism are also an important part of play. This is one area where I have found it

important to plan and to leave work behind. In the past, I have brought work with me on trips but then felt guilty about not working while on vacation or felt guilty for trying to play tourist while working. Needless to say, this was not pleasant or productive. So now, I separate work and play; having said that, when at a conference I schedule some time to play tourist if it is in a city I have never been to. This time management allows me to not feel guilty about either activity as they were both planned. So, what strategies do I use when at a conference? One is to look at the schedule before leaving. This way, I can determine if there are sessions where I am less interested in the topics and I can choose a morning or afternoon to explore. Another strategy is to add a couple of days onto the trip exclusively for vacation time. In this case, my husband would join me part way through the conference. However, here too, I leave room for spontaneity such as meals or drinks with friends I only see once or twice a year. And true vacations? In this case I do NOT take work with me and I limit checking my email to every second or third day. I also only respond to time sensitive emails (e.g., page proofs) and leave the rest to the end of my vacation. It does mean I have a lot of emails when I get home but mentally I feel much better when I walk away from technological gadgets for awhile.

So, to ensure time to play you need to block it off in your schedule and protect this time, be efficient, and allow room for some spontaneity. Over the years, I have found a schedule that works for me but each person needs to determine what is best for his or her life. If your best writing time is first thing in the morning it may not be good to exercise at that time. However, if you are a night owl perhaps starting with exercise and then moving into your work day could fit your schedule. Separating vacations and working is best for me, but if you can read on planes (I get motion sick) then perhaps bringing work is an efficient use of time. Similarly if you are comfortable working a few hours each day on your trip all the power to you. Use your time in a way that best fits your abilities and needs.

Remember, the point of play is to have fun, so not everything can be scripted beforehand. Plan some things, be willing to change your plans, and most of all have fun!

Sincere thanks to Dr. Barbee, Dr. Cunningham, Dr. Morry, and Dr. Silvia for contributing to this section. Hopefully your advice will help us turn sand holes into sandcastles.

HUMOR COLUMN

May I “Zuckerberg” You?

by David A. Kenny
University of Connecticut

I realize that most of the older readers (i.e., those over 30) have little idea what Facebook is all about, and many of us think that it is just a way to self-aggrandize and show cute pictures of children and pets. However, we need to realize that Facebook is making relationship research more difficult. Here is why: Many of us in this organization study friendship. However, it is now almost impossible for us to study friendship because Facebook has changed its meaning. Let me explain.

As relationship researchers, we know quite a bit about friendship, and a brief summary is as follows: Unless you are four years old, you do not ask someone to become your friend. Friendship just happens, and need not necessarily be reciprocal. In fact, some studies estimate the probability of reciprocation as less than 50 percent. So, perhaps about half of your friends consider you to be their friend. Ordinarily, there is no breakup in friendship. Think about your adolescent friends. You are no longer friends with many of them, but you never broke up. Also, you do not have that many friends. There is the “Dunbar number” which is the total size of your network, and that number is 150. However, about only 12 or less people in this network are real friends. If you do not believe me, take a look at Michael Argyle’s rules of friendship and you will see that not very many members of your network would qualify as friends. For instance, how many

people would help you move the books in your office to another office? Not that many. Besides, friends are real people. Of course, some of us have imaginary friends, like Bogus (<http://www.imdb.com/title/tt0115725/>), but by and large, for almost everyone, a friend is a real person. Lastly, “friend” is a noun.

Facebook has changed friendship. First, “friend” is now a verb: You “friend” someone. (Changing nouns to verbs or denominalization is an ugly trend in language: Stewardesses now say that they have “beveraged” the passengers.) Second, becoming a friend now requires a conscious choice. Thus, you know exactly who your friends are. Third, friendship is reciprocal. If someone “friends” you on Facebook, you have to accept or reject them. The norm is that if someone “friends” you, you have to accept them. It would be very rude to reject their request, and you would need to come up with all sorts of excuses for not accepting the invitation. Fourth, you have a lot of friends. A friend (both real and Facebook) of mine’s daughter has 576 friends and I know a graduate student who has 434 friends. Solange Sfeir from Beirut Lebanon, who owns *Smile Dental Journal* (no I am not making this up), has 4,986 friends! She seems to collect friends the way Kardashians collect boyfriends. Fifth, if you are friends with someone, it is difficult to no longer be their friend. Defriending someone is just not done. In fact, Facebook etiquette dictates that it is only acceptable to defriend an ex-boyfriend or girlfriend. But normally, you would not even do that, because you want to know what they are up to. In fact, one recent survey found that 81 percent of all respondents would not defriend an ex on Facebook, and 75 percent admitted to constantly checking an ex’s Facebook page.

Sadly, we can no longer study friendship because Facebook has distorted the meaning of the term. As a case in point, I looked at the 63 friends that I have on Facebook and a good number are family members, some of which I would consider friends and some not, and others are coworkers, not all of whom are my friends. Several of my best friends are not on Facebook and so they are not included. So my Facebook “friends” are not really my friends.

Something needs to be done and I have sent the following email to Mark Zuckerberg, son of a

psychiatrist and a dentist and the founder (I guess co-founder with those blond Harvard Winklevoss twins and that Brazilian dude, Eduardo Saverin) of Facebook:

Mark: You do not know me (unless you have seen my 1000 acre farm on Farmville for which I paid over \$2000), but I think it is really cool that you get to party with people like Justin Timberlake, are worth (according to Forbes) \$13.5 billion, and Obama comes to you for advice. We owe so much to that BU coed who dumped you, which led to you inventing Facebook. By the way, even though I am a dude too, I think it still ok for me to say that you are much sexier than Jesse Eisenberg. That dude has not memorized passages of Homer’s Iliad and does not know the difference between an épée and a foil, like you do. I have a cool suggestion for you, dude: Because you are so awesome (over 3.7 million people like **your** Facebook page!), why not change the word on Facebook from “friend” to “Zuckerberg”? So you would Zuckerberg someone and deZuckerberg someone else. Think if you branded your name, you could then sell it for all sorts of things, and you would then be worth more than Bill Gates, Warren Buffet, and that Mexican oil guy Carlos Slim combined! Also, if you change “friend” to “Zuckerberg” maybe Syria, China, Vietnam, and Iran would no longer realize that Facebook is a social networking site and no longer ban it. By the way, when you use this idea I promise that I will not sue you for stealing my idea. I would however ask you to Zuckerberg me.

BOOK REVIEWS

Relational Competence Theory: Research and Mental Health Applications.

By Luciano L'Abate, Mario Cusinato, Eleonora Maino, Walter Colesso & Claudia Scilletta (2010)

Springer-Science (Verlag). 326 pp.

**Reviewed by David Ryback
EQ Associates International**

This erudite book is not light reading. Rather, it is a very densely written theoretical overview of all aspects of relationship interaction, or what the authors call relational competence theory (RCT), about the dynamics of how we communicate with one another in various, real-life contexts.

Theory is dealt with from a conceptual view, including verifiability; applicability; redundancy of models and constructs; and fruitfulness, or testability—viewed from the abstract to the concrete. A number of models are presented, such as those dealing with horizontal width (emotionality, awareness, etc.); depth (comparing public and private facades); objective settings (such as home, school, work); horizontal functionality (such as approach-avoidance); and more.

To put it in simple terms, any communication between people is extremely complex, even a simple request to pass the butter, affected not only by the words themselves, but also by the tone, body language, pitch, pacing, etc., not to mention the culture in which this request is made. From “Pass the butter, please,” to “Give me the butter, you moron,” this simple message can result in very different responses. According to the principle of reciprocity, the response to such a request, possibly, “Get the d.n butter yourself,” can tell us so much more about the dynamics behind this relatively simple interaction. For example, in addition to the above Selfish answer, according to Model¹¹ (Selfhood), there are also three other possibilities: Selfful: “Sure, right after I get some for myself.”

Selfless: “Here you are.” No-self: “Let’s not argue. Here it is.”

Relational competence theory takes into consideration whether relationships are long- or short-term, deep or superficial, intimate or not. Much of the research for the book was accomplished in Italy, where most of the authors live and work. The competence for successful relationships is learned, according to the authors, “through a continuous process of socialization molded by lifelong intimate and nonintimate relationships, with their associated pleasurable and painful events.” In order to gain a deeper conceptual analysis, they distinguish clearly between prolonged, intimate, close relationships, on the one hand, and the nonintimate alternative, short-lived, distant and opportunistic, on the other.

The authors’ aim is to offer models of relationship “from a variety of redundant vantage points.” Their assiduous study using over 45 assessment tools (such as Intimacy Anxiety Scale, Marital Jealousy Questionnaire, Enmeshment Scale, Narcissism Scale, Partner Quality Test) allows for a strongly-structured overview of human relations.

One of their 16 models, labeled “The Depth of Relationships,” focuses on the difference between public and private personae, and highlights the concept of “impression management.” Men, they found, are more likely to use what they call opposing “self-presentation strategies” (e.g., “playing dumb” vs. “knowing it all”) than are women, such strategies being associated with lower self-esteem.

Through a thorough review of the research that digs deeply into the complexity of human interactions, L’Abate and his colleagues elucidate the concepts of relational competence. From Model⁴—Ability to Love—to Model¹⁵—Intimacy—we learn how to excel at such communications with case studies and exercises offered by L’Abate and his colleagues. A table of interactive practice exercises is offered toward the end of the book.

This book may become one of the authoritative sources for comprehensive research on social interaction. Luciano L’Abate, the senior author, proves his mettle as one of the hardest working and most productive researchers on human interaction.

The references at the back of the book take *at least 2 ½ full pages* to list his citations, revealing a man whose research covers the waterfront, from intimacy (“Intimacy is Sharing Hurt Feelings,” 1977) through therapy (*Beyond Psychotherapy*, 2002) to play (*The Praeger Handbook of Play across the Life Cycle*, 2009). This very youthful octogenarian proves that life can be lived to the fullest, no matter what age, as he tackles the very profound issues of human interaction, researching, writing, organizing international teams of scientists, to answer the deepest issues in psychology, teaching us how to interact most lovingly with one another. His forthcoming book has the provocative title, *Hurt Feelings*, one more mountain for this fearless researcher to climb—and conquer.

Close Relationships
By Pamela Regan (2011)
New York, NY: Routledge, 387 pp.

Reviewed by Stacey L. MacKinnon
University of Prince Edward Island, Canada

As we all know, relationships are an integral part of our day to day lives, affecting us emotionally, psychologically, spiritually, and physiologically. With her new book “Close Relationships”, Pamela Regan sets out to demonstrate just how multidisciplinary and multifaceted the study of close relationships actually is. She does so initially by drawing on theories, methodologies, and empirical findings from such diverse areas as psychology, communication, sociology, anthropology, social work, marriage and family studies, counselling and the health sciences. She uses these approaches to discuss a wide variety of relationship experiences such as family, friend and romantic relationships, lifespan issues, relationship types (e.g., heterosexual, homosexual, casual, dating, cohabiting, marriage), and the more recent issues involved in beginning and conducting relationships online. This is a great deal of material to cover in just 387 pages but Regan does so in a manner that undergraduates, graduates, and the general public will find engaging and interest sparking.

Part One: Principles of Relationship Science. Chapter one opens with a discussion of basic facts and key concepts necessary to begin to understand relationship research. Many of those new to the science of relationships enter our classrooms with unfounded beliefs about the commonsense nature of relationships and are convinced that they already know everything they need to know about them. Regan wisely begins her book by, in a sense, “myth-busting”, introducing for example Fact #3: Relationship Science is not easy and Fact #4: Relationship Science is important. Chapter two follows with a discussion of the research methods most commonly used in relationship research. Chapter three dives into why we need relationships at all, focusing on the evolution of the need to belong, attachment and the importance of social interaction and social support in our everyday lives.

Part Two: Relationship Development. Chapter four provides the standard overview of issues of attraction. Chapter five dives into more uncharted territory by expanding the realm of relationship initiation into a discussion of flirting (including cyber-flirting), first dates, and relationship intensification leading to increased commitment between the partners. Chapter six picks up at the point where a relationship has been established and the partners are working to develop it into something more meaningful. A thorough discussion of theories of relationship development follows including filter theory, the wheel theory of love, and the premarital dyadic formation model of development. Self-disclosure, social exchange principles and interdependence round out this section. Chapter seven moves even further into the relationship cycle to address mate selection and marriage. Of particular interest in this chapter is the discussion of different types of marriages (e.g., free choice, arranged, traditional, egalitarian) as well as alternatives to marriage (e.g., cohabitation, same sex partnerships).

Part Three: Relationship Processes. This section of the text addresses the relationship processes that shape people’s relational experiences and ultimately their outcomes. For example, Chapter eight deals with thinking and feeling, including issues such as positive illusion, implicit relationship theories and affect. Chapter nine focuses on communication and social support, including sex and culture differences

in the desire for and acceptance of in-depth communication and support. Chapter ten attempts to answer the question “What is love?” by introducing Different types and typologies of love (i.e., Triangular theory, Colors of love, prototypes). A new and interesting addition to the scientific study of relationships, the neurochemistry of love is also discussed briefly. Chapter eleven moves from the heart to the bedroom to discuss sex. Several areas of interest are discussed briefly including attitudes, attraction, first sexual encounter, frequency, satisfaction, communication, and the impact of sex on relational satisfaction.

Part Four: Relationship Challenges. The dark side of relationships pokes its head out in part four beginning with Chapter twelve on rejection and betrayal. Four main areas of interest are addressed in this chapter: unrequited love, sexual disinterest, relational stalking, and infidelity. Chapter thirteen, on aggression and violence, details such diverse issues as physical aggression, coercive control, sexual aggression in romantic relationships as well as peer aggression and bullying in the workplace/school. There is an upside to this section however as Chapters fourteen and fifteen discuss how to deal with conflict and loss positively and the types of interventions available to those who wish to make a dysfunctional relationship healthy and viable again. This section will also provide insight into the types of intervention possibilities for those who are considering a career in counselling, social work or marital/family therapy.

From a pedagogical perspective, Regan has done an excellent job of writing an accessible textbook that is an enjoyable read. The examples used throughout are well-chosen and relevant to today’s reader. In particular though, the exploration exercises make a wonderful homework assignment, small group work project, in-class exercise, or exam question allowing students to apply what they have learned to real life experiences. An additional benefit to this book is its interdisciplinary nature which serves to enrich the information provided and introduce students to other ways of looking at close relationships that they may not have considered before.

This engaging text would do well as a primary text in an undergraduate or graduate level class, or as an interesting read for the layperson with a desire to

further understand the complexities of our everyday relationships. Because of its interdisciplinary nature, this text would be at home in courses across the academic spectrum from psychology to communication to sociology to anthropology to marriage and family studies. It certainly is a welcome addition to my own bookshelf.

JOURNALS UPDATE

Editor’s Report on *Personal Relationships*

by Lorne Campbell
University of Western Ontario,
Canada

In this report I want to discuss the special issue that will be published in June 2011, the implementation of early view at PR, and provide some basic statistics for the journal.

Special Issue

In 2009 Dr. Timothy Loving sent out a call for manuscripts for a special issue of PR focusing on the mind-body connection in personal relationships. The goal of this special issue was to compile a set of articles that represent cutting-edge approaches to understanding how the mind and body are connected within the context of personal relationships. I am happy to report that we achieved this goal, and that the special issue will appear in print in June 2011. It contains eight manuscripts presenting research demonstrating novel links between relationship and physiological processes. The table of contents for the special issue appears below. I want to thank Dr. Loving for his wonderful work on the special issue, the authors for considering PR as an outlet for their research, and of course to the reviewers who provided invaluable assistance to the editorial team.

Early View

Personal Relationships is now part of the EarlyView service, meaning that articles are now published on a regular basis online in advance of their appearance in a print issue. These articles are fully peer reviewed, edited, and complete—they only lack page numbers and volume/issue details—and are considered fully published from the date they first appear online. I want to thank my editorial assistant Rachel Harvey, as well Bethany Butzer who worked with Rachel for a temporary period, for their excellent work in clearing the backlog of accepted articles so that they could be published via EarlyView. We are now targeting our efforts at reducing the amount of time between publication online and in print.

Basic Statistics for the Journal

Our editorial team began receiving manuscripts on June 1, 2008, and to date we have received a total of 579 original submissions. In our first full year we received 171 original submissions, and in our second full year we received 224 original submissions. At the time of writing (April 6, 2011), we have so far received a total of 184 original submissions since June 1, 2010. With close to two months remaining until the end of our third year receiving submissions, we are on track to process over 200 original submissions for our second straight year. PR continues to be a popular outlet for research on close relationships.

Of the 579 manuscripts submitted to PR since 2008, we have made final decisions on 522 manuscripts. A total of 111 manuscripts have been accepted for publication, meaning that our acceptance rate is currently 21% (the acceptance rate has held fairly steady since our editorial team began processing manuscripts). In terms of diversity of authorship, 62.7% of all original submissions since June 1, 2008 have come from scholars based in the United States. We have received submissions from 33 different countries, and it is encouraging that we continue to receive submissions representing a wide range of countries and cultures. Interestingly, 63% of all manuscripts accepted for publication to date are from scholars based in the United States, a percentage that is identical to the proportion of US based scholars submitting their work to PR.

Overall, our editorial team continues to efficiently process manuscripts. The average number of days

from submission to first decision for submitted manuscripts is 76 days (between 2 and 3 months). The average reviewer turnaround time is 31 days for original manuscripts, and 30 days for revised manuscripts. Lastly, the average number of days from submission to our team making a final decision on manuscripts is 94 days. Thank you to everyone that has assisted with the submission/review process!

I am pleased with the efficiency of the editorial team at PR, but I want to acknowledge that the average times noted above do not reflect every authors experience with their submissions. In some instances the time to first decision is longer than we would like for a number of reasons. Our team handles a large number of submissions each year, and we always strive to provide feedback to every submitting author in a timely manner.

Tentative Contents of Upcoming Journals

Journal of Social and Personal Relationships *May 2011 [Volume 28 #3]* *Table of Contents*

LORA E. PARK, JORDAN D. TROISI, & JON K. MANER

Egoistic versus altruistic concerns in communal relationships

SARA DOCAN-MORGAN

“They don’t know what it’s like to be in my shoes”: Topic avoidance about race in transracially adoptive families

LAURA E. VANDERDRIFT, GARY W. LEWANDOWSKI JR, & CHRISTOPHER R. AGNEW

Reduced self-expansion in current romance and interest in relationship alternatives

MENELAOS APOSTOLOU

Inheritance as an instrument of parental control over mating

JEFFREY A. HALL

Is it something I said? Sense of humor and partner embarrassment

RODRIGO BRITO, SVEN WALDZUS, MACIEJ SEKERDEJ, & THOMAS SCHUBERT

The contexts and structures of relating to others: How memberships in different types of groups shape the construction of interpersonal relationships

LAUREN A. LEE, DAVID A. SBARRA, ASHLEY E. MASON, & RITA W. LAW

Attachment Anxiety, Verbal Immediacy, and Blood Pressure: Results from a Laboratory-Analogue Study Following Marital Separation

KATHRYN P. BROOKS, THEODORE F. ROBLES, & CHRISTINE DUNKEL SCHETTER

Adult Attachment and Cortisol Responses to Discussions with a Romantic Partner

Personal Relationships
June 2011 [Volume 18 #2]
Special Issue – Mind-Body Connections]
Table of Contents

TIMOTHY J. LOVING & LORNE CAMPBELL
Mind-Body Connections in Personal Relationships: What Close Relationships Researchers Have to Offer

KATHLEEN A. LAWLER-ROW, LAURA HYATT-EDWARDS, & KARL L. WUENSCH
Forgiveness and Health: The Role of Attachment

LIISA KELTIKANGAS-JÄRVINEN, PÄIVI MERJONEN, LAURA PULKKI-RÅBACK, JARI LIPANEN, TERHO LEHTIMÄKI, RIIKKA RONTU, JORMA VIKARI, & MIRKA HINTSANEN

Development of Adulthood Hostile Attitudes: Childhood Environment and Serotonin Receptor Gene Interactions

JENNIFER S. PRIEM & DENISE HAUNANI SOLOMON

Relational Uncertainty and Cortisol Responses to Hurtful and Supportive Messages from a Dating Partner

SARAH A. NOVAK & GREGORY D. WEBSTER
Spousal Social Control During a Weight Loss Attempt: A Daily Diary Study

CAROL L. WILSON & MOLLIE A. RUBEN
A Pain in Her Arm: Romantic Attachment Orientations and the Tourniquet Task

ANGELA M. HICKS & LISA DIAMOND
Don't go to Bed Angry: Attachment, Conflict, and Affective and Physiological Reactivity

ANNOUNCEMENTS

SAVE THE DATES!!!
CONFERENCE ANNOUNCEMENTS

**2011 IARR Mini-Conference:
Relationships - Development,
Maintenance and Dissolution**

7-9 July 2011 Gdańsk, Poland

The *International Association for Relationship Research and Faculty of Social Sciences University of Gdańsk* invite you to submit proposals for symposia, presentations, and posters for the mini-conference on Relationships – Development, Maintenance, and Dissolution.

Keynote speakers include Gail S. Goodman, Jacki Fitzpatrick, Mario Mikulincer, and Phillip R. Shaver.

For details, visit www.iarrgdansk2011.ug.edu.pl or email iarrconference@ug.edu.pl.

2011 IARR Mini-Conference: Health, Emotion, and Relationships

20-22 October 2011, University of Arizona

The next *International Association for Relationship Research* Mini-Conference will be held on October 20-22, 2011, at the University of Arizona on the theme of "Health, Emotion, and Relationships (HER)."

This conference will highlight research that focuses on the intersections/boundaries of health psychology, affective science, and relationship research. We have a great line-up of invited speakers, including Burt Uchino, Mark Whisman, and Linda Luecken.

The conference will also include a New Scholar's Workshop and a workshop on Methods for Analyzing Relationship Data.

Stay tuned – a call for paper/poster submissions will be announced early in 2011.

The URL is

<http://sfcs.cals.arizona.edu/iarr/home>

Program Committee:

Emily Butler, eabutler@u.arizona.edu

David Sbarra

Matthias Mehl

Noel Card

Ashley Randall

2012 IARR Conference

12-16 July 2012, Chicago, Illinois

We are pleased to announce that the 2012 Conference of the International Association for Relationship Research will be held July 12-16, 2012, in beautiful Chicago, Illinois! Learn, share, network, and explore with your peers in a world class city.

The Conference will take place at two locations conveniently located in downtown Chicago, the historic Palmer House Hilton and DePaul University's Loop campus. The Palmer House

Hilton is a landmark hotel easily accessible to public transportation and near numerous restaurants and tourist attractions. The hotel is only a 3 minute walk from the DePaul Loop Campus.

Getting to the conference will be very convenient from anywhere in the world. Chicago is a hub for several airlines, and the city is served by two international airports, O'Hare and Midway. The airports are both connected to train lines that stop within a minute walk of the conference venues. For those who would prefer not to fly, Chicago is easily drivable from many parts of the country, and is a major hub for Amtrak.

In addition to the exciting scholarship that will be showcased at the conference, there will be downtime to relax and renew. During those times, there are many options to see the city while catching up with old or new friends. The conference locations are an easy walk to the Chicago Art Institute, Grant Park, Lake Michigan, the Chicago River, Millennium Park, Sears (Willis) Tower, Shedd Aquarium, and the Field Museum. The Magnificent Mile, Chicago's premier downtown shopping district, is a 5 minute cab ride away from the conference locations. For baseball fans, the Cub's Wrigley Field and the White Sox's U.S. Cellular Field are both easily accessible from the El train that is located in front of the conference hotel. In addition to the museums, parks, sporting venues, and shops, there are many nearby dining options, theaters, comedy clubs and live music venues.

Conference submissions will be accepted for review November 1st through December 15th, 2011. Notification of the status of program submissions will begin on February 15th, 2012.

We are excited to have you join us in Chicago for the 2012 IARR Conference. It promises to be an intellectually and culturally rich experience for all who attend.

Leah E. Bryant, Chair, Local Arrangement Committee

Sue Sprecher, Chair, Local Arrangement Committee

Ralph Erber, Chair, Local Arrangement Committee

Lesley Verhofstadt, IARR 2012 Program Planner

Sandra Metts, IARR 2012 Program Planner

Update to CFP - ECREA 2011 Interpersonal Communication and Social Interaction Conference

**8-9 September 2011,
Belfast, Northern Ireland**

The 2011 Interpersonal Communication and Social Interaction (ICSI) Section Conference of the European Communication Research and Education Association (ECREA) will be hosted by the School of Communication, University of Ulster. It will take place in Belfast, Northern Ireland, from 8-9 Sept 2011.

The aim of the conference is to draw together scholars and practitioners from a variety of disciplines working in the field of interpersonal communication and social interaction.

Following requests, particularly from young scholars, we have now introduced a 'Posters' section at the Conference. In addition, YECREA have organised a special 'Young Scholars Workshop' as part of the Conference.

As a result of the introduction these new sessions, the deadline for submission of Posters and Papers has been extended until 30 April 2011.

Full details of both of these new developments can be found on the Conference website:
<http://www.socsci.ulster.ac.uk/comms/ecrea/>



International Association for Relationship Research

CALL FOR PROPOSALS

Call for Proposals 2013 Mini- Conferences

The Future Conferences Committee (FCC) of the International Association for Relationship Research (IARR) invites proposals to a host regional, thematic, or graduate student / new professional

conference to be held in 2013. The deadline for submission is **November 1, 2011**.

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

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

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

1. Name, title, and contact information of applicants. Include mailing address, telephone number, fax number, and e-mail address for all applicants. Designate one or more applicants to serve as the Local Arrangements Chair or Co-Chairs. (In the case of a single Local Arrangements Chair, designate a second applicant willing to take charge if the Local Arrangements chair is unable to fulfill his or her duties.)
2. Theme. Explicate the theme of the conference. Discuss how the theme fits into the mission of IARR.
3. Site. Include city, state or province, and country. Specify the physical site of the conference, such as a university campus or a conference center. Provide a brief description of the ambience and amenities of the site. Describe the transportation options for traveling between the local airport and the site.
4. Proposed dates.
5. Projected number of attendees.
6. Any possible co-sponsors. Estimate their degree of financial involvement.

7. Major venues. Include descriptions of the following:
 - a. Meeting places, including rooms for plenary sessions and paper sessions.
 - b. Eating facilities, including cafeterias, banquet halls, and restaurants in the vicinity.
 - c. Lodging facilities, including local hotels, dormitories, and on-site housing. Describe any low-cost housing options.
8. Any stipends offered to invited speakers and / or students.
9. Projected costs of travel and lodging. Provide current airfares from gateway cities around the world (i.e., Beijing, Sydney, Chicago, Montreal, Buenos Aires, London, and Cairo). Estimate lodging costs for participants. Describe any low-cost housing options.
10. Projected registration fee. The fee structure should include (a) a rate for members of IARR; (b) a rate for non-members of IARR; (c) a rate for graduate students; and (d) a rate for participants from underrepresented countries (based on World Bank classifications).
11. Projected budget. Complete and attach the *Mini-Conferences Budget Form* available on the IARR website (www.iarr.org). Estimate revenue (from registration fees, co-sponsors, etc.) and costs (for venue, meals, equipment rentals, conference program, speaker honorariums, etc.). Provide both overall and itemized estimates of revenues and costs.
12. Projected Sponsorship. Report the money and services that your school, local business community, and others will provide to defray the cost of the conference

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



Call for Proposals 2014 Conference

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

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

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

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

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

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

2. Site. Include city, state or province, and country. Specify the physical site of the conference, such as a university campus or a conference center. Provide a brief description of the ambience and amenities of the site. Describe the transportation options for traveling between the local airport and the site.
3. Proposed dates. Specify the proposed dates of the event. The conference is usually held during a 4-5 day period in July, which is a reasonably convenient time for most IARR members.
4. Proposed schedule. Provide a preliminary outline of the conference schedule. Include time for lunches, dinners, coffee breaks, approximately six plenary sessions (90 minutes in length), and approximately eight paper / poster sessions (90 minutes in length). (Note: The Local Arrangements Chair(s) will work closely with the program planner on the final schedule to accommodate the number of submissions accepted for presentation.)
5. Major venues. Include descriptions of the following:
 - a. Meeting places, including (a) auditoriums for plenary sessions; (b) a central area for breaks between sessions; (c) large rooms for symposia, book exhibits, registration, and poster sessions (with the capacity to house at least 70 posters); and (d) smaller rooms for paper sessions and interest groups.
 - b. Presentation equipment, including access to (a) overhead projectors; (b) computers for power point presentations; (c) computer projectors for power point presentations; and (d) poster stands for poster sessions.
 - c. Eating facilities, including cafeterias, dining rooms, and banquet halls.
 - d. Lodging facilities, including local hotels, dormitories, and on-site housing. Describe any low-cost housing options.
6. Hospitality. Describe plans for lunches, dinners, and coffee breaks. Traditionally, all lunches and at least two dinners are served in community to encourage interaction among attendees. One coffee break in the morning and one coffee break in the afternoon (with beverages and light snacks) also should be included in the registration fee.
7. Awards dinner. Include plans for an awards dinner with a social event (typically a dance) afterwards. The awards dinner can be included in the registration fee or available at an additional cost.
8. Optional excursion. Describe plans for an optional excursion (if desired). This excursion should not be included as part of the registration fee.
9. Projected costs of travel and lodging. Provide current airfares from gateway cities around the world (i.e., Beijing, Sydney, Chicago, Montreal, Buenos Aires, London, and Cairo). Estimate lodging costs for participants (for both regular and low-cost housing options).
10. Projected registration fee. The fee structure should include (a) a rate for members of IARR; (b) a rate for non-members of IARR; (c) a rate for graduate students; and (d) a rate for participants from underrepresented countries (based on World Bank classifications).
11. Projected budget. Complete and attach the *Main Conference Budget Form* available on the IARR website (www.iarr.org). Estimate revenue (from registration fees, co-sponsors, etc.) and costs (for venue, meals, equipment rentals, conference program, speaker honorariums, etc.). Provide both overall and itemized estimates of revenues and costs.

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

MEMBER NEWS & UPDATES

In Memory of Brant Burleson

Brant Burleson, Professor of Communication and Affiliate Professor of Psychological Sciences at Purdue University, passed away at home on December 10, 2010 after battling cancer. With him that day were his wife and colleague, Erina MacGeorge, their children Jesalyn and Carson, and other family members and friends.

Brant was born in Boise, Idaho on December 9, 1952. He grew up in Boulder, Colorado, graduating from Fairview High School in 1971. He graduated Summa cum Laude with a B.A. in Communication from the University of Colorado, Boulder in 1975. He then earned an M.A. (1977) and Ph.D. (1982) in Communication from the University of Illinois. After spending two years on the faculty at SUNY Albany, Brant came to Purdue University in 1980, where he then remained for 30 years.

Brant was a prolific scholar who published more than 150 peer-reviewed articles and chapters in scholarly books; he also edited five scholarly volumes including the *Handbook of Communication and Social Interaction Skills* (with John Greene) and *The Communication of Social Support* (with Terrance Albrecht and Irwin Sarason). Along with his mentor Jesse Delia, Brant was an early proponent of the "constructivist" perspective which focused on explaining individual and developmental differences in communication skills; this work provided the foundation for his three-decade program of research on person-centered forms of emotional support. Brant became a leading authority among relationship scientists on the communication of social support. His research convincingly demonstrated that some forms of emotional support are more effective than others at relieving distress and facilitating coping. The effectiveness of the support we provide and receive in turn influences the quality of our personal relationships, physical health, and psychological well-being.

Across his career, Brant received numerous awards in recognition for his scholarship and his role in mentoring young scholars. He was recipient of Berscheid-Hatfield Award for Distinguished Mid-Career Achievement in Personal Relationships Research (from what was then INPR) as well as the M. L. Knapp Award for career contributions the study of interpersonal communication (from the National Communication Association). He was elected a fellow of the International Communication Association as well as a distinguished scholar of the National Communication Association. In 2008, Brant was one of only two faculty members from across Purdue University to receive the Provost's "Graduate Student Mentor Award," and in 2009 the International Communication Association recognized him with its B. Aubrey Fisher Mentorship Award. Brant was especially proud of these latter two awards as they recognized his work with graduate students. Brant directed 20 Ph.D. dissertations (including my own) during his years at Purdue and co-authored with and helped launch the professional careers of many more students.

I had the privilege this past November of being part of a panel where Brant was honored for receiving a major career award. Although he was too ill to attend the conference in person, Brant spoke to those attending the panel via Skype about the incredible joy he experienced in studying communication that occurs in personal relationships, and working within the network of relationships we call our "academic community." Seeing the passion with which he spoke and the connection he felt with many people in that room was very moving. Like many of you, I will remember Brant as an outstanding scholar, a devoted mentor to his students, and a person who always stood by his convictions.

**Steven R. Wilson, Professor
Department of Communication
Purdue University**

New Book Announcement

Close Relationships (2011) Routledge Academic By: Pamela Regan

This multidisciplinary text introduces the concepts, methodologies, theories, and empirical findings of the field of interpersonal relationships. Information is drawn from psychology, communication, family studies, marriage and family therapy, social work, sociology, anthropology, the health sciences, and other disciplines. Numerous examples capture readers' attention by demonstrating how the material is relevant to their lives.

Intended as a text for courses in interpersonal/close relationships taught in psychology, communication, sociology, anthropology, human development, family studies, marriage and family therapy, and social work, practitioners interested in the latest research on personal relationships will also appreciate this engaging overview of the field.

New Book Announcement

Interdependent Minds The Dynamics of Close Relationships (2011) Guilford Press By: Sandra L. Murray and John G. Holmes

Why do some marriages grow stronger in the face of conflict or stress while others dissolve? In this book, Murray and Holmes present a groundbreaking theory of how mutually responsive behaviors emerge—or fail to emerge—in relationships. Illustrating empirical findings through the vivid stories of four diverse couples, the authors explore how conscious considerations interact with unconscious impulses to foster trust and commitment. Compelling topics include why marriages have such different personalities and what makes partners more or less compatible. Implications of the model for helping

couples sustain satisfying relationships and improve troubled ones are discussed. This is a scholarly work written in an extremely clear and engaging style appropriate to academics and therapists and as a supplemental text for graduate and advanced undergraduate courses on relationships.

New Website Announcement

www.ScienceOfRelationships.com

We are proud to announce the launch of a new website, www.ScienceOfRelationships.com. The goal of the site is to promote the scientific study of relationships to the public by making research findings accessible to non-academics. The site features answers to questions that readers have submitted about relationships, summaries of journal articles, applications of relationship research to popular culture examples, and links to relationship research in the media.

Our site is one channel for relationship researchers to reach out to the general public, with the hopes of debunking popular (non-empirically based) myths about relationships and arming readers with sound information. In addition, the site may be useful as a teaching resource for courses in close relationships. Because our primary goal is reaching those outside of academia and our circle of researchers, we would appreciate it if you could share the link with your classes/students and other non-academics that you think may be interested.

Please stop by the site and check it out!

Ben Le, Gary Lewandowski, Tim Loving, Marci Gleason, & our esteemed team of contributors

IARR BOARD

IARR OFFICERS

President

Anita Vangelisti
a.vangelisti@mail.utexas.edu

Vice-President & President- Elect

Christopher R. Agnew
agnew@psych.purdue.edu

Past-President

Jacki Fitzpatrick
jacki.fitzpatrick@ttu.edu

Secretary & Treasurer

Brooke Feeney
bfeeney@andrew.cmu.edu

BOARD MEMBERS

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

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

Ximena Arriaga (Member-at-Large)
arriaga@psych.purdue.edu

Maria Kaźmierczak (Member-at-Large)
psymk@univ.gda.pl

Laura Miller (New Professional Representative)
lmille41@utk.edu

COMMITTEE CHAIRS

Stanley Gaines (Membership)
sogainesjr@yahoo.com

Leah Bryant (Mentoring)
lbryant2@depaul.edu

Bjarne Holmes (Media Relations)
B.M.Holmes@hw.ac.uk

William Dragon (Website)
WDragon@cornellcollege.edu

Omri Gillath (Future Conferences)
ogillath@ku.edu

João Moreira (International)
jmoreira@fpce.ul.pt

C. Raymond Knee (Awards Committee)
Knee@UH.EDU

EDITORS

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

Lorne Campbell
 (Personal Relationships)
Personal_Relationships@uncg.edu

Marian Morry
 (Relationship Research News)
marian_morry@umanitoba.ca