

# RELATIONSHIP RESEARCH NEWS

OFFICIAL NEWS JOURNAL OF THE INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR RELATIONSHIP RESEARCH

May 2012

VOL 11, NO. 1

## PRESIDENT'S COLUMN

### What a Difference a Conference Can Make

by Christopher Agnew  
Purdue University

Conferences get a bad rap these days. And for good reason. You hear stories about gaggles of statisticians holding their annual meeting in the casinos of Las Vegas (!), or politicians holding conferences with lobbyists at swank international locales far away from their constituents. It can make you wonder if a conference, ANY conference, really delivers what most people would hope it might deliver: Exposure to the most recent and exciting work being done in the field, and opportunities for greater camaraderie and collaboration with like-minded colleagues. Well, I have good news for you: The IARR Conference will single-handedly dispel any negative stereotypes you may have developed with respect to conferences. Simply put, our conferences have a long-standing and well-earned reputation of being among the very best academic gatherings around.

Our 2012 Conference in Chicago this summer will follow in this rich tradition and is fast approaching (July 12-16, 2012; for information, go to [iarr2012conference.com](http://iarr2012conference.com)). It is shaping up to be our largest conference ever, having receiving over 650 submissions for program consideration! The final program is phenomenal and the various events planned to help facilitate collegiality on various fronts are sure to delight. The member-friendly

registration rates have also helped to propel our membership numbers up 29% over last year – yes, the future of relationship research is bright and will be well represented in Chicago. That said, there is always room for one more!

For those of you who already know you will be attending, be sure to reach out to others (particularly students) who may have not yet made plans to attend, as registration is now underway. As we get closer to this much-anticipated and meticulously planned event, I thought it might be useful (particularly for our student members) to provide two key tips for getting the most out of what promises to be a truly fantastic event:

*Talk, talk, talk. And then talk some more:* It can be easy to find yourself hanging back, in absorption mode at a conference, particularly if you find you do not know too many people in attendance. This is one conference where you need to immediately drop that approach. Introduce yourself. To everyone. Throughout the weekend. You will be stunned by the number of folks who share common research interests, and by the number of professional relationships that can be formed in a short amount of time. I have very fond memories of attending my first IARR Conference (actually an ISSPR Conference, one of the predecessor organizations of IARR) following my third year in graduate school. It was held in the Netherlands (Groningen) in 1994. I met a number of our leading scholars for the first time there. I was fortunate to hear a very memorable address by Hal Kelley to boot. I remember being stunned that the “big wigs” would actually talk with me! Not only did we talk but my meetings at the conference began a number of professional relationships that continue to this day. In addition, I met a number of peers, students like myself who were seeking an academic career. Many of these peers are current friends and colleagues in the field. It can be difficult to talk, of course, particularly in

large public settings, but I urge you to do so – you won't find a more hospitable setting than our conference. And the benefits can be extraordinary.

*Sophie's Choice, over and over:* For relationship researchers the IARR Conference puts one in the constant position of having to make a proverbial "Sophie's Choice". And the burden of choice can weigh heavy. For example, this will be you thinking to yourself: "I desperately want to attend the session on relationship maintenance processes but there is also the relationships and health session at the exact same time – you mean I have to choose?" Gone is the experience of slim pickings at a conference, of biding one's time while waiting for the "good" sessions to arrive. At the IARR Conference, they are ALL good. Yes, you will feel some anxiety undoubtedly about the many juicy choices, but it is a positive anxiety, one allayed by the invariably high quality of the session you end up choosing to attend. You will feel pulled, but trust me, you can't go wrong. Go to sessions, lots of them. You will not be disappointed.

In my last column I urged you to get the word out about membership in our organization, including to students (either your own or, if you are a student now, a student colleague). I also mentioned that you should take advantage of our program to offer gift memberships to our next generation of relationship scholars (go to [iarr.org/Membership](http://iarr.org/Membership) for details). I direct a similar message to you now with respect to our conferences: Attend! Bring others! Talk! Make professional contacts that will last your whole career! And experience the exquisite burden of having to choose among research offerings almost too good to be true.

Let me close by offering my sincere thanks to all those who have helped serve the Association in recent years, particularly this last one when I have had the privilege to serve as President. Brooke Feeney has done a superb job working on the various nuts and bolts of our Association. As she concludes her 3-year term as Secretary-Treasurer, we all owe her a debt of gratitude. I am guessing that most members have little sense of the huge amount of time invested "behind the scenes," including the literally hundreds of hours that go into planning each of our conferences. From site selection (thank you, Omri Gillath) and program planning (can't thank

Sandra Metts and Lesley Verhofstadt enough) to onsite local organizing (Leah Bryant, Susan Sprecher, and Ralph Erber have been simply tireless in their efforts), again and again I have been dumbstruck witnessing true altruism at work. We have a phenomenally helpful membership. The armchair psychologist would venture to say that those who study relationships tend to really care about other people. Sure makes for a wonderfully supportive environment, and for an association that should instill pride in all of us.

It has been my great honor to serve our organization as president this year. I look forward to seeing you in Chicago and beyond!

**INSIDE THIS ISSUE OF RELATIONSHIP RESEARCH NEWS**

**PRESIDENT’S COLUMN**

*What a Difference a Conference Can Make*  
by Christopher Agnew .....1

**FROM THE EDITOR’S DESK**

by Marian Morry .....4

**NEW PROFESSIONALS COLUMN**

*Thinking Outside the Classroom: Getting our Students Ready for the World*  
by Laura Miller ..... 5

**FEATURE ARTICLES**

*Classroom Horror Stories: IARR Members Share Their Experiences*  
by Leah Bryant ..... 6  
*Navigating the Route to Publication*  
by Colleen Sinclair ..... 12

**HUMOR COLUMN**

*“There’s an App for That”*  
by David Kenny ..... 19

**BOOK REVIEWS**

*Romantic Relationships in Emerging Adulthood*  
Reviewed by Steve Graham & Sam Hunley .21

**JOURNALS UPDATE**

*PR Report*  
by Lorne Campbell..... 23  
*Tentative Contents of Upcoming Journals.....* 24

**ANNOUNCEMENTS ..... 25**

*IARR Publications Committee Seeks Nominations for Editor of Relationship Research News*  
*Dyadic Data Analysis Workshop Michigan State University*

**IARR BOARD..... 27**

**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 deadlines for final copy are October 1 and April 1. Inquiries regarding Feature Articles are welcome at any time.

## FROM THE EDITOR'S DESK

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

I begin my comments in this issue with two housekeeping items that have been addressed in the last few months. First, to reflect the international membership of our readers, RRN has changed the numbering and naming of the newsletters. Beginning with this issue, the first newsletter of the year will be published in May and numbered Vol. 11, No. 1. The second newsletter of the year will be published in November and numbered Vol. 11, No. 2. In addition, we will no longer refer to these newsletters as Spring and Fall but rather as the May and November issues.

Second, a number of IARR members did not receive the Fall 2011 edition of RRN. As the Editor of the newsletter, I sent an email to all IARR members to determine who was missing their copy and had the publisher send out a new copy. Brooke Feeney and I have been working with the publisher to resolve this mailing problem and have been assured that this should not happen again. If you are missing any copies of RRN or want to look at back issues, they are available on the website at <http://www.iarr.org/Publications/index.html>

On to this issue: Our standard columns are all here. Laura Miller discusses helping our students get ready for the outside world or how to translate what they've learned into useful work-related skills. Leah Bryant, on the other hand, has useful advice for those staying in the academic realm, and those of us who have been here awhile, on how to deal with classroom horrors. Finally, Colleen Sinclair asked a number of past and present journal Editors for their advice on how to negotiate the publishing process. Regardless of where you are in your career, this advice is insightful as well as encouraging to anyone currently feeling the sting of rejection. In many ways, perseverance is the key but you also have to know when to say enough.

Once again, Dave Kenny has found the humorous side to everyday life; in this case cell phone Apps.

This goes beyond "dinner by the cell phone light" to getting romantic advice everywhere from first encounters to dissolutions.

In our journal updates, you will see that Lorne Campbell and his editorial team are wrapping up their time with our journal *Personal Relationships*. I would like to take this opportunity to thank Lorne and his team for all of their hard work. Although we don't say it often enough your effort is greatly appreciated. Starting in June, Julie Fitness and her new editorial team will be taking over the review of new submissions. Welcome aboard.

We have two announcements in this newsletter. The first is for editor of this newsletter. Hard to believe but the October edition will be the last one for myself and my Associate Editors. The second announcement is for a dyadic data analysis workshop by Deborah Kashy and Robert Ackerman. This workshop will be held in July 2012 at Michigan State University.

In closing, I would like to thank the contributors to each of our feature columns for their advice, experience, and words of wisdom. It is through this process that we help develop our colleagues of tomorrow.

Hope to see you in Chicago!

---

**Submission deadline for the  
Next issue of RRN**

**October 1, 2012**

**Submit all materials  
to Marian Morry**

**[Marian\\_Morry@umanitoba.ca](mailto:Marian_Morry@umanitoba.ca)**

## **Thinking Outside the Classroom: Getting our Students Ready for the World**

**by Laura Miller  
New Professional Representative  
University of Tennessee - Knoxville**

Upon returning from a faculty-led trip to Washington D.C., a student recently remarked, "I had no idea how many possibilities were out there." Her comment struck me as surprising; however, I later learned it was her very first off-campus networking opportunity. Had she not attended the trip, she would have missed the chance to gain hands-on experience, build a professional network, and learn more about potential career paths. Many students, however, are unable to participate in such trips, but still need to polish these skills before entering the 'real world.' How might we adequately prepare students academically, professionally, and personally for life after college? One strategy is incorporating service learning projects in the college classroom. Benefits of service learning for both students and faculty are outlined in the next section.

Service learning combines formal instruction with related service in the community. The goal of service learning is to enhance understanding of course topics through hands-on experience, focusing on critical, reflective thinking. Teaching students through experience can leave a lasting impression and will broaden students' perspectives on career, networking, and public service possibilities; consequently stretching students to think outside their comfort zones in ways that cannot be accomplished in the classroom. By doing so, students will quickly realize that what is going on in the classroom and what is going on in the real world are not so detached as they begin to understand, see, and experience the connections.

Encouraging students to make a difference in the community, of course, relates to our study of communication and relationships as international scholars. Relevant service learning projects are endless, but will likely vary depending on the specific course goals and foci. Courses tailored to individuals' communicative patterns and preferences

may benefit from projects urging students to observe such processes in nontraditional settings. Volunteering at a homeless shelter, for example, may be a unique context in which to study relational development, disclosure, and conflict. Instructors wishing to emphasize cultural differences in relationships may encourage students to participate in community or campus cultural events, such as festivals, international dinners, or tutoring students in English as a second language. Through such experiences, students will learn more about the world, while applying relational concepts such as power, proxemics, and privacy to real-life cultural encounters. Courses focusing on health communication might assign community service in walk-in health clinics. Through their service, students will not only help countless patients and families, they will broaden their perspectives on the health care system, health literacy levels, and real-life patient interactions. Such assignments will facilitate application of course materials to everyday settings and will augment relevant class discussion based on students' experiences.

Not only can service learning enhance student growth, faculty can benefit personally and professionally from integrating service learning into courses. First, service learning promotes interactive teaching methods and reciprocal learning between students and faculty; hence, it offers the unique opportunity to learn from our students outside of the classroom setting. Moreover, through such community engagement, faculty also may discover new avenues for research and publication. Fostering relationships with community partners can open up doors for future research and collaboration that may have otherwise been overlooked. Lastly, engaging in different teaching styles will help keep the classroom experience exciting, fun, and rewarding for instructors, making the same exact course unique each semester.

By incorporating service learning projects, we are not only broadening students' perspectives on the community around them, we are getting them ready for the relationships, interactions, and experiences they will have after college. While students may be hesitant to reach beyond their comfort zones, many will learn, grow, and develop a stronger sense of curiosity, critical thinking, and public awareness as a result. Whether it be through travel opportunities,

service learning projects, or some other means, I challenge all new professionals to inspire creativity, exploration, and thinking outside the classroom and help get our students ready for the world!

---

## **Classroom Horror Stories: IARR Members Share Their Experiences**

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

When thinking about how to engage the readers of *Relationship Research News*, some ideas were presented to Marian Morry, the editor, and it was agreed that problematic teaching situations would capture the interest of IARR members. The next task was to figure out how to approach an article of this nature. This is what I asked some of our colleagues:

I am writing an article for "Relationship Research News," the newsletter for IARR, inspired by a panel that Nancy Brule put together for Central States Communication Association a couple of years ago about a difficult or challenging situation we encountered in the classroom. I would like to include your experience. Would you please email me a narrative account of something troublesome, difficult, strange, etc. that happened in class (or involving a student/s) and how you handled it? Just an informal email to me is fine. My vision is to put these stories together to address the kind of issues we, as relational scholars, encounter and how we handle them. My hope is that it will be 1 part humor, 1 part horror, and 2 parts educational. :) All contributors will be acknowledged collectively, to provide some anonymity for the sake of the student(s) involved.

Approximately half of the individuals who were asked provided a response. Most of the others indicated that they would need to think about which incident they should write about, implying there were many.

There is a voluminous amount of literature that provides great insight into effective instruction from

a variety of IARR's own affiliate disciplinary areas (e.g., educational psychology, instructional communication, etc.). But, that is not the goal of this column. Rather than focusing on strategies for becoming a better teacher, instead the focus will be on those memorable moments when no matter what we do, horror ensues and the strategies used, for better or worse, to cope with these situations.

As explained in the email that solicited contributions to this article, the names of the contributors will not be linked to their horror story, to preserve the anonymity (dignity, really) of the student(s) involved. Please enjoy the candor, honesty, and insight of Nancy Brule, John Caughlin, Lisa Diamond, C. Raymond (Chip) Knee, Pam Lannutti, Jimmie Manning, Marian M. Morry, and me, as we highlight some of the more difficult moments of our teaching careers.

### **Classroom Horror Stories**

#### **"Sex, Lies (about child pornography), and the National Guard"**

Once, when teaching about relational trust, I showed a clip from a movie where the friend of a couple is babysitting and begins to reward a child with candy and sugary cereal. Then, the clip alludes that the babysitter is going to sexually abuse the child. Afterwards, I facilitated a class discussion where we talked about how oftentimes sexual abuse happens in situations with someone we trust, not with an anonymous stranger.

Well, a student became really upset by this idea and said that I and other students were blaming the parents in the situation. I tried to assure her that was not my intent.

After class, the student approached me and said, "Just so you know, I'm a member of the National Guard. And I know where you live."

I stood there for a moment and caught my bearings before responding, "I'm not sure what you're getting at."

"I can cause trouble for you. In fact, I think I'll make a visit to some of the conservative groups in town

and tell them that you're showing child pornography in class."

"But I'm not doing that," I responded.

"I know that. But they don't," she said. And she left the room, walking out while looking at me.

Needless to say, I reported her to my chair. The university offered her a refund for the class and told her that she shouldn't attend again.

Fortunately, to this day, no one has visited my house and no "conservative groups" have raised any complaints. Even more fortunately, my administration and the other students in the class had my back.

### **“Love in a Large Lecture Classroom: A Teaching Horror Story”**

I teach an Introduction to Interpersonal Communication course that has 125 to 150 students registered per semester...but that isn't the strangest or most horrible part of this story. The strangest and most horrible part of this story has to do with lust, love and loss...lust, love, and loss that I and 124 other innocent victims were forced to witness. Here's what happened:

It was the Spring semester and my Intro to IP course had 125 students. It is a large lecture course taught in a stadium seating classroom. A few weeks into the class, I notice that about half of the room were staring at the right side of one of the front rows of class during my lecture. I look over to find two students, a man and woman, gazing into each others' eyes and holding hands. I was perplexed, but unsure of what to say, so I kept on teaching. It happened again the next day and the next. After about a week of this, I approached the love birds before class started and asked, while smiling, how they were able to take notes and hold hands at the same time. They just looked sheepish in response. I thought this light-hearted approach would get the message (Knock it off!) to them in a friendly way. And it did...for about 2 weeks.

Then, one day I look over to that side of the classroom to see our love birds kissing. Yes,

kissing. Not in a peck-on-the cheek way...but in a way my TA described as "going at it." I was shocked. I froze. And stared at them...which of course made the rest of the class look to see what I was staring at. After what seemed like at least 5 full minutes of making out, the love birds stopped and looked up to find me and everyone else staring at them. At that point I just moved on to teaching. When I got back to my office, I sent the love birds an email explaining how their behavior was inappropriate and should not take place in my classroom again. I got no reply from either of them, but in the next class there was no PDA...or in any classes following. I thought we were done being disrupted by these two. But, I was wrong.

About 4 weeks before the end of the semester, I was lecturing about relational termination. I looked over to see that the female love bird was crying. She kept crying, but I didn't know what to do because there are 125 people in the room and I don't want to stop lecturing to talk to her and draw attention to her that may be uncomfortable for her. I kept lecturing, and she left the room before class was over. She did not return when class was over. The male love bird acted as if nothing happened. The next class, we were still talking about dissolution. Both love birds were there, but this time, she started crying again, got up to leave again, and whacked the male love bird with her bag and called him an "asshole" before she walked out. He said nothing. I was frozen and staring again...as is the whole class. That day, I sent them both emails demanding that they come to my office for a meeting before returning to my classroom. Only he arrived. I asked what was going on. They broke up. I explain how they simply cannot continue to disrupt my class. He says he understands. I also alerted our counseling center about her behavior and I assumed they followed-up with her. Neither student was disruptive in class again.

I know this story isn't the worst nightmare, but it was strange. And I still think about it when I teach IP. I now tell my students that along with no texting, no facebooking, and no cheating during class there is also no hooking-up or partner abuse allowed in class either.

### **“Unrequited Love in the Classroom”**

We've probably all been in the position of being romantically interested in someone only to discover that they don't share that interest. Unrequited love is both common and complex (Baumeister & Wotman, 1992). Research has shown that this so called one-sided love can bring discomfort to both the interested and disinterested parties. Normally, one would think there has to be some sort of "relationship" for this to develop. Just how one-sided can unrequited love get? Well, allow me to share the story of a student who repeatedly kept signing up for my classes.

It almost didn't matter what the topic was – this student would find a way to make it relevant, I guess. "Whatever," right? Who doesn't want their courses to be popular and draw students from diverse areas of the university?!? Then one day she requested an appointment. I ask her what it concerned. She said "I have a situation that has arisen that I need your input on." Hmmm, the longer I teach, the more I've gotten used to giving polite, caring, but quick referrals to the counseling center so that I don't get personally involved in students' private lives. I tried to refer her this way, so she emphasized that it was something that was academic as well as personal and that only my opinion mattered.

So here we go...As soon as she entered my office, I got goose bumps. She tried to shut the door (my policy is open door anytime anyone is in my office). And there she sat, for several minutes, explaining how she was married, but that he couldn't have children, and she needed to know if I ever would be, could ever be, interested in her. And if so, she would divorce her husband and stop taking classes to make it appropriate...and then she and I could eventually get married. HUH!?!

When I realized that I was probably going to survive the ongoing heart attack, I picked my tongue up off the floor, and tried to think of the easiest, gentlest way to address all of this without picking up the phone and calling security. She eventually left, feeling a bit sheepish, I'm sure, but also probably relieved that she had shared her real feelings. What guided my response? Three important things. (1) Acknowledge her feelings as real, (2) provide a rationale for the rejection, (3) use supportive and

non-judgmental language instead of controlling, demanding language. And then I immediately bolted down the hall, tripping over things, to inform the appropriate department and security personnel in case there was more to her situation than might have appeared!

### **“Come Hell or High Water, Nothing Will Stop Me From Teaching!”**

The first semester I taught my own class, I was in a basement (garden level) classroom. Early in the semester a thunderstorm with heavy rains came up during class, and my students all stopped to look then started whining that I should cancel class. My response was something along the lines of "Are you kidding me? Do you know, I walked through blizzards to get to class?! And you think we should cancel class because it's a little wet outside? What are you going to do if we cancel class--it's not like you want to go outside in that. If we were talking a flood, then you could talk to me about canceling class, but a rainstorm. Sheesh." Not two minutes later, a giant wave of water dropped from the ducts above the classroom onto the students' desks, splattering everywhere. The students didn't say a word and just looked at me like I caused that. "OK, class is canceled," I said. The water eventually reached about 4.5 feet high. (Or, in the metric system, that's way too high for teaching.)

### **“Coping With Negative Student Interactions”**

We've all been there. Sometimes interactions with a particular student go wrong from day one, other times we think things are going well and then something happens that takes us by surprise. I have encountered both types of problems over the last 15 years. One particular interaction though stands out vividly as it not only involved me and the student, but also modern technology (a university class email list) and an email to the entire class.

A few years ago, I had a very negative interaction with a young woman, whom I'll call Amy, who wrote her exams at our accessibility services office. Because Amy did not write the exam in class with the rest of the students she was not able to ask questions if she did not understand an item. During

the term this didn't seem to be a problem, or at least she never brought up any issues with me and in our class room interactions Amy always seemed very pleasant and keenly interested in the course.

Then came the last exam. About two hours after the class finished the exam, Amy used the class email function to send an email to everyone about unhappy she was with the exam. To quote her *"Hi everyone, I was just curious how many of you felt that this last exam had quite a few questions on it that you've never seen before? Or that made absolutely no sense to you? I'm writing this to everyone because before I can send a message to our professor or the dean if need be I need to know if more than the 4 people I talked to feel the same way). If you could all please get back to me I'd appreciate it."* (All omissions/errors were in her email.) I don't think she realized that I also receive these emails.

To be honest my first reactions were quite negative. Rather than approaching me directly, she was explicitly telling the class that my exams were unfair and nonsensical verging on slandering my reputation, she was trying to garner social support—implying she would use this to “bully me to change the exam or grades,” and, finally, she was threatening to “go to the Dean” about my exam. I decided that the best thing to do was (a) not react immediately, and then to (b) indicate she may want to wait until she sees her grade before appealing, and (c) explain the university policy about appealing an exam – speak to the professor first, then submit an appeal to the department, then appeal to the faculty. When I did respond, I also indicated I would be happy to meet with her at any time, although we should wait until we had her exam back.

Our meeting was also confrontational. Amy entered demanding that I drop 3 questions she felt were unfair; we hadn't even looked at the exam yet! Turns out she got all 3 correct. As she continued to argue she didn't like these questions, I indicated to her that she should not push this point because if I drop these 3 questions her grade would in fact go down. In addition, her grade on this exam was similar to her other exams.

At this point Amy indicated “I talked to other students and they also thought the exam was unfair.” This continuation of an argumentative style and

trying to imply consensus did elicit one reaction which wasn't really appropriate on my part: I told her directly that in class I only had 3 questions which were about definitions so I didn't see what her issues were about, no other student had made raised any concerns or complaints, and her trying to “bully me” by trying to get a group opinion (real or implied) and threatening to go to the Dean was inappropriate behavior for a student. I even indicated that I had never had students complain about an exam before they received the grades and I certainly never had students complain about questions they had gotten correct.

Amy responded that she wasn't trying to bully me but if others felt the same way she wanted me to change the exam or she would go to the Dean. I indicated that this was indeed an attempt to bully someone to get you want. After about 15 minutes of this back and forth, I asked her right out if she wanted me to drop the 3 questions for her and lower her grade. She declined my offer and glared at me. I then asked if she had other questions she wanted to discuss. Amy finally looked at her exam and the questions she got wrong. She only questioned two items and both were word-for-word out of the text book!

At the end of this interaction, her parting words were to the effect of “I'm still going to ask my friends if they thought the exam was unfair.” Did we resolve the issue, perhaps; no appeal was ever submitted and she never contacted me again. Was it dealt with properly; maybe. She certainly got me mad both with the email and then again with her attitude during our face-to-face meeting. Trying to deal with the issue and not the emotions was the better decision and I'm glad I focused on the facts themselves. I never responded to the class itself and no one every commented on this email. I debated about this, but to respond or comment to everyone in the class seemed inappropriate as it would put more focus on the issue and on Amy's behavior.

Did I learn anything from this negative interaction; absolutely. First, do not react immediately. I am glad that I did not react immediately to her email but rather thought about it and composed a non-confrontational response. Second, it is hard for people to look at their own behavior objectively. Amy could not see that her behavior was

inappropriate and verging on bullying and I still have a hard time deciding if my behavior in the face-to-face interaction was appropriate or not. Third, all the facts in a situation will not necessarily resolve the issue. Even with knowledge about which questions she had right and wrong, how she did relative to her other exams, and how the class did on this exam Amy did not feel better at the end of our interaction and I still felt that she was trying to bully me into changing the exam and/or her grade. Fourth, I now let the class know on day one that I see the emails they send out to everyone in the class. They should know before they write any email that I will see it. I'm not sure that this would have changed Amy's email, but I suspect she would have toned it down if she knew beforehand that I would not only see it but also would respond to it immediately.

### **“Injury, Tourette Syndrome, and Extreme Shyness”**

In my experience, every class has the possibility for disaster. The disasters are not necessarily welcomed, and certainly not enjoyed, but it is from these experiences that I have gained a bit of perspective and maintain a sense of humor in, and about, teaching. I have encountered many troubling situations but decided to share some of the highlights.

Remember when classroom televisions were mounted on the wall, dangling in corners with VCRs on a shelf below the tv set? When teaching one of my first interpersonal courses, I smacked the side of my head on the corner of the bracket. It knocked me out cold. Not to be deterred by a concussion, I powered through the rest of lecture about relational decline (Or was it? There is not much I remember about that experience, to be quite honest). But that injury pales in comparison to my colleague's. She got her rear end caught on the corner of the blackboard, ripping her pants and cutting her...er, cheek. Not to be deterred by a wardrobe malfunction and deep cut on her...er, cheek, she used a stapler to mend her pants and finished her lecture. These experiences did not prepare me for what was in store shortly after beginning my first tenure track job.

Once there was a death threat because of a disagreement about how to enforce an attendance policy in a small group class (I was pro enforcement, the student was anti enforcement – tomatoyto, tomahto). That was unfortunate and swiftly handled by the Dean of Student's Office. And thankfully it took place at the end of the quarter. Then when subbing for a colleague, I almost lost it when there were loud ape noises coming from someone in the class, and not a single student would acknowledge it. I held my tongue, and as it turned out, the noise was from a student who was unable to hold his, as he has tourette syndrome. The class adapted, so much so, that it did not even occur to anyone to inform me of the situation. The following quarter, I knew things were going to be interesting when one student showed up to the first day of class wearing a hockey mask (remember Jason from the Friday the 13<sup>th</sup> movie franchise?) and carrying a *South Park* doll, that would exclaim common phrases from the tv show in its electronic voice at inopportune moments. Well, that was a long quarter. But we all adapted, as what was initially fear turned into supportiveness for a painfully shy student.

What are the take-aways from these experiences? Well, first it is important to roll with the punches. Accidents happen. Second, be patient and understand that the world is a big place where we all have to find a way to live here together.

### **Oh the Horror! What Can be Done?**

Suffice it to say, teaching college students comes with its own unique types of challenges. Many of these horror stories were idiosyncratic and unlikely to occur again, but provide a breadth of understanding of the types of issues that our colleagues have encountered. One example captured a common challenge faculty face – dealing with challenging students. The conclusion of that story provided a thoughtful conclusion about how to best address this kind of situation. And in closing, the response of one of the contributors has some wonderful insights into how some of these kinds of situations can be deterred from the outset, before a problematic classroom situation becomes a horror story.

### “Avoiding a Classroom Horror Story”

You know, I haven’t really had truly troublesome experiences, maybe because I work REALLY hard to prevent them by trying to create and maintain a safe and supportive climate. In my smaller seminar on gender and sexual orientation, for example, one of my rules (since I know that the class draws a lot of GLB students, some of which are still in the process of coming out) is that NO ONE is allowed to ask anyone else their sexual orientation – since even a “non-answer” to that question is an answer, of sorts. To lighten the mood, I say (on the first day of class, when I’m introducing these rules) “the only person’s sexual orientation you are allowed to ask about is mine, and let me just resolve this for you right now, so you don’t spend the first two weeks wondering about it. I’m a LESBIAN LESBIAN LESBIAN” (at which point I usually write it on the board with some exclamation points and flowers and stars). I’m not so sure this is an ideal strategy, either.....I was talking to a student once and she said “oh, my friend took your sexual orientation class, and it sounded so cool! I heard that you began EVERY CLASS by writing on the board “I am a lesbian!!!” I informed her that no, it was actually only the first day that I made such a disclosure, but I guess this is an example of how our actions are misperceived and misremembered by our students! But I suppose the whole point is that, I want to create a climate in my class in which being a lesbian is a non-issue, in which it’s “old news.” That alone can be transformative in this culture. I know (because my students often tell me) that for many of them, I am the first lesbian they have ever been in the same room with, and I’m committed to “normal bombing” them so that they inevitably walking away from that class thinking “wow, I never knew lesbians were so.....NORMAL.” The fact that I’ve never had an utter social breakdown in the classroom is, I suppose, evidence that the approach is working.

One piece of advice I give all new teachers, to avoid future chaos? LEARN YOUR STUDENTS’ NAMES. If I have a class with less than 40 students, I photograph each student on the first day, with my iphone, and I spend the whole first week learning their names. I have found that when you can IMMEDIATELY address individuals by their first names, and let them know that they are known to you as individuals, it tends to prevent social

breakdown in the classroom. Students want the same thing we all want – to be listened to and respected as individuals. By immediately communicating to my students, by using their names, that I see and hear them as individuals, I find it elicits incredibly mature and thoughtful behavior on the part of my students.

### Closing Words

The following individuals contributed their experiences and insights for your amusement, horror, commiseration, and consideration:

Nancy Brule, Bethel College  
 Leah E. Bryant, DePaul University  
 Lisa Diamond, University of Utah  
 John Caughlin, University of Illinois  
 C. Raymond (Chip) Knee, University of Houston  
 Pamela Lannutti, Boston College  
 Jimmie Manning, Northern Kentucky University  
 Marian M. Morry, University of Manitoba

### Reference:

Baumeister, R.F., & Wotman, S.R. (1992). *Breaking Hearts: The Two Sides of Unrequited Love*. New York: Guilford Press.

## Navigating the Route to Publication

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

Sometimes the publication process seems to be more process than publication. Some authors may even find it something of a mystery as to how one attains the all-important journal acceptance. Contrary to some misconceptions about editors as roadblocks, editors are actually here to help. As testimony to this fact, ten editors from various journals within relationships research volunteered their time to offer advice to authors regarding the publication process. First, Dr. Jeffry Simpson offers his advice for how to make the most out of a manuscript. Next, a panel of editors provided their insights to an array of questions about the fact and fiction of the publishing. Thank you to all the editors for their contributions!

### **The Publication Process through the Eyes of a Journal Editor**

Jeffry A. Simpson, University of Minnesota  
 (Editor, JPSP-IRGP)

I have spent the past 15 years in different editing roles. I began editing in 1998, spending four years as the editor of *Personal Relationships*. From 2002-2008, I served as an associate editor at the *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology—Interpersonal Relations and Group Processes*, where I handled most of interpersonal relations submissions. From 2008 until now, I have been the editor of *JPSP-IRGP*. During this 15 year time-span, I have action-edited well over 1000 papers and, as you might expect, have learned a few tricks of the trade along the way.

I don't claim to have any more knowledge or expertise on how to successfully navigate the editorial process than many other people in our field. In fact, the IARR newsletter has, over the years, published several insightful commentaries on this important topic. I have been asked to offer a few of my own insights about what authors can do to "help" reviewers (and editors) better understand and appreciate their papers. My list of 10 suggestions is neither complete nor exhaustive, but it does highlight several issues that demarcate good submissions from not-so-good ones.

1. **Choose the right journal.** At least 25% of papers are sent to the wrong (or an inappropriate) journal, usually because the author has not done his or her homework beforehand. Journals differ in their standards, in the topics they routinely publish, in the value they place on the use of certain methods (or the expectation of a multi-method series of studies) and theories, and in the importance they put on testing hypotheses derived from major theoretical models. It is important to know the standards and typical practices of the journal to which you plan to submit a paper before doing so. Read several articles that have been published in the journal recently, and look at the list of editorial board members. If you don't recognize any board members, or if none of them have expertise on the topic or content of your paper, you probably have targeted the wrong journal.
2. **Get your paper to good, relevant reviewers.** Once you have selected an appropriate journal, the next step is to try to get your paper into the hands of good and/or relevant reviewers if possible. Action editors do not always know who the best or most appropriate reviewers are for a given paper. Authors can help editors out by suggesting a few possible reviewers in the cover letter or by citing good/relevant reviewers (including editorial board members, if they are appropriate) in the paper itself.
3. **Open your paper with a "hook" that captures your primary findings or main points.** Especially if you have a complicated set of findings (such as interactions), it may be wise to begin your paper with an interesting "hook" that points readers toward your ultimate findings or conclusions. Hooks can include real-life stories or events, famous or highly pertinent quotations, or sharply contrasting viewpoints on a given topic or issue. Good hooks accomplish two things. First, they quickly pull readers into your paper and motivate them to read on. Second, they help readers keep complicated ideas and findings more easily and clearly in mind as you present your methods, results, and conclusions. If readers can keep relating what happened in the "hook" with what you actually did and found in your studies, they are likely to have an easier

time reading, thinking about, and hopefully appreciating your paper.

4. **State the major contribution(s) of your paper, including the gap(s) it fills.** Many editors and reviewers know less about the specific topic or area of your research than you do, sometimes by a large factor. Thus, is it important to clearly articulate—especially in the introduction and sometimes again toward the end of your paper—what the major contributions of your paper are and what critical gaps in the literature and/or our current knowledge have been filled. This can often be accomplished in a few simple sentences.
5. **Make the paper easy to read.** The background literature in a field is often dense and complicated. The research methods in most papers tend to be complex, especially if multiple studies that use different paradigms are presented. And the results of studies—particularly a series of studies within a single paper—are not always clean and consistent with a priori predictions. As a result, your writing must be as clear, direct, and easy to read as possible. In my lab, we have a rule; the more complicated a theory, method, and/or set of results is, the better, more streamlined, and easier-to-read a paper must be. Otherwise, most reviewers will have neither the cognitive resources nor the patience to digest “multiply complex” papers. Writing more clearly can be accomplished by “unpacking” your prose from detailed, carefully developed outlines, writing short and simple sentences when possible, avoiding the use of jargon or words that camouflage the crux of what you want to communicate, linearly “funneling” readers toward your ultimate predictions and conclusions, and paying attention to how well and how accurately each word conveys your intended meaning within each sentence. Someone once told me that smart people communicate the most directly and clearly; rather than hiding behind words, they step out front and use them to convey complex ideas as clearly and directly as possible so that virtually anyone—even your grandmother who probably does not have a degree in psychology (and might not have even gone to college)—can understand and appreciate them.
6. **Deliver what you “promise.”** A surprising number of authors fall into the trap of making implicit promises in their papers that they do not—and sometimes cannot—keep. For example, authors occasionally suggest that they will measure “behavior” when they actually have only self-reports of behavior; they sometimes unwittingly suggest a novel hypothesis that is never really tested; they draw inferences from their results that are not warranted or cannot be fully justified; or they claim they will solve a problem that never gets remedied. Do not promise more than what you can deliver, and deliver well. And when you do deliver well on your promises, take credit for them by accentuating the novelty, importance, or broader implications of your findings in the general discussion.
7. **Provide evidence of psychological processes when you can.** Most authors are good at documenting “outcome” evidence. For example, they are skilled at showing that independent variable X systematically influences (or is associated with) dependent variable Y, just as their theory anticipates. The strongest and most compelling papers, however, go beyond this. Rather than simply showing that  $X \rightarrow Y$ , the best papers also attempt to identify the specific psychological process (or processes) through which  $X \rightarrow Y$ , often in the form of specific moderating or mediating variables. What, for instance, is happening in participants’ heads when they are exposed to variable X and then provide a response (measured by variable Y)? Process evidence can be quite important, not only because it may illuminate what is occurring in the minds of participants during a study, but also because different theories often make different predictions about what should be happening cognitively and/or emotionally along the pathway from variable X to variable Y. Despite the fact that process evidence can be just as important as outcome evidence, a surprising number of papers offer only outcome evidence.
8. **Attend carefully to reviewer feedback, write a detailed revision cover letter, and make a thorough revision.** At least half the battle in getting a paper published centers on doing a thorough and detailed job of addressing all of the

editorial feedback you receive. There are several ways to handle this stage of the publication process in an effective, constructive, and efficient fashion. To begin with, read the editorial correspondence very carefully once the sting of receiving what seems like a “monumental” revision has abated and you are in a more constructive, task-focused state of mind. Then outline the cover letter of your revision before you start revising the paper. Doing so will not only help you keep track of everything that needs to be done and changed; it will also help you think more carefully, systematically, and clearly about each of the reviewers’ and editor’s points. When writing the revision cover letter, respond as directly and constructively as possible to each and every point in a collaborative and non-defensive manner, and list each reviewer or editor question/concern followed by your specific response to it. Remember that one solid piece of new data that quells a major concern typically speaks much louder than 1000 eloquent words in a cover letter. The best revision cover letters are mini-papers in themselves in that they are detailed in their focus, comprehensive in their coverage, persuasive in their argumentation, and appreciative in their tone.

**9. Hang in there until you are formally told “no.”**

As Yogi Berra once said, “The game ain’t over until it’s over.” Sometimes authors believe the game is over before it has been officially “called” by the editor. Don’t leave the batter’s box until the umpire (the editor) calls the third strike and officially declines your paper with no possible recourse at that journal. If, for example, an editor declines your paper but leaves the door open for a possible new submission involving additional data, further analyses, or a major theoretical reframing, do what it takes to make the next submission possible unless what is being requested is simply too daunting or too time-consuming. All of the best and most prolific scholars in our field have had numerous papers rejected at a higher rate than many people might imagine. Most of them, however, pay careful attention to editorial feedback, make the necessary and requested changes, additions, and revisions, and then step right back into the batter’s box with a new submission whenever they can.

**10. Adopt a resilient and constructive attitude.** As everyone knows from direct experience, our profession can be a tough one that requires the patience, dedication, and commitment of Job (or what seems to be a truly maniacal person). To endure, it helps to adopt a resilient, optimistic, and constructive attitude, especially toward the ultimate goal of the editorial process. When the process goes well, it should make your paper better, clearer, more compelling, and hopefully more impactful on the field over time. However, it can be difficult to appreciate this fact when one is mired in the 13th analysis for the 25th requested change as part of the 3rd revision of what one already considers to be a “very good” paper. All editors are (or should be) dedicated to making the papers they receive as good and impactful as they can be, not only to facilitate the careers of the authors, but to increase the citation impact factor of their journal as well. Thus, authors and editors are actually on the “same side”, especially as papers move toward their final, published form.

Finally, keep in mind that editors find themselves in a tough position. Each year, they are given a limited number of pages to publish the best and most important papers in the field, and they are the only individuals in the editorial process who see all of the good and deserving papers that are being submitted to their journal within a given period of time. This partly explains why good papers that receive fairly positive reviews occasionally get declined. Papers not only “compete” against the standards held by reviewers and editors; they are also being implicitly compared to the large number of other good papers that are weaving their way through the editorial process.

**“No hard and fast rules:” Multiple Perspectives on the Publication Process**

H. Colleen Sinclair, Mississippi State University

For this feature article, a number of editors for relationships-relevant journals were contacted and asked to respond to eight questions about their advice to writers, reviewers, and editors involved in the peer-review publication process. My sincere thanks go to the respondents for taking the time out to provide answers to the following questions (and, in

some cases, even recruiting additional responses from others), especially given how busy editors are. Our kind respondents and their impressive credentials included:

- Lorne Campbell, Associate Professor, University of Western Ontario, Associate Editor of *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*: October 2007 – September 2008, Editor of *Personal Relationships*: June 2008 – May 2012 (Masthead Editor from March 2010 – December 2013)
- Annmarie Cano, PhD., Associate Editor, *Journal of Family Psychology* (since 2007) and *Health Psychology* (since 2010)
- Marianne Celano, PhD., ABPP, Associate Professor, Emory Univ. School of Medicine, Associate Editor, *Journal of Family Psychology*, 1 year as AE, 7 years on editorial board.
- Susan Chuang, Associate Professor, for *Journal of Family Psychology* – 2 years, editor for books, special issues – 4.5 years
- David Demo, PhD., University of North Carolina – Greensboro, Editor, *Journal of Marriage and Family* (2007-present)
- Barbara H. Fiese, PhD., Professor and Director Family Resiliency Center, University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign, Associate Editor for the *Journal of Family Psychology*, 6 years experience, on other editorial Boards- 15+ years
- Nadine J. Kaslow, PhD., ABPP, Professor, Chief Psychologist, Vice Chair, Emory University School of Medicine, 3 years as Editor of the *Journal of Family Psychology*, 6 years as Associate Editor with 3 different journals, 25 years as reviewer
- Mark A. Whisman, PhD, Professor, University of Colorado Boulder, 3 years on the *Journal of Family Psychology*
- Sarah Whitton, PhD, University of Cincinnati, Associate Editor, 1 year on the *Journal of Family Psychology*

Questions asked of our contributing editors are provided with summaries of the responses. (*Note, in some cases responses came from multiple editors simultaneously and thus the exact origin of a specific quote could not be identified.*)

**1. What do you think are the most common misconceptions about the publication process?**

Our editors raised many valuable points, and a few themes emerged. For instance, a number of editors wanted to reassure authors that publication is not “luck of the draw.” Authors may feel that reviewers were selected purposefully to reject the article or if they had just gotten a different “reviewer #3” that the result of the reviews wouldn’t have been “unjust.” However, as Dr. Campbell notes, even articles with positive reviews may not be published simply due to page limitations on the journal. Thus editorial decisions are not just made with the author’s article in mind, but a submission is also compared to other manuscripts so that the papers that make the most substantive contribution are selected. A sentiment echoed by a number of editors was: “the truth is that editors go into this work because they care about the field, and care about getting the best work “out there” in the hands of others to read.”

Further, rather than being motivated to find any reason to reject an article, many editors saw their job as trying to help both authors and the science. A number of editors mentioned an investment, in particular, in helping early career scientists establish their research and felt it was a common misperception that only “certain” authors or senior scholars get published, particularly in top tier journals. In truth, even senior scholars have their manuscripts rejected. It is nothing personal.

An additional misconception that the editors wanted to correct included cautioning authors about assuming that editors only want “certain studies” that may promote their individual agenda or theoretical perspectives. As noted by Dr. Campbell, although editorial teams may have a “vision of the journal or editorial philosophy” there are no “hard and fast rules or procedures.” Editors are not some sort of “Wizard of Oz—an ordinary person attempting to exert extraordinary and nefarious control over [a journal].” Being familiar with past content and reading the instructions to the authors that each journal provides can help the author gauge whether a particular journal is the best fit. Information not provided in the instructions – such as whether, say, *The Journal of Marriage and Family*, will accept a study that doesn’t include a nationally representative sample or if *Personality and*

*Social Psychology Bulletin* would accept a single-study paper – should be sought from the editor rather than assumed.

## 2. What do you think are the biggest mistakes authors make when trying to get published in empirical journals?

Echoing the importance of finding the right journal for your work, a number of editors identified mistakes in choosing where to submit an article as a common mistake for authors. They recommended avoiding a “hit or miss” approach to selecting destinations for submissions, and strongly encouraged purposeful decision-making. Do your research. Know your audience. Otherwise, mistakes in choosing outlets simply cause delays in the publication process.

Once an appropriate outlet is identified, in every returned response editors mentioned the importance of proofreading. Apparently receiving manuscripts that are sloppy, have APA style errors, or overly “jargony” is not uncommon. Lack of effort in proofreading colors reviewer perceptions of the work and the conscientiousness of the author. As noted by Dr. Campbell, “Errors, of course, do not change the results that are presented, but they do distract reviewers and editors and in extreme cases can make it difficult to adequately evaluate the merits of the research.”

Having corrected typos and grammar, additional mistakes occur when authors do not do sufficient work to identify how their research makes a substantive contribution. Remember, that “Editors...often need to ask (a) does a given manuscript pass the threshold for publication, and then (b) what is the magnitude of the contribution of a given manuscript compared to other manuscripts that can potentially be selected for publication?” (Dr. Campbell). Thus authors should do their best to make a strong case for the magnitude of their contribution. This can be overlooked in the following ways:

- “Omitting recent or relevant literature in the literature review,” (Dr. Demo) thus providing insufficient empirical support for the research.

- Not organizing the literature review well-enough to “make a cogent case for the present study.”
- Not providing “a guiding theoretical framework for the research question and analyses.” (Mentioned in every returned response.)
- “Failing to connect the study’s purpose to the sample, measures, and analysis.”
- Neglecting a “convincing argument that their findings advance science or contribute anything new.”
- “Saying more research is needed without specifying what that research is and *why* it is important.”
- Assuming that just because a study hasn’t been done before means that it is worthwhile.

Lastly, common mistakes for authors also emerge when addressing reviews. Apparently there are a number of missteps that authors make in addressing reviews, starting with trying “to second guess what reviewers are trying to say rather than address the concerns directly.” Note, the editors do not say that the authors have to incorporate every single recommendation of reviewers. Rather, as one editor noted it is a common misconception “that you have to do each and every thing that each reviewer asks—in fact, when authors do this without consideration of how to integrate the different reviews, and what meaning that changes will have for the quality of their work, it can result in a disjointed and poorer quality paper.” However, it *is* important to address every single comment. Even if you don’t agree, you still “should acknowledge each issue and address it as best they can, with a good rationale if they decide not to take a recommendation.”

## 3. What are the things you have been most impressed with when you get a manuscript?

In contrast to the common mistakes, the elements of a manuscript that most impress our editors seem to be those that address many of the typical errors. They are most impressed with manuscripts that show attention to detail, tell a coherent story, have a comprehensive yet succinct literature review, make a strong argument for why the study is valuable to the

field, and clearly build off a theoretical foundation.

Also, editors placed considerable emphasis on the method. They wanted to see a clear and concise methodology. Appropriate samples – including adequate size and pertinence to the topic of study – were appreciated. Some also expressed respect for researchers who did not shy away from complex research designs. After all, relationships are complex, and thus the means to investigate relationship processes may also need to be so. A number of editors appreciated authors making it clear how the method, including the statistical procedure, is appropriate to test the hypotheses. In the words of one editor “Research studies that are well-designed to answer the questions of interest” are the most impressive and “...To me, design is more important than fancy analyses.”

#### **4. What do you do, as an editor, if you disagree with a review?**

Although when we, as authors, get reviews back we may rail about injustice and rant about disagreements, and wonder how such a “bad” review got past an editor, editors *do* read the reviews and consider them all carefully. Most journals require three reviews in order to determine where the consensus seems to lie. Many note that it is rare that there is one lone voice of dissent or a lack of commonalities among reviewer opinions. However, in situations where that may arise, editors reread the manuscript carefully and provide an additional review before making an editorial decision. Some even seek out additional expertise if they felt the article content was outside their realm of knowledge. In the words of one editor: “If I disagree with a reviewer’s recommendation (e.g., reject), or if I think a reviewer was too harsh, I may give more weight to other reviewers’ recommendations, particularly if I don’t see a ‘fatal flaw’.” Also as noted by Dr. Campbell: “The decision of an editor is not dictated by the reviews but rather is informed by them. When I disagree with specific elements of a review, or with the recommended decision of the reviewer, I attempt to respectfully provide rationale in my decision letter sent to authors and reviewers for my decision.”

Editors note that if the authors still believe that a review was erroneous that it can be addressed in a respectful query to the editor, expressing the rationale for the disagreement and seeking advice for how to address it.

#### **5. What is the best way for an author to tackle reviews?**

As noted above, missteps in addressing reviewer comments are not uncommon. So we know there are wrong ways to go about a response. What are the right ways? First, no matter how hard you worked on a manuscript, know that obtaining a minor revisions review on a first draft is exceedingly rare. Thus, there *will* be reviews and changes needed. Second, a number of editors recommended reading the reviews but then encouraged setting them down and walking away for at least a day. Often reviews can seem far more intimidating at first glance than they are in reality.

Third, re-read the reviews, see what can be addressed, communicate to the editor whether you intend to resubmit, and formulate a plan of attack for each comment. What are minor vs. major changes? Are changes possible or are the recommendations so dramatic that it might be better to pursue an alternative outlet? What needs to be done in order to accomplish the necessary changes (e.g., read extra literature, redo an analysis, conduct a follow-up)? Create a checklist. If there are co-authors, delegate who is responsible for what. “If there’s a disagreement, it may be that the writing was not clear and there’s a misunderstanding. So, it’s the responsibility of the authors to ensure that their position is grounded theoretically and then supported with a sound methodology and... the authors [need to] make their case in their cover letter.” Note, many editors stated that they thought it was completely “reasonable and appropriate to communicate with the editor if you have evidence that one or more reviewers made mistakes in their evaluation.” However, it is important to acknowledge their perspective, respond politely, and make a clear counter-argument. As noted by Dr. Jeff Simpson in the accompanying piece, keep in mind that “data speaks louder than words.”

For this reason, “it is often the case...that reviewers and/or the editor suggests that an additional study would be very useful and increase the likelihood of acceptance” (Dr. Campbell). Conducting an additional study may be a daunting task that seems unfeasible in the window of time available for a resubmission. Thus, each author must weigh their ability to conduct the additional study and decide whether to potentially ask for an extension on the deadline or whether to withdraw the submission and try an alternative outlet. Note, as Dr. Campbell notes, “In my experience as an author, when I conduct additional research along the lines suggested in the decision letter, and when the results work out as expected, the revision (sent in as a new submission but with a detailed cover letter) tends to be reviewed favorably.”

If you don't receive an R&R, and instead get the dreaded rejection letter, do not let the reviews go to waste. “Consider the reviews ‘free advice’ and revise the manuscript accordingly. Then submit the revised manuscript to another journal.” Editors agreed that there is no real point to disputing a rejection. It is best to pursue other avenues and not further delay the publication process.

#### 6. **How do you recommend an author go about picking a journal?**

Another common misstep identified by editors was the failure to pick an appropriate outlet. As many evidently struggle with this decision, it seems important to gather advice about how to make better choices. Our editors recommended the following:

- First, decide who you want your audience to be (e.g., general vs. specialty interest), so you know whether you want to submit to *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* or a relationships-research specific journal like *Personal Relationships*.
- Look at which journals you are citing most in your references to determine the journals which have published manuscripts similar to yours.
- Then pick up some recent copies of those journals and read current papers to gauge goodness-of-fit on both methods and topic.

- “Emailing the journal editor for guidance is also an option.” (Dr. Campbell)
- Many opt to try a top tier journal first, then work your way down if your manuscript is rejected. Keep in mind, however, that this adds time to the publication process thus it isn't a bad idea to have smaller studies out to other journals in order to meet departmental productivity standards. Distribute your work across multiple journals. Those on the tenure-track, though, might want to be sure to have some manuscripts out to top tier journals where their work will be more visible.
- Thus, when deciding whether a top-tier journal is a plausible outlet, “authors should take a careful look at the overall significance of their findings within the broader context of the field. If this is highly ground breaking work then a top tier journal is warranted. If the work is exploratory with minimal impact but is important to establish programmatic line of research I would consider second tier journals.”

#### 7. **What advice would you have for authors who keep trying but just can't seem to get many articles published?**

You might feel that you chose the right journal, proofread your work, and have a strong contribution to make but still face the frustration of repeated rejections. The publication process can be fraught with disappointment, frustration, and even anger. You may feel that your work will never see the light of day. So what can you do? Our editors have some advice.

First, keep in mind that “it's not the number of pubs but the quality of the pubs” that matters. Some might feel under pressure to reach productivity standards for tenure and promotion, but a high impact publication is worth multiple lower-tier publications.

Second, “take any reviews received seriously.” Don't assume the world is out to get you. Rather, by and large, reviewers and editors are motivated to improve the quality of the science. Thus, they likely have important tips on how a study can be improved and will tell you the weakness to remedy *and* the strengths to build upon.

Third, don't be afraid to ask for help or mentorship. "Have a senior colleague review the manuscripts and reviews. There may be a common thread that can be addressed. Contact the university research office and ask for an external review of the manuscripts and reviews to get an outside opinion. Attend writing workshops at your home institution." Even a productive peer or reference book on writing well could be a useful resource to help you grow as a researcher.

Fourth, don't stop trying. "Persistence and an ability to make use of constructive and sometimes negative feedback are essential to publication success." (Dr. Campbell) "Revise, revise, and revise again prior to each submission." (Dr. Demo) However, it is important to know when to move on. Your study may have critical flaws that are not going to be remedied by simply moving down the tier of journal options. If you "consider another journal, a different research question, or a different way of analyzing the data [and] none of these approaches bear fruit, move on to another project."

#### 8. Any additional tips?

Here a couple of editors elected to provide tips for reviewers about being responsible gatekeepers of science. Specifically, one editor told a story of a colleague who they had seen "get repeated rejections based on a theoretical framework—their data are excellent, they have controlled for all manner of confounds, and still reviewers do not believe the results, perhaps because the findings mean major changes to their own thinking and methods. This is a sad state of affairs when scientists cannot remain detached enough from their own models to evaluate science objectively. I imagine this happens in relationships research as well. There's not much one can do in this situation unless they want to change research directions; or perhaps we all can keep this in mind when we review work that doesn't necessarily fit our own conceptual models of how the results should look."

Also, editors mentioned that receiving insulting reviews or reviews that point out flaws but with no recommendations for remedies makes their

job more difficult. Editors encouraged reviewers to adopt a reviewer philosophy that focuses on assisting the progress of science and scientists. "Regarding reviews, in my conversations with colleagues about experiences with the review process in general one theme that emerges is the disappointment, and sometimes anger, associated with the negative tone of some reviews. Constructive criticism can be helpful to authors, but insensitive comments about the perceived quality of the research or researcher intentions are not helpful but instead can be hurtful and anger provoking. As a reviewer, try to focus comments on how to improve the manuscript or future research." This way, even if the manuscript is rejected there are steps that the scientist can take to make a stronger contribution to our field. Keeping this common goal in mind – to *help* advance the field – could help all involved better navigate the publication process.

## HUMOR COLUMN

### "There's an App for That"

by David A. Kenny  
University of Connecticut

My wife just bought a tablet (no way I give Apple a free plug!), and she is considering purchasing several apps for it. I wondered what relationship apps are available. I did find some and I provide a brief description written by the app maker:

**My Virtual Girlfriend:** "My Virtual girlfriend is the premeire [misspelling from the website] dating simulation game for mobile phones and tablets, that combines both humor with a dash of romance for a bit of flirty fun. The goal is simple, you must make the right moves in order to progress with your virtual date and get her to fall in love with you."

**PickUpLines:** “With PickupLines, you have access to nearly 150 pick-up lines with the touch of a button. All pickup lines are hand-selected to bring you the best. Everything from cheezy to witty to hilarious! Next time you're at a social gathering and the woman across the room catches your eye, have something clever to say.”

**HowToTalkToWomen:** “This program will teach you my secrets to staying in a conversation with a woman for as long as you want to talk to her. YOU will decide when and how to end the conversation.”

**UFlirt:** “You go into a bar and see a beautiful girl but you don't know what to say. Let this application help you with witty pickup lines from the pros.” I never knew that there are professional flirts. Do they have competitions?

**FlirtMaps:** “The first mobile dating app that makes it easy to break the ice with nearby singles in realtime. Whether you're at home or traveling the world, you can navigate the easy-to-use map to try your best opening line with other available members in your area.”

**Dating DNA:** “Dating DNA is a free social networking dating service. This means that you fill out a free dating profile, post it, and then start searching for people that are compatible. The nice thing about the Dating DNA app is that it gives each user a DNA score. This DNA score determines the likelihood of you being able to match up with someone that is compatible with your likes and dislikes.”

**Love Messenger:** “Send fun and romantic images, sounds and videos to someone special via MMS Text Message, Email, Facebook or Twitter.” Does anyone know what MMS is?

One thing about most of these apps is that they are written for men. Perhaps women, as the traditional “relationship experts,” may no longer have the advantage in dating if guys can take advantage of these great apps. I am sure women are really impressed when the guy they are talking to is staring at his phone or tablet to figure out what he should say next.

While looking for relationship apps, I stumbled upon some rather strange apps. Here are a few that you might find amusing:

**Fake Me Out Of Here:** “Fake Me Out Of Here, has an intelligent and sensitive sensor that activates and sounds the ringtone on your Android when the phone shakes. If you're strange enough to have a fake conversation with yourself then this app is for you. Shake the phone any time so that it rings when there is a need to exit an uncomfortable situation, then answer and excuse yourself tastefully.” This app could prove to be very useful when talking to a dean or department head.

**Bizarre Holidays:** This app “presents you with one wacky holiday each day. You'll find silly holidays like Blame Someone Else Day and Dance Like a Chicken Day. Use it to have a little fun or plan fun parties for friends and family.” This explains the email I got from my graduate students saying that they would not be in because it was Strut Like a Strumpet Day.

**Where's the Bathroom:** This app “cuts through all the extraneous phrases and gets straight to the point. Simply press a button to ask where the restroom is located. Recordings are offered in many different languages by native speakers.” This would be great when going to international meetings. Maybe I should not say “going”?

**Witch Hunt:** “Believe it or not, there are witches everywhere and you can't trust anyone! Well at least that's what this app seeks to prove. If you are unsure, prepare and protect yourself and get Witch Hunt today. This app uncovers all the witches around us disguising themselves as a friendly neighbor, friend or relative. With one simple shot, Witch Hunt will ID the witches in the photo within seconds. It does this by lighting them on fire, so you know they are dangerous. Plus you may want to do yourself a big favor and turn the camera around and snap yourself, you could be a witch too!” I should use this with prospective job candidates. I assume that it is gender neutral and can detect warlocks too.

**Don't Push:** “You know those people who do the opposite of what they are told to do? Well this app was designed for them and possibly you too. It has a button saying ‘don't push’, I wonder what happens if you do?” This app was obviously inspired by Dan Wegner's research (“Do not think about the white bear”).

Finally, I have some suggestions for relationship researchers who might want to create a new app. I only ask them to give me a mere five percent of their royalties. I have taken a relational lifespan approach to organizing this section.

**SeeIfHelsAJerk:** Brian Spitzberg and Bill Cupach could create a quiz that could be given to a potential dating partner to determine whether he or she is relationally competent.

**LIWKEm:** Here is another one for someone checking out a potential dating partner. Jaime Pennebaker might create an app that would Google, Facebook and Twitter a person (e.g., a potential dating partner), and based on the information that was located, it would use LIWK, his content analysis program, to provide a description of that person. Glad this and the pervious one were not invented when I was dating.

**EggShellsToSouffles:** Ed Lemay and Peggy Clark might provide people with some conversational retorts when their anxiously attached partner is feeling threatened.

**OneDayAtATime:** Shelly Gable might create an app in which relationship partners could enter daily data and the course of the relationship could be monitored. If Kim Kardashian and Kris Humphries had bought this before the wedding, they would have to get their money back, as they never would have had it long enough to generate meaningful data.

**AreYouRU:** Leanne Knobloch might write an app to tell people if they are relationally uncertain. This might be a good app if you are married to Newt Gingrich.

**IsItOverYet?:** Steve Duck might help people figure out how near their relationship is to being over, and whether it has yet gotten to the point of grave dressing. I would think that Seal and Heidi Klum might find this app useful.

**AmIDementedYet?:** Simon Baron-Cohen might write an app so that when people would wake up in the morning they could take a test to see if they had Alzheimer's. They might need a separate app to remind them to take the test.

(You can view previous columns by Dave Kenny at [http://davidakenny.net/iarr\\_hc.htm](http://davidakenny.net/iarr_hc.htm).)

## BOOK REVIEWS

**Romantic Relationships in Emerging Adulthood (2011)**  
**Edited by Frank D. Fincham and Ming Cui**  
**Cambridge. 338 pp.**

**Reviewed by Steven M. Graham**  
**New College of Florida**  
**and**  
**Sam Hunley**  
**Furman University**

Philosophers and social scientists have known for millennia that relationships of all sorts have important implications for psychological and physical well-being. For instance, in recent decades, social scientists have emphasized the importance of romantic relationships in adulthood as a means of satisfying attachment needs, providing a context in which social support normatively occurs, and providing a socially-sanctioned context for sexual expression. Though the literature on adult relationships is firmly established, until recently social scientists have paid comparatively little attention to romantic relationships in emerging adulthood (EA). Indeed, until the publication of Arnett's (2000) seminal article on EA, researchers did not necessarily identify it as distinct from other, related constructs (e.g., late adolescence or young adulthood), nor did they deem EA as worthy of study in its own right. This timely volume, deftly edited by Frank Fincham and Ming Cui, makes an important contribution to the nascent literature on EA by making clear links between this construct and the importance of romantic relationships during this life stage. Indeed, several of the authors who contributed to this volume have suggested that the formation and maintenance of close romantic relationships is one of the (if not *the*) most defining events in the transition from emerging to full-blown adulthood. This volume provides a solid framework upon which to build a future social science of EA and underscores the important role of interpersonal relationships during this life stage.

### Part I: Introduction

The introductory chapter presents the concept of EA and makes a case for its importance. In this chapter, Fincham and Cui describe some of the defining characteristics of EA although they ultimately allow the definition to “emerge” from the various treatments of the construct provided by the contributing authors. This concise chapter provides an excellent road map for readers who may want to read chapters selectively rather than read the book from cover to cover.

### Part II: Conceptual and Methodological Foundations

The second section of the book, containing four chapters, provides an excellent introduction to the concept of EA and to some methodological considerations associated with the study of this construct. Chapter 2 by Alan Reifman does a particularly nice job defining EA and addressing some of the critiques that have been leveled at the utility and generality of the concept. Paul Amato's chapter 3 makes a compelling case for the importance of examining both the timing of developmental processes and their sequence. Chapters 4 and 5 highlight some statistical issues associated with the study of EA. Each of these chapters is well written, accessible to audiences with varying levels of statistical sophistication, and, importantly, provides solutions to problems instead of simply identifying difficulties.

### Part III: The Developmental Context of Romantic Relationships in EA

This section includes three chapters dealing with the familial context of romantic relationships in EA, highlighting the extent to which romantic relationships in EA do not occur in a vacuum. Rather, they are strongly associated with relationships that people have observed and experienced earlier in life. Each of these chapters presents new data that address interesting questions while simultaneously suggesting avenues for future research.

### Part IV: Relationship Processes in EA

Perhaps the heftiest section of the book, these five chapters cover important relationship processes such as evolution and cognition, relationship initiation, sex, cohabitation, and nervous system functioning in the context of romantic relationships. Chapters in

this section nicely complement those in the previous section in that they focus less on new data and more on theory relevant to EA. For example, Clark & Beck's chapter on relationship initiation provides an excellent commentary on and critique of EA as a concept whereas Lefkowitz's and colleagues' chapter on romance and sex addresses some shortcomings of earlier research on EA and suggests some solutions. In chapter 12, Stanley, Rhoades, and Fincham have written a comprehensive treatment of the cohabitation effect and suggest directions for future research on the topic. In chapter 13, Diamond and Fagundes explore associations between nervous system processes and romantic relationships. Each chapter in this section advances relevant theory and encourages readers to extend knowledge in these areas by including suggestions for future research.

### Part V: Practical Applications

The final section of the book examines the issues of mental health, relationship education, and academic and career trajectories. Chapter 14, by Joanne Davila, raises the interesting point that, whereas the association between romantic involvement and a variety of mental health outcomes is negative in adolescence, the reverse is true in EA. This pattern, in and of itself, highlights the utility of the EA construct. After providing some information on the history of relationship education, chapter 15, by Fincham, Stanley, and Rhoades, makes a strong case for why people may be optimally receptive to relationship education during EA. It then showcases some promising data from an impressive, large-scale study dedicated to evaluation of relationship education during EA. Chapter 16, written by Manning, Giordano, Longmore, and Hocevar, explores the role of romantic relationships in occupational and educational development. Like several other chapters in this volume, it presents new data in addition to advancing theory. Overall, this section shows the importance of research on this topic. More specifically, it shows what we, as social scientists, can do to improve important life outcomes drawing upon our knowledge of basic processes regarding romantic relationships and this important life stage.

In conclusion, this book is well written and expertly edited. It includes an effective and informative blend of theoretical advancements and original data. The volume, particularly in the first two sections,

provides a strong foundation on the construct of EA and on methodological and statistical issues associated with studying it. Remaining chapters light the way for future research in this area. Whereas we concur with the editors and authors that romantic relationships can and do play a significant role during EA, we challenge readers to think about other means of establishing adulthood in light of commentary in recent years, most notably by Bella DePaulo (DePaulo & Morris, 2005), suggesting that not all adults seek out romantic relationships.

This volume could be useful for an advanced graduate course on EA, close relationships, or both. It is essential reading for scholars of EA, deserves consideration for inclusion in the library of any relationship researcher, and is a welcome addition to any academic library with a social sciences collection.

Reference:

DePaulo, B. M., & Morris, W. L. (2005). Singles in society and in science. *Psychological Inquiry*, 16, 57-83.

---

## JOURNALS UPDATE

### A Report on Personal Relationships

by Lorne Campbell  
University of Western Ontario,  
Canada

My editorial team will cease receiving new submissions to PR on June 1, 2012, but we will continue to process manuscripts and fill issues through the end of 2013. Our goal is to ensure that all manuscripts accepted for publication under our tenure are published in print by the end of 2013, and we have received support from the board of IARR to publish additional pages in the journal to deal with the current print publication lag. The editorial team assembled by the incoming editor Julie Fitness will

begin receiving new submissions on June 1 of this year, and we have been in contact to ensure a smooth transition.

Overall, our editorial team has done our best to implement changes to increase the efficiency of the submission/review process, and to ensure that high quality research continues to be published in the pages of PR. I personally want to thank all of the individuals that have worked very hard, and continue to work hard, as associate editors for PR—Chris Agnew, Anita Barbee, Gurit Birnbaum, Susan Branje, Chip Knee, Tim Loving, Nickola Overall, and Theo van Tilburg. It has been a pleasure serving as editor of PR, and it certainly has been an excellent learning experience. I look forward to the new and exciting directions awaiting both the field of relationship science as well as PR.

### Basic Statistics for the Journal

Our editorial team began receiving manuscripts on June 1, 2008, and to date we have received a total of 758 original submissions. In our first year we received 171 original submissions, in our second year we received 224 original submissions, and in our third year we received 219 submissions. At the time of writing (April 5, 2012), we have received 144 submissions since June 1, 2011. As noted above, PR continues to be a popular outlet for research on close relationships.

Of the 758 manuscripts submitted to PR since 2008, we have made final decisions on 681 manuscripts (or 90% of all submissions). A total of 147 manuscripts have been accepted for publication, meaning that our acceptance rate is currently 21.5% (the acceptance rate has held fairly steady since our editorial team began processing manuscripts). In terms of diversity of authorship, 61% of all original submissions since June 1, 2008 have come from scholars based in the United States. We have received submissions from 40 different countries, and it is encouraging that we continue to receive submissions representing a wide range of countries and cultures. Consistent with prior trends, 60% of all manuscripts accepted for publication to date are from scholars based in the United States, a percentage very similar to the proportion of US based scholars submitting their work to PR.

## Tentative Contents of Upcoming Journals

### *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships* November 2012 [Volume 29 #3] Table of Contents

SOPHIA JOWETT & JOHN NEZLEK  
Relationship interdependence and satisfaction with  
important outcomes in coach–athlete dyads

DANIEL R. STALDER  
The role of dissonance, social comparison, and  
marital status in thinking about divorce

ANNE WIETZKER, ANN BUYSSE, TOM LOEYS,  
& RUBEN BRONDEEL  
Easing the conscience: Feeling guilty makes people  
cooperate in divorce negotiations

GUSTAVO CARLO, MEREDITH MCGINLEY,  
RACHEL C. HAYES, & MIRIAM M. MARTINEZ  
Empathy as a mediator of the relations between  
parent and peer attachment and prosocial and  
physically aggressive behaviors in Mexican  
American college students

MATTHIJS KALMIJN & CHRISTIAAN W.S.  
MONDEN  
The division of labor and depressive symptoms at the  
couple level: Effects of equity or specialization?

AMY CLAXTON, NORM O'ROURKE,  
JULIANNA Z. SMITH, & ANITA DELONGIS  
Personality traits and marital satisfaction within  
enduring relationships: An intra-couple discrepancy  
approach

BRIAN J. WILLOUGHBY, JASON S. CARROLL,  
& DEAN M. BUSBY  
The different effects of “living together”:  
Determining and comparing types of cohabiting  
couples

### *Personal Relationships* June 2012 [Volume 19 #2] Table of Contents

DIANNA MURRAY-CLOSE, ASHLEY S.  
HOLLAND, & GLENN I. ROISMAN  
Autonomic Arousal and Relational Aggression in  
Heterosexual Dating Couples

CASEY J. TOTENHAGEN, EMILY A. BUTLER,  
& CARL A. RIDLEY  
Daily Stress, Closeness, and Satisfaction in Gay and  
Lesbian Couples

ASHLEY S. HOLLAND, R. CHRIS FRALEY, &  
GLENN I. ROISMAN  
Attachment Styles in Dating Couples: Predicting  
Relationship Functioning over Time

ESTHER M. HAKVOORT, HENNY M. W. BOS,  
FRANK VAN BALEN, & JO M. A. HERMANNSS  
Spillover between Mothers' Post-Divorce  
Relationships: The Mediating Role of Parenting  
Stress

MARGARET S. STROEBE, GEORGIOS  
ABAKOUMKIN, WOLFGANG STROEBE, &  
HENK SCHUT  
Continuing Bonds in Adjustment to Bereavement:  
Impact of Abrupt versus Gradual Separation

TEUN GEURTS, THEO G. VAN TILBURG, &  
ANNE-RIGT POORTMAN  
The Grandparent-Grandchild Relationship in  
Childhood and Adulthood: A Matter of  
Continuation?

PEGGY A. HANNON, ELI J. FINKEL, MADOKA  
KUMASHIRO, & CARYL E. RUSBULT  
The Soothing Effects of Forgiveness on Victims' and  
Perpetrators' Blood Pressure

STEVEN ARNOCKY, SHAFIK SUNDERANI,  
JESSE L. MILLER, & TRACY VAILLANCOURT  
Jealousy Mediates the Relationship Between  
Attractiveness Comparison and Females' Indirect  
Aggression

BLAKE M. RIEK & ERIC W. MANIA  
The Antecedents and Consequences of Interpersonal  
Forgiveness: A Meta-Analytic Review

DOUG P. VANDERLAAN & PAUL L. VASEY  
Relationship Status and Elevated Avuncularity in  
Samoan Fa'afafine

JI-IN YOU & AMY BELLMORE  
Relational Peer Victimization and Psychosocial  
Adjustment: The Mediating Role of Best Friendship  
Qualities

MING CUI, KOJI UENO, FRANK D. FINCHAM,  
M. BRENT DONNELLAN, & K. A. S.  
WICKRAMA  
The Association between Romantic Relationships  
and Delinquency in Adolescence and Young  
Adulthood

SHANNON M. SMITH & HARRY T. REIS  
Perceived Responses to Capitalization Attempts are  
Influenced by Self-Esteem and Relationship Threat

SILVIA DONATO, RAFFAELLA IAFRATE,  
THOMAS N. BRADBURY, & EUGENIA  
SCABINI  
Acquiring dyadic coping: Parents and partners as  
models

serve for a three-year period. The Editor, with the assistance of Associate Editors recruited by the Editor, prepares editions of the newsletter for regular distribution to IARR members and other subscribers. Currently IARR is publishing two printed issues of RRN per year (in the spring and fall), each of which is approximately 30-40 pages. The newsletter is also available on the IARR website shortly after its production. The incoming editorial team's first issue will be published in May of 2013, and the last issue will be published in November of 2015. IARR has arrangements with Blackwell-Wiley for the printing and mailing of the newsletter.

Self-nominations for this important and rewarding role are welcomed. A completed nomination packet should include a vita, the names of at least two references, and a letter addressing goals for the newsletter and a description of how the candidate would run the newsletter.

A brief email note of intent to apply should be sent by April 15, 2012. All nomination packets should be sent by April 30, 2012. The note of intent and the nomination materials should be sent electronically to Sandra Metts, Publications Committee Chair ([smmetts@ilstu.edu](mailto:smmetts@ilstu.edu)). Questions may be directed to Marian Morry (Marian\_Morry@Umanitoba.ca), the current Editor, or any member of the Publications Committee: F. Scott Christopher ([Scott.Christopher@asu.edu](mailto:Scott.Christopher@asu.edu)), Paul Mongeau ([Paul.Mongeau@asu.edu](mailto:Paul.Mongeau@asu.edu)), Harry Reis ([reis@psych.rochester.edu](mailto:reis@psych.rochester.edu)), and Susan Sprecher ([sprecher@ilstu.edu](mailto:sprecher@ilstu.edu)).

---

## ANNOUNCEMENTS

### **IARR Publications Committee Seeks Nominations for Editor of *Relationship Research News***

The IARR Publications Committee is soliciting nominations for editor of the *Relationship Research News* (RRN) to succeed Marian Morry, whose editorial term ends with the fall issue of 2012. Ideally, the new Editor will be selected by July of 2012 and shadow Dr. Morry's production of the November 2012 issue. The IARR Handbook indicates that the newsletter editor will typically

## **Dyadic Data Analysis Workshop**

### **Michigan State University**

### **July 23-27, 2012**

**Instructors:**

Deborah A. Kashy, Ph.D. (Michigan State University)

Robert A. Ackerman, Ph.D. (University of Texas at Dallas)

**Dates and Times:**

July 23-26 (Monday-Thursday) 9:00 AM to 5:00 PM

July 27 (Friday) 9:00 AM to 12:00 PM for one-on-one consultation meetings only

**Cost:** \$1,000.00

**Website:**

[http://psychology.msu.edu/Workshops\\_Courses/dda.aspx](http://psychology.msu.edu/Workshops_Courses/dda.aspx)

The workshop will focus on analyses for data in which both members of a dyad are measured on the same set of variables. Topics to be addressed include the measurement of nonindependence, the Actor-Partner Interdependence Model, the analysis of distinguishable and indistinguishable dyads, and the analysis of over-time dyadic data (e.g., dyadic growth curve models). The software package used in the workshop will be SPSS. Although the workshop does not require any prior knowledge or experience with multilevel modeling (a basic introduction to this analytic approach will be included during the workshop), participants are expected to have a working knowledge of multiple regression and analysis of variance, as well as SPSS.

This four-day workshop (with an optional ½ day on Friday) will include a lecture component with hands-on application of the material covered in lecture, as well as one-on-one consultation meetings concerning participants' actual research and data analytic questions. There will be time for individual meetings with workshop instructors from 3:00pm to 5:00pm each afternoon, as well as on Friday morning 9:00-11:00. Participants are encouraged, but not required, to bring their own data so that they can apply these new methods to their own projects.

# IARR BOARD

## IARR OFFICERS

### President

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

### Vice-President & President- Elect

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

### Past-President

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

### Secretary & Treasurer

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

## BOARD MEMBERS

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

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

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

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

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

## COMMITTEE CHAIRS

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## EDITORS

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

Lorne Campbell – Masthead Editor  
Julie Fitness - Incoming Editor  
(Personal Relationships)  
[Personal\\_Relationships@uncg.edu](mailto:Personal_Relationships@uncg.edu)

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