

RELATIONSHIP RESEARCH NEWS

OFFICIAL NEWS JOURNAL OF THE INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR RELATIONSHIP RESEARCH

November 2012

VOL 11, NO. 2

PRESIDENT'S COLUMN

IARR: The Recent Past, the Year Ahead

by Dan Perlman
University of North Carolina at Greensboro

“Thriving” — that is the first word that comes to my mind when I think of how IARR, founded June 1, 2002, is doing as it embarks on its second decade. Having been blessed with excellent past leadership, there are numerous indicators that IARR is flourishing. The number of members jumped to an all-time high in 2012, the association’s finances are solid, the Chicago conference was a booming success, IARR’s journals are prospering, the cost of dues has declined rather than increased in the recent past, and we are doing more to garner media coverage for IARR related relationship research. Bravo! Kudos to all those who provided outstanding leadership in 2011-2012, especially Chris Agnew for his highly effective contributions as IARR President and all the key governance members who have completed their terms of service (Brooke Feeney, Secretary-Treasurer; Sandra Metts, Publication Committee; Ximena Arriaga, Board Member-at-Large; Laura Miller, New Professional Representative; Chip Knee, Awards Committee; Omri Gillath, Future Conferences Committee; João M. Moreira, International Committee; Stanley Gaines, Membership Committee; Leah Bryant, Mentoring Committee; Leah Bryant, Sue Sprecher and Ralph Erber, Local Arrangements Committee; Lesley Verhofstadt and Sandra Metts, Program Committee; and William Dragon, Webmaster).

Looking Ahead

What’s next? In the Palmer House hotel lobby during IARR’s Conference I asked a former President of one of IARR’s parent organizations, the International Society for the Study of Personal Relationships, what he thought IARR should be doing. His advice to me as incoming President was simple: Things are great, just avoid errors. Hopefully 2012-13 will not only be a year in which foul-ups are avoided, but also one in which core values are maintained and the association moves forward in productive ways. In terms of staying on course, the key values to which IARR’s founders were committed included appreciating the contributions that scholars from several disciplines make to understanding relationships, being an international organization, welcoming new professionals, and the importance of research. I expect we will remain true to each of those values in the year ahead.

About moving forward, IARR has matured, some things have already happened, and other things are being initiated. In light of IARR’s maturation, we are working on two fronts. First, the Finance Committee has been reactivated. Its members are Leah Brant, Chair, Chris Agnew, Bob Milardo and Sue Sprecher. They will be looking at several aspects of IARR’s financial situation and management (e.g., what balance should IARR strike between building a rainy day fund and keeping dues low vs. to what extent should the Association use its resources now to expand the scope of what it is doing? If the latter, what new or expanded activities should IARR undertake? Has IARR grown to the point where it needs some additional administrative help via part-time staff or paying for services?). Second, IARR’s administrative guidelines and its historical archives are fairly minimal. In the change of officers this summer, both outgoing and incoming officers voiced a need for more systematic information on how IARR does things. Also, we

don't currently have any conscious effort to preserve historical information. Susan Boon has agreed to spearhead an effort to better systematize the Association's operating procedures and archive historical materials.

Events During the Summer of 2012

Besides the Chicago conference, arguably the biggest thing that has happened over the summer and into the early fall is that Ben Le has revamped the IARR web site making it more attractive and functional. If you haven't been there recently, check out the redesigned home page, <http://www.iarr.org/>. Ben has expressed the philosophy of the site as follows: "I view my role as facilitating the posting and organizing of content, not creating large amounts of original content. If we want the site to represent the organization, content from a wide range of members needs to be included. For the site to be truly dynamic, we need committees and individual members to generate content they want to share with other members (as well as a general audience), and send it to me to post." We hope there will be an expansion of useful information on the site.

Two other nice things occurred in September. First, articles in the *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships* will now be covered in the American Psychological Association's PsycTEST database. The database is designed to provide a non-evaluative finding aid and archive for locating measures described in the scholarly literature. All records in the database link back to journal articles that describe the development, review, and/or use of that particular instrument. When available, and contingent upon the author's permission, the database includes the instrument itself. IARR is exploring having *Personal Relationships* also included in APA's coverage. Secondly, Rozzana Sanchez Aragon, as chair of the Membership Committee, has done a Spanish language membership brochure. This brochure is posted on the IARR web site and Rozzana circulated copies of it at a recent meeting of Mexican social psychologists. Incidentally, Chris Agnew and Ximena Arriaga were honored invitees at that meeting.

In terms of bumps in the road, during the business meeting in Chicago, members suggested ways that

the proposed June 2013 mini-conference on dyadic coping might morph into a conference more similar to previous IARR mini-conferences. These suggestions were communicated to the 4-member mini-conference organizing committee. The members of the organizing committee were not in agreement on the best ways to proceed. This led to a decision to lay aside plans for the originally proposed event. Instead Karen Kayser and Tracey Revenson will host a one-day mini-conference on Dyadic Coping and Cancer, Friday, June 21, 2013, at the University of Louisville independent of IARR sponsorship. On behalf of IARR, I have offered that we would announce this conference and discuss any other forms of cooperation that might be mutually beneficial. The Future Conferences Committee is in discussion at the time of this writing (October 1) regarding the possibility of a different IARR sponsored mini-conference in 2013.

Committees and Their Goals for 2012-13

Committee Chairs have summarized their goals for 2012-2013. The goals of each Committee as well as the list of Committee members are available on the IARR web site, www.IARR.org.

One innovation in 2012-13 is the establishment of a teaching committee, which might ultimately become a standing Committee. The members are Kelly Campbell, Chair, Agnaldo Garcia, Natalie Hengstebeck, Rody Miller, and Brian Spitzberg. The Committee's mission is to improve the process of education about personal relationships through the sharing of information and pedagogical practices across instructors, disciplines, institutions, and regions. It has identified an exciting set of tasks for 2012-2013.

IARR'S Lifeblood: Member Involvement

IARR is a member-run organization whose lifeblood is what its members give to it. Governance members can lead the way but the wider the circle of IARR members who contribute, the greater will be the Association's success. Thus I invite and encourage you to be involved in IARR. A separate item in this newsletter entitled "Help Wanted: 21 Ways You Can Contribute to IARR" lists ways IARR can use your assistance. Please check the list and offer help in response to those or other ways you can contribute to IARR's mission and vitality in 2012-2013.

INSIDE THIS ISSUE OF RELATIONSHIP RESEARCH NEWS

PRESIDENT’S COLUMN

IARR: The Recent Past, The Year Ahead
by Dan Perlman1

FROM THE EDITOR’S DESK

by Marian Morry4

NEW PROFESSIONALS COLUMN

Professor “Plus One”: Transitioning to Work/Life as a Partnered Academic
by Kendra Knight 5

FEATURE ARTICLES

Confessions of a(n IARR) Conference Planner
by Leah Bryant 6
Tracking Tenure and Promotion
Edited by Colleen Sinclair 9
Inclusion of Kim Kardashian in Your Scientific Self
by Ty Tashiro..... 13

HUMOR COLUMN

“I Have Tthis Friend Who ... ”
by David Kenny 15

WEB NEWS

by Ben Le 16

JOURNALS UPDATE

PR Report
by Julie Fitness 17
Tentative Contents of Upcoming Journals..... 18

ANNOUNCEMENTS 19

Help Wanted: 21 Ways You Can Contribute to IARR
Call for Advances in Personal Relationships

MEMBER NEWS AND UPDATES 20

Awards Report

IARR BOARD 23

RELATIONSHIP RESEARCH NEWS

Outgoing Editor

Marian Morry
University of Manitoba

Outgoing 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 Justin Lehmiller, Harvard University, Department of Psychology, Cambridge, MA, USA, 02138; lehmiller@fas.harvard.edu. 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

This is my last edition as Editor of *Relationship Research News*. It has been a wonderful experience and I suspect one of the few positions where people email or stop you at a conference to say how much they enjoyed a recent article. The articles and book reviews were only made possible through the contributions of my Associate Editors Stacey MacKinnon, Leah Bryant, and Colleen Sinclair. Without your dedication and hard work, my job would have been much more difficult. So, thank you.

We are happy to give the torch to Justin Lehmler, the incoming editor, and his editorial team. Justin has already been busy behind the scenes looking for ways to bring something new or something more to our newsletter and subsequently our members.

We have other new faces in the current edition of *Relationship Research News*. First, as the new President of *IARR*, Dan Perlman has been busy both planning the future and acknowledging our past. His President's Column summarizes these activities so I won't reiterate them here. However, I do want to encourage our members to check out the article later in the newsletter entitled "Help Wanted: 21 Ways You Can Contribute to *IARR*."

A second new contributor to the newsletter is Kendra Knight, the New Professional Representative. Regardless of your rank, Kendra's article on transitioning to a new job when you have a spouse is relevant to all academics. I would also like to encourage senior colleagues to add to the discussion on the *IARR Website* about their experiences, opinions, advice, and resources.

Ben Le is back as our website guru. He can't develop our site on his own, so please check out Ben's article to see what you can contribute to the website. Chip Knee has also provided us with a report on the recipients of the Association's Awards.

Finally, Julie Fitness is the new Editor of *Personal Relationships*. Julie and her team started accepting articles earlier this summer. Julie will provide a regular update on the journal for our members. Mario Mikulincer is still the Editor of *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*. Unfortunately he was able to provide an update of the journal for this edition.

Leah Bryant has written about her experience with being a conference organizer. A wonderful behind the scenes exposé for individuals contemplating a future conference. Finally, Colleen Sinclair's piece involves advice for promotion through the ranks. In addition, we have an invited piece about writing for the general public. Thanks Colleen for arranging this.

Dave Kenny expounds on the humorous side of an event many of us will experience as some point in our lives: Retirement. Or, if you read his article maybe it is best to postpone this event as long as possible.

Finally, have you ever thought of authoring or editing a book? If so the call for *Advances in Personal Relationships* is designed for you. This book series publishes cutting edge research and theory in the field of personal relationships. Do check out the formal call later in the newsletter.

In closing, I will miss being the editor of this newsletter but you can still find me working hard with Julie Fitness. I know you'll be in good hands with Justin.

Marian

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

April 1, 2013

**Submit all materials
to Justin Lehmler**

lehmler@fas.harvard.edu

Professor “Plus One”: Transitioning to Work/Life as a Partnered Academic

Kendra Knight
New Professional Representative
Christopher Newport University

I don't remember why I ever thought it was a good idea to write about relationships in the academy for an audience of academics who study relationships. However, as someone who teaches and researches questions related to work-life, I believe that the challenges of being a partnered academic are relevant to our new professionals (myself included). What follows, therefore, is a discussion of three common scenarios that partnered new professionals face when transitioning to their first professional appointments.

#1 Relocating with a Non-Academic Partner

Many new academic professionals will transition to their first job with a non-academic partner “in tow.” This can make the job search process that much more daunting, particularly if relocation is required. Negotiating this transition begins long before the actual move, and in the experience of those who have done it successfully, begins even before the job search. The first challenge is to acquaint your partner with the nature of the academic hiring process. It is one thing to say, “We just can't predict where we'll end up,” and quite another for your partner to truly understand the constraints of today's academic market. One strategy is to ask your partner to subscribe to the same job alerts and listservs that you read. Your partner will not only be better informed, but he/she will also be more involved in the process, which will benefit you both.

The appeal of a particular job offer will naturally depend on your unique circumstances – whether your partner is employed, if you have children, etc. However, across the board, new hires with partners should be concerned with relocation support provided by their prospective institution. Some universities will pay to relocate only the new hire, while others will pay for everyone in the family. Investigate state and institutional policies so that you know whether to include partner relocation costs in your contract negotiations.

Lastly, when relocating with a non-academic partner, remember that the transition may be more difficult for your partner. Although you are changing institutions, your “culture shock” may be mitigated somewhat by the familiarity of the academic environment generally. Your non-academic partner, by contrast, may be spending his/her days in an environment vastly different from “home.”

#2 The Academic Couple

Relocation with a partner who is also an academic is exponentially more complex, but it's a work-life challenge that affects many academics. In the United States, for example, an estimated 36% of academics are partnered with another academic (<http://gender.stanford.edu/dual-career-research-report>). Although this percentage has been relatively stable over the past four decades, universities have become increasingly responsive to the needs of the dual-academic-career couple. Many universities now have formal or informal policies and practices for the joint- or sequential-hiring of academic couples. New professionals may wonder: Is this an option for me, or one merely reserved for “stars” among senior faculty? The Stanford Dual-Career Research Report (URL above) found that about 25% of individuals negotiating partner hires in the United States are assistant professors. However, negotiating a dual hire looks a little bit different for junior versus senior faculty. According to the Stanford report, compared to those hired at the rank of associate or full professor, assistant professors were more likely to raise the issue of a partner hire at later stages of the interview process, (i.e., after a verbal or written offer had been extended). Conventional wisdom suggests that prospective junior faculty avoid disclosing the need for a partner hire too soon, for fear that the hiring committee will - consciously or not - gravitate toward an unattached competitor. These concerns are not unfounded, but should be weighed against the fact that the sooner a hiring institution learns about the need for a partner hire, the quicker they can mobilize their resources to attempt to make that possible.

The Higher Education Recruiting Consortium (HERC) also provides support for academic couples. HERC maintains free regional search engines for faculty positions, allowing for partners to link their profiles to enable dual-career searches. Regional

HERCs also maintain resources for academics interested in non-faculty university positions and jobs outside academia. To find information about your regional HERC and participating institutions, visit <http://www.hercjobs.org>.

#3 Leaving Your Partner Behind

Of course, the transition to your first academic appointment can also produce short- or long-term periods of geographical separation from a romantic partner. In these cases, the heartache of an absent partner can compound the stress of beginning a new academic post. On the bright side, you may find that you can get a lot of work done in your quasi-solitude. The rigors of your first position may be more manageable when there isn't a partner waiting at home while you burn the midnight oil. Of course, this comment is not meant to reinforce the norm of the ideal worker as one who is free from responsibilities of family and care work. But it may help you to reframe your time apart from your partner as a focused period where you can get done what you need to in order to bring the two of you together again.

Another thing to keep in mind is that because much of the incidental and routine interaction has been removed from your relationship (e.g., seeing each other off to work in the morning), you and your partner may have to carve out blocks of daily togetherness. This may be obvious to you, but less so to your new departmental colleagues. Those with live-in partners, for example, likely don't have face-to-face conversations each night that parallel you and your partner's "protected" Skype time. Therefore, it may be worthwhile to gently remind the more receptive among your colleagues that your primary family responsibilities take a mediated form. From what I understand, good departments are sufficiently invested in the diversity, stability, and engagement of their junior faculty so as to support their unique work-life arrangements.

Agree? Disagree? Let's Discuss...

I would like to close with an invitation to the IARR membership to continue this conversation on the web. Benjamin Le has been so kind as to create an online discussion board on the IARR website so that new professionals and senior colleagues can weigh in with their experiences, opinions, advice, and

resources. I encourage you to join the discussion at <http://www.iarr.org/new-professionals-discussion/> and I look forward to learning from you all!

Additional resources:

American Association of University Professors (2010). *AAUP Recommendations on Partner Accommodation and Dual Career Appointments; Report of the Committee on Women in the Academic Profession*. Retrieved from <http://www.aaup.org/AAUP/comm/rep/dual.htm/>

Bell, D. A. (2010, May 13). The intricacies of spousal hiring. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from <http://chronicle.com/article/The-Intricacies-of-Spousal/65456/>.

Confessions of a(n IARR) Conference Planner

by Leah E. Bryant
DePaul University

Please note that these are my musings. Depending upon the author, this article would likely look different, but also probably similar. For months I have been trying to decide how to frame this – as a cautionary tale? An airing of grievances (it is almost Festivus season, after all)? A how-to guide? Instead, I settled on just sharing my experiences as one of your local hosts of the 2012 IARR Chicago Conference.

How it All Began

Let me tell you a story. But bear in mind, the exact detail and facts are a bit lost in the storytelling process. A long time ago INPR and ISSPR came back together (because there was, what I understand to be, a break-up) to form what is now known as IARR. A decision was made, perhaps in Madison, that IARR would have a biannual conference. Sue Sprecher created an off-year conference with a Compassionate Love theme. That conference structure is still used today. It was a smashing success. It's true; I was there.

And now fast-forward a bit in time. One afternoon in Chicago, I picked up Sue on the street. It's also true. She was rolling her suitcase down Sheffield Avenue by my house (explanation: her daughter used to be my neighbor). I pulled over and offered her ride. It was okay, because we weren't strangers. Sue learned of my involvement in planning the Kansas University New Scholar's Workshop, as the former mentorship chair, that was one of the responsibilities. That gave Sue an idea...when the future conferences committee (name is approximate) was beginning to become concerned because no one was coming forward to propose the 2012 conference, she approached Ralph Erber, my colleague in the Psychology Department, and me about co-planning a conference. I love a good conference, a party, and Sue and Ralph, so it seemed like a great idea. Our strategy to dominate the 2012 IARR conference scene simply came together through a series of happy coincidences.

And then we assembled the Dream Team. Sue Sprecher, Ralph Erber, and Sean Horan and I led the charge of local arrangements with the help of Stan Treger. We had Sandra Metts and Lesley Verhofstadt as the amazing program planners. Summer Brown was hired as our director of registration. And during this process, we had the unwavering support of two IARR Presidents, Anita Vangelisti and Chris Agnew. Each and everyone named here was vital in, what I consider to be, the success of the 2012 Chicago conference.

Decisions Had to Be Made

At first, conference planning was so much fun! This was when it was in the conceptual stage. We were courted by hotels, given tours of beautiful spaces, got to taste lots of great food. Then, when decisions had to be made, things got a little tricky. The contracts, in particular, were tricky. Here are some fun facts. When deciding how many rooms to include in the hotel room block, we had be aware that if a certain percentage of the total was not reached we would be penalized an extraordinary amount (it was so scary, I cannot even remember the exact number). To have powerpoint in the room where we had the Anita Vangeliti's Past-President's talk would have cost over four-thousand dollars (YES, \$4000). If we were to have had a cash bar, which we considered, a bowl of nuts on a the

cocktail tables would cost approximately \$37 each(which led to Sue's "nut test" – she would ask if the venue would be amenable to us bringing in our own nuts, and if they were, we knew they were generally accommodating). And if we did not have non-profit status then renting the reception space would have been cost-prohibitive.

Many questions were asked. All emails were kept. This proved to be of extraordinary value, figuratively and literally. At some point we were told that if we brought our own powerpoint and used it in two of the hotel break-out rooms, but no more than two, we would not have to pay all of the associated costs (remember, \$4000!). Sue verified this, triple checked it, and we got powerpoint access for two of the hotel break out rooms. We cheered. And then there was, what I will kindly call, a misunderstanding with one of the restaurants where we contracted dinner. Archived emails were retrieved; and let's just say that the food provided was far superior to what it would have otherwise been.

Trying to Foresee the Unforeseen

In 2012, there was a record number of conference submissions, almost twice that of the largest previous conference. Logic would dictate that there would in turn be a record number of attendees. Countless hours were spent trying to predict the future so decisions could be made about space allocation, head counts for lunches and dinners, the size of the hotel room block, the number of programs to print, the number of volunteers needed on each day and in which space, ad naseum (really, it makes my stomach hurt just remembering these details). The number of attendees grew to the point where the Berghoff Restaurant could no longer accommodate all of the attendees (Buddy Guy to the rescue!). The hotel room block was filled before early bird registration ended (the ability to increase the room block to the rescue!).

Many sleepless nights involved visions of conference attendees at the Daley Center instead of the Daley Building, long elevator lines, confusion about which elevators go where leading to attendees wandering the halls of the Daley Building (not Center), lost attendees wandering the streets of Chicago overcome by the sheer mass of humanity

that is the Taste of Chicago (which every year has occurred over the 4th of July weekend, until this year), overflowing rooms because of limited space, Public Safety deciding not to open the building on Sunday (but they didn't, thank goodness, after a lot of begging and baked goods), etc.

In response to these visions, we worked with Public Safety to make sure the space we intended to use was in fact useable. We found amazing volunteers and interns who were stationed at all conceivable locations to help direct people to the right locations. There was strategic scheduling of panels to ensure that there would not be elevator overload. We created maps, walking directions, human guides with signs, and pretty much whatever else we could think of to help attendees navigate the 1-mile stretch of State Street that encompassed the locations of the conference (okay, the Chicago Cultural Center was one block east of State Street and Buddy Guy's Legends was one block west).

The Kindness of Others

The generosity of and support of others is what makes IARR conferences a success. Wendy Samter had the support of Bryant College (no relation), helping to make the 2008 conference a great success. Through Mario Mikulincer and his institution's extraordinary support, the 2010 conference was truly incredible. Having planned a conference, I can better understand the decisions that are constrained by things like location, meeting space, and cost. These are considerations that are complex and difficult to manage.

Our goal, when putting together the Chicago conference, was to highlight the wonderful programming, utilize the city, and not exceed a \$300 registration fee including the reception. This would not have been possible without the help of many people. The space we used at DePaul University was donated by the College of Communication and the College of Digital Media, saving us tens of thousands of dollars. Ralph Erber got the reception at the Berghoff Restaurant (it was the first business in the U.S. to receive a liquor license, by the way) subsidized by DePaul's College of Liberal Arts and Social Sciences and the College of Science and Health. The other receptions and their contents were either paid for, or subsidized by, DePaul University,

Purdue University, and Wheaton College. Everything distributed at registration (e.g., messenger bag, program, pen, etc.) was graciously donated by the Chancellor of Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis, Illinois State University, and DePaul University. Our registration expert used the existing account system at DePaul to save us thousands of dollars in processing fees. And all of our conference volunteers donated their time, without the promise of any compensation. Therefore, the cost of registration did not truly reflect the actual cost of the conference, as it was subsidized in large part by other institutions and generous people.

There are many unsung heroes who helped make the conference a success. I am indebted to the following people (among many others): Gina Marroquin (Volunteer Coordinator), Shannon Carton (Book Exhibit Manager), Danielle Chiamonte, Samantha Grazziano, Hope Cornelis, Nancy Brule, Maureen Erber, Adriane Stoner, and David French.

And I would be remiss in not mentioning this. Because so much time and effort was invested in trying to make the Chicago conference a success, while keeping the cost low, I was bracing myself for the onslaught of criticism that seemed inevitable with hosting upwards of 700 people who were subject to the outcome of all of our many decisions. This is no lie, the only criticisms I received were constructive and thoughtful. The feedback I received was almost entirely positive. However, I know that it is unrealistic to believe that everything was perfect to everyone. This speaks to the graciousness of our members who understand that hosting a conference, without compensation, is a labor of love for IARR and its members. But we were paid for this conference with your kindness. And for that, we will always be grateful.

Next Time

There will only be a next time if I can work with the Dream Team.

Tracking Tenure and Promotion

Edited by H. Colleen Sinclair
Mississippi State University

There are few greater jobs than being a full professor. However, it can seem a daunting task to many as to how to proceed through the ranks. Accordingly, we have assembled some advice for those heading up the tenure track. We provide two articles, one on the move from assistant to associate professor and the other on the move from associate to full professor, written by those of us who have recently “survived” the process. We hope this advice will assist in helping you thrive rather than just survive.

From Assistant to Associate
 H. Colleen Sinclair
 Mississippi State University

Having recently made my way up the tenure track to the esteemed position of Associate Professor, I thought that my last contribution to *Relationships Research News* could be advice about what to do or what to expect. At first, I thought the challenge of this piece would be coming up with something worthwhile to write as, despite my recent experience, I certainly do not feel like an expert on the topic. Upon doing some research, consulting with colleagues (who all also recently achieved the rank of associate professor), and talking with new scholars, I found instead that the challenge was going to be fitting everything into the allotted space.

So let me start with recommending some resources. People often reference the book *Getting Tenure* by Marica Whicker, Jennie Kronenfeld, and Ruth Ann Strickland as they list the “Ten Commandments of Tenure” and, in particular, are a valuable resource about the political aspect of tenure. After all, you are a “candidate” for tenure. And, as noted by Mawdsley (1999) collegiality is a growing consideration in tenure decisions and often explains failed applications (especially those decisions that seem to run counter to record). Picking up a copy of the Whicker and colleagues' book might help inform you on that aspect as well as others. If not the

Whicker et al. text, Amazon.com would be happy to show you other more contemporary options.

Also, the Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues has a number of pertinent articles for early career scholars including “Controlled Chaos: Collecting Materials for Administrative Review” by Kim Case, which has a lot of valuable advice about putting together the tenure application. I highly recommend checking out the article and a number of others on the site: <http://www.spssi.org/index.cfm?fuseaction=page.viewpage&pageid=1445>

Now for some additional tips:

1. *Take Responsibility:* Find out – even as early on as during the interview stage - what the expectations are at your university in your position for teaching, research, and service. Ask about average success rates. Ask multiple people (e.g., department heads, members of the Promotion & Tenure committee). Ask those who recently obtained tenure. Ask about those who didn't. And ask repeatedly (as things may change, especially if it isn't in writing). In any case, take responsibility for finding out the expectations at your institution for your position - the earlier the better.
2. *Never too early:* It is never too early to look at the application materials of others and start planning what the table of contents is going to be for your research, teaching, and service binders. Filling it in as you go will make your life substantially easier come application time.
3. *Strategize Publishing:* Rather than repeat the advice offered in recent past issues of RRN related to writing, the question that seems to come up most with regard to tenure is “how much?” There have been various studies that have attempted to quantify the productivity of academic psychologists. Averaging across schools (research institutions to teaching-focused colleges) may not help much as demands vary depending on institution, but averages ranged from .91-1.83 per year for assistant professors, 1.19-1.79 for associate professors, and 2.27 to 2.31 for full professors (see Joy, 2006 for review broken down by institution type).

However, you will probably find a theme of "quality is better than quantity" in the advice from many (Hunt & Cleary, 2011). Thus try to identify your strongest set of studies - those which you think make the most compelling contribution to the field - to package and submit to a high tier journal.

With rejection rates so high, it will feel like a long shot, but one well worth it if made, as not only does it build your vita but also your reputation.

At the same time as having your best paper making the run at the big journals, have your 2-3 brief reports (though see Ledgerwood & Sherman's 2012 cautions about flash reports) and single studies ready for the sub-field journals. You may even feel you have a 'safety' journal like you had a 'safety' school when applying to grad school. Somewhere you felt you could get in, and would be happy to do so, but wasn't *JPS*.

Also, consider proposing a "special issue" for a journal in your area. This will allow you to network with those in your research area – who could serve as future collaborators or external letter writers – and add to your publications.

4. *Realistic Goals*: Learn to set realistic goals for what you want to accomplish at the daily, weekly, monthly, and semester level. Academics often underestimate how long it will take them to complete a task, so be the empiricist about it. Start a spreadsheet that tracks how many words you write in your writing hours, how long it takes you to read an article, how many weeks it takes to really respond to reviews. This may sound like OCD, but it really helps to identify your individual level of productivity and when you sit back and look it gives you a really nice picture of all that you do in fact accomplish. Further, setting realistic goals means you will likely be able to complete tasks identified on annual reviews consistently, which is a bonus when the tenure committee looks back over your annual reviews during the application process.
5. *Avoid the Service "Chute."* Many people will likely caution you about not saying "yes" to

everything. Like some sort of chute on a game of chutes and ladders, service can be a pitfall many new faculty fall into, especially in smaller departments or when they want to be a good citizen and think service will make them appear so. The best advice I got with regard to service is to develop a "service agenda."

Much like you have teaching statements and research statements, consider what you want a service statement to say. What do you want to do with service? Do you want to contribute to the development of minority scientists by volunteering on undergraduate research committees? Do you want to make science accessible to the public by developing a blog? Do you want to improve the quality of science in your field by serving as a journal editor or grant reviewers? What is your service goal? Identify it and identify service opportunities that fit within that goal. This enables you to say "no, serving on the parking committee doesn't fit within my service agenda of mentoring junior scholars" but also helps you build a role in your department, university, or national organizations.

6. *I don't have anything against birds, but...:* There are multiple ways that you can kill two birds with one stone. If you mentor undergraduate research assistants, see if you can't turn your lab into a course. If you teach large sections of introduction classes, see if you can't run mini-studies in the class (particularly if the subject pool is in demand). If you need to do a lot of reading in a particular area, propose a graduate seminar on the topic. If there are some senior scholars with whom you would like to network, chair a symposium and invite them as panel members. In any case, think about how what you are doing can serve multiple goals.
7. *Applying Yourself*: Discussion of applying for grants and awards should probably be a stand-alone feature, like writing. It can be difficult to find motivation to work on grants when it can be so much work for so little reward. Hours and days can disappear when working on a grant. And then, months later, you get your notice of rejection, many times with no word as to why. Yet, it is important to keep trying. Some universities will just want to see evidence that

you have attempted to seek funding each year. Others will make acquiring it an explicit requirement of tenure. (See tip #1.) Do get the advice of your department head on the necessity of a grant and consider the needs of your students for support.

As with publishing, be strategic in your choices. Although it is worthwhile to plan for the NSF Career grant, you want to maintain back-up plans. Don't rule out smaller grants. Obtaining these is like building good credit. It shows you can be funded. You may wish to consider one smaller every other year (or every year) along with one larger, but try for grants that *do* give you feedback about your application so that you can use this feedback to shape future applications (ask the program officer if feedback is provided).

8. *Beyond Teaching Evaluations:* If you have a high teaching load, your teaching evaluations are probably going to be as important as your publication count. You should find out what the averages are for your department (usually available from Institutional Research offices), and work to be above the average. Once there, you can feel like you hit a ceiling for how high your evaluations can go (and note, it is okay to start fair and show upward progress - some might even recommend this as a strategy).

If your university requires "excellence" in teaching, you should further consider a) teaching awards (usually available at both university and national levels), b) publishing in teaching journals, c) developing new courses, d) collecting student letters of support (keep every unsolicited thank you e-mail and card - after application, they make a nice collage), and e) tracking indicators of students success inside and outside the classroom such as presentations, jobs, and student awards.

However, you should likely avoid summer teaching or taking on extra courses. Even at primarily teaching universities, a publication or grant that you work on in the summer is going to be more worthwhile on your vita than an additional course. Plus, you may get burned out

teaching the same thing over and over with no break.

9. *Subject to Review:* Start thinking early about who you think will be good external reviewers for your area of research. This is what conferences are good for. Find those already tenured working in your area at comparable universities. Approach them (they won't bite - mostly) and get to know them. Ask questions about research, new directions. Have a drink. Invite them to speak as part of a symposium panel. Maybe some will turn into collaborators (which will help you in other ways such as publishing with known authors), but know that then they cannot write your letters for you if you have worked with them.
10. *Brand Yourself:* In this age of social media, you need an online presence. Preferably, this should be one you control. When you ego-surf, what do you find? Are you an environmentalist in Fargo? Are you wanted for bouncing checks in Charlotte? No, those are just "name twins." Are there pictures publicly available from your Facebook account that shows some things that should have stayed in Vegas? Or maybe you have less than a hot pepper rating on RateMyProfessors.com? Maybe not, but that might be what shows up when someone searches for your name. Wouldn't you rather have professional profiles on LinkedIN, Academia.edu, or ResearchGate so that when people search for your research area your name comes up? Or maybe a blog that contributes to the dissemination of science to the community? Join the staff at the Huffington Post or Science of Relationships. Create online profiles and virtual CVs (e.g., at visualcv.com), and make sure that the first thing that comes up in a Google search is the you that you want people to see.

Generally speaking, that last piece of advice extends to life off-line and the entire tenure application process. In many ways, it is an exercise in impression management. So you need to decide what kind of scholar you want to be and align your work to meet that goal. The earlier you know, the faster the pieces will come together. For although five-seven years seems a ways down the road, it will

arrive faster than anticipated – best to start applying now.

References cited:

Hunt, G. E. & Cleary, M. (2011). Quality is better than quantity when it comes to publications. *Journal of Clinical Nursing, 20*, 70-72.

Joy, S. (2006). What should I be doing and where are they doing it? Scholarly productivity of academic psychologists. *Perspectives on Psychology Science, 1*, 346-364.

Ledgerwood, A. & Sherman, J. W. (2012). Short, sweet, and problematic? The rise of the short report in psychological science. *Perspectives on Psychological Science, 7*, 60-66.

Mawdsley, R. D. (1999). Collegiality as a factor in tenure decisions. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education, 13*, 167-1777.

Promotion to Full Professor

Marian M. Morry
University of Manitoba

Having recently been promoted to Full Professor, I must admit that this was the most stressful time in my career. I actually had many bouts of anxiety both during the preparation period and the “waiting to hear” period. While approval at each level brought a brief sense of relief, this was often followed by more anxiety. This seems counterintuitive as applying for tenure should be, and was, stressful. Once you have tenure you would think this stress should be reduced. Not necessarily so.

This application for promotion requires putting yourself “out there” in an entirely new way. More specifically your entire portfolio will be reviewed by colleagues external to your university who will indicate if you meet the criteria of having made an international contribution with your research. For example, at my university the requirements include having “established a wide reputation in his/her field of interest, to be deeply engaged in scholarly work, ... [and] published in sufficient quantity and quality to indicate that the candidate's contribution is widely recognized by academic authorities in his/her field.” In all applications to this point, the research criteria have always been somewhat ambiguous as statements are written to apply to multiple

disciplines with different standards. But, now there are the added ambiguities of what qualifies as “being recognized in your field” or “having a wide reputation”?

Let's start at the beginning, should you apply for promotion to Full Professor. The decisions based on teaching and service tend to be fairly simple. For every course we receive teaching evaluations and as long as these are consistently in the good to excellent range no worries. My university looks for consistency over time to see if you've changed in the last few years; ramped up your teaching just for the promotion application. In regards to service, if you meet the requirements set out for your department and faculty committee work you are well on your way. You also need to show though that you are willing to perform service at the level of a Full Professor. This includes sitting on graduate student committees (if you have a graduate program), performing reviews for granting councils, and sitting on association committees. You also probably have a good sense from your yearly performance reviews whether or not you are meeting the university criteria for teaching and service.

The hard decision involves the research component. There are no hard and fast rules here. When I applied, a few colleagues in other departments and I stressed over this component in different ways: I haven't published a book, I haven't received an external grant, my publications are all in second tier journals, ... The bottom line was always “is it enough?” My advice here is based on my conversation with my department chair.

- 1) Talk to your department chair. Does he or she think your application would be approved (at least at the department and faculty levels)? Is there anything that he or she thinks you need to do to improve your application?
- 2) Talk to your colleagues in your department/area. If there is a specific point you are concerned about (no book, no grant, to top-tier publication) ask them if, in general, they see that one aspect as a concern.
- 3) Look at the CVs of colleagues in your department/area who are already at the Full Professor level. This will give you some sense of what is needed.

While each of these steps can create their own level of anxiety, in the long run they will save you a lot of work. You may find that you need to wait a year or two and improve on one or two areas. However, you may also find that you were worried about something that may not be a serious issue.

The next step is preparing your promotion materials. In many ways this application is similar to your earlier tenure and promotion experiences. You need to gather and present evidence of your research, teaching, and service. As usual, you think you are prepared as you have been duly collecting all materials and keeping them in one place. Well, some of us do this. As you fill in the forms and start organizing the material, you will find that there are items missing. Remember you probably have 15 or more years of “stuff” to collect, organize, and present in a coherent fashion. Invariably this will take time and something will need to be located and added. Giving lots of time to prepare will reduce last minute panics. Having said that, starting too early means you may have to update your materials as new teaching evaluations arrive, manuscripts move through the journals, and so on. This could also be time when you might start second guessing your decision to apply. Don’t.

At my university, when you submit this application you are also requested to submit the names and contact information for five (yes 5) individuals who could be potential external reviewers. Some universities do not have this requirement and search for the individuals themselves. In either case, the university will try to get 2-3 individuals to comment on whether or not your research (and teaching and service) meet the criteria for Full Professor. How do you choose these individuals? Well, first they have to be at the rank of Full Professor already which narrows the pool of alternatives considerably. Second, is your university an undergraduate only program or is there a graduate program in your area? If you are at an undergraduate only university you may want to nominate at least some individuals who know about the challenges of research and publishing in a similar type of institute. Third, although this may go without saying, try to pick people who like you. Not your best friend but also not diametrically opposed to your theories, research, or viewpoints. Finally, it also helps if they know who you are: Do they know your name? Your research?

And then you wait and feel anxious. And you wait and briefly forget about it. And then someone asks how the process is going, comments on their own application, or a committee meets, or an external reviewer’s letter comes in and you feel anxious again. This process is also incredibly long; mine was 7 months from the date of submission to the final letter from the President.

So, while many aspects of this application are similar to what you have done before, there are some new pieces. My only advice is to (a) start early and (b) talk to your department chair and colleagues. Then, when your application is approved celebrate.

Inclusion of Kim Kardashian in Your Scientific Self

**By Ty Tashiro
Writer, Discovery Network**

Three years ago, in the dim light of my windowless office at the University of Colorado, I let my mind wander away from my academic life and it never came back. I dreamed about how great it would be to write for eight hours a day, unencumbered by faculty meetings, committee work, or university politics. Some of my research assistants, who also worked for bestselling business author Jim Collins, had planted these ideas over the course of a few months. They had observed my struggle to handle the deluge of work outside of the research and teaching that I loved and eventually began to suggest in hushed tones, “You should do what Jim does...”

So, after one particularly stressful stretch, I did. In hindsight, I should have exercised more constraint before leaving academia and pursuing a career as a popular press writer. Luckily, things are working out as I am completing my first book this month and landed a writing position with the Discovery Network’s Fit and Health Channel. For those of you considering a career in the popular press, I have a few observations from my odd, but enjoyable pursuit of this new career path.

1. No Heuristics, Just Unbearable and Effortful Processing. There is no uniform “way” to write a book. If submitting a scientific article for peer review feels haphazard, then the process of just figuring out where and how to submit a book proposal will feel like pure chaos. How to write sample material is also entirely nebulous because the most common advice you receive is to keep writing until you find your “voice.” Your voice is a diffuse construction, defined roughly by the structure, tone, or content of your writing. I can’t tell you how to do it, but I can tell you that your voice will change dramatically when you go to write popular press versus scientific pieces.

2. The Dissonance Between Scientific and Popular Press Motives: My Discovery Health articles appear once a week and are limited to 300 words. I am constantly trying to balance the need to draw readership to the site, while also presenting a fair representation of the research. Creating a harmonious interdependence between these two distinct goals is not easy. On the science end, it’s difficult to figure out when to explain inconsistent findings, point out methodological flaws, and even when to use references.

I find myself reading peer reviewed journals, but also reading *50 Shades of Grey*, examining the attractiveness of swimmer Ryan Lochte, and tracking Kim Kardashian with Google Alerts for a future article.¹ What I’ve learned is that these “trending” topics are one of the most reliable ways to draw reader’s attention, which allows you to deliver a dollop of science, about things like defining criteria for sexual disorders, fluctuating asymmetry, or correlates of infidelity.

3. Positive Illusions About Sales. The assumption that getting a book published guarantees financial success is a case of an unhelpful positive illusion. In fact, most relationship popular press books do not sell well because it’s a “crowded area.” Finding a unique angle for your book proposal is critical to finding an agent, publisher, and for selling books in among hundreds of relationship titles is challenging.

4. Lack of Social Support Is Normal. If you ask seasoned nonfiction writers for advice about how to write a book, their most common response is, “Don’t do it.” You think they’re joking, but then you find

out that they’re dead serious. This is partly because writing a great social science book is usually done with a “narrative nonfiction” style, which means that the book contains engaging stories written with the richness of a fictional tale, while also being rooted in nonfiction facts. Michael Lewis, one of the best narrative nonfiction writers, has said that narrative nonfiction brings all of the creative headaches that face novelists coupled with all of the research and fact checking of nonfiction writing.

5. Person x Other Interactions. What is so difficult about writing a great social science book is learning how to deftly incorporate the tools of a great fiction writer. I was very fortunate to work under great advisors with excellent writing styles in graduate school, but it still took me over a year to begin to grasp three writing fundamentals that make popular press books successful: scene, character, and plot. Writing great stories is essentially a creative process of creating vivid Environments (scene), in which the Person interacts with various Others (characters) and the plot emerges through the Person x Other interactions.ⁱⁱ

6. It’s Not the Partner, It’s the Actor. The biggest challenge for many writers is that you really have to sell yourself. Gone are the days when writers turned in books and then let their publishers worry themselves about sales. Publishers expect you to build a “platform” with Twitter, Facebook, and blogging, which provides a base for you to promote your book once published.

One symptom of producing more content for the public eye through social media and blogging is that anyone can take shots from the peanut gallery. Although some of the negative comments you receive from the cyberspace crowd are unreasonable and can raise one’s defenses, most of the negative feedback is informative and can be used by novice writers to adapt their voice.

Conclusions and Career Advice

Being a writer has provided great freedom and the challenges have been invigorating. However, the work of a writer can be very lonely, so any good relationship scientist knows that it’s important to be mindful about creating social situations. I often find myself missing the informal discourse with colleagues about the nuts and bolts of psychological

theory or research and the enthusiasm and curiosity that students infuse into the work environment.

For people looking to move into a popular press career, I've included some supplementary materials and references on my personal blog, sexlovescience.tumblr.com.ⁱⁱⁱ For graduate students, I have an old school piece of advice, which is that the training you are receiving will be your most valuable asset. Your advisors' demands for clarity in your scientific writing, rigor with your research methods, and insistence that you thoroughly review the research literature, will be one of the keys for distinguishing yourself in whatever career you choose to pursue.

ⁱ I've found that one of the keys to successful articles is letting the trending stories in the popular press drive your choice of scientific topic.

ⁱⁱ In the first paragraph, I've tried to tell you selected details about when and where my experience took place (scene), some key people present during that process (characters), and set a decision to be made (plot).

ⁱⁱⁱ Include supplemental material on your social media to drive traffic to your sites, like sexlovescience.tumblr.com

HUMOR COLUMN

“I Have This Friend Who...”

by **David A. Kenny**
University of Connecticut

This column is semi-serious. More accurately, it is hemi-semi-demi serious. Also, like all of my columns, you should not believe anything you read in what follows. I have this very close

friend who retired last year, and this column is about retirement. He has shared with me his feelings about retirement and I want to share them with you. (If you want an intelligent and serious discussion about retirement issues, I strongly urge you look up the several excellent columns in previous issues of newsletter by Paul Wright on this topic.)

My friend is having all sorts of difficulties with retirement. However, I think, in principal, retirement in academia is absolutely necessary. Most of the training that we receive in graduate school is out-of-date in ten or so years. Academics need to be continuously re-tooling, and alas many of us (not you and me, of course) are just incapable of doing so. For instance, I know of a very famous colleague who gave his hand-written notes to a secretary who would then send out emails and print out the responses, so he could “reply.” The evidence gathered by my ex-student, Dean Simonton, is that we are most productive around age 40, and for most people there is a rather a steep decline in productivity after that. Some faculty stay on way too long (for some it is one year!), and fail to give opportunities to new faculty who are better trained and more likely to develop original and innovative ideas. Of course, these concerns about becoming “dead wood” apply to other people, and not to you, me, or my friend.

Back to that friend. He told me that there were things about his job that he hated. Among these were grading students, teaching students who were only there because they were required to be, going to meetings (especially meetings with self-important administrators), and suffering through talks. I was shocked to learn that my good friend found almost every talk boring, even mine! So, he reasoned that he could still do all the things he liked about his job, but once retired he would no longer have to do the things he hated doing. He could spend all this extra time doing the things that he really wanted to do, like learning to program in a new language, revising his webpages and creating webinars, and finishing papers that he started a decade ago. On the personal side, he could spend more time with his grandchildren during “work” hours and not feel guilty about that, and he was spending more time at the gym (he says he has lost a bunch of weight, but from looking at him I really doubt it), the golf course (his golf handicap has gone up), and on the softball

team (he did not make MVP). It all seemed to make perfect sense to him and he decided to retire. But, he tells me that he was very naïve about the whole notion of retirement.

The first thing that surprised him when he told people that he was retiring was that they congratulated him. For what was he being congratulated? Still being alive at retirement age? I do not think that it was that. Was it being financially able to retire? Maybe, but that begs the question as to why it is better to be retired than to be working. He figured out that he was being congratulated because now he did not have to go to work. But he liked going to work. Part of the idea is that with retirement you can finally do the things you really wanted to do, but he was already doing that. He was retiring so that he would not have to do the things he did not like to do. He slowly learned to smile and say “thank you” when someone congratulated him on his retirement.

The second thing that surprised him is that most people presume that if you are retired you are no longer working. This should have not surprised him as this is what retirement usually indicates... duh. When he would show up at work faculty, students, and staff would say, “What are you doing here?” Again, there is the idea that one does not work if one does not have to, or perhaps one does not work unless one is getting paid to do so?

The third thing that surprised him is his status had officially changed now that he was retired. His title changed. His rank was no longer Professor, but rather Emeritus (not to be confused with airline named Emirates). Shut your eyes and imagine an Emeritus or Emerita Professor. What do you see? Somebody with white hair hunched over a cane is what I see. Some universities have a special rank for active retired faculty, but no such rank exists at his university. Being listed as emeritus had effects on his work. On the plus side, when an editor looks up his email address and sees that he is now “emeritus,” sometimes they did not ask him to review the paper. On the negative side, some interesting and informative emails regarding his work were likely not sent. Also, invitations to collaborate, visit, or talk might not have been sent. Also, as a retired faculty member he lost some university resources. For instance, he immediately lost his mailbox and his

mail was put in an out-of-the-way blue basket. He was allowed to keep his large corner office for only one year after retirement, but now he has a smaller, though very adequate one, without a window. He agreed that faculty who are teaching and on the payroll deserve the prime offices, services, and support, but he felt that there is the not so subtle message sent that retired faculty members are irrelevant. He even said to me, “I feel like I am being treated like the walking dead, and I am not even as interesting as a zombie.” I just think he is being paranoid, don’t you?

My friend claims he does not regret retiring, but he wishes that he had more fully appreciated all the implications of his decision beforehand. As I said earlier, I am very close to my friend. So close that I sleep with his wife, and we have very similar social security numbers, maybe even the same one. So I feel for the guy. But I certainly am not going to do something so ill-advised as to retire before my time. If I were to retire, I might as well start lecturing an empty chair!

WEB NEWS

**by Benjamin Le
Haverford College**

After a two year vacation, I’m stepping back in as point-person for the IARR website, with the support of the *ScienceOfRelationships.com* team. If you’ve been to the site in the last couple of months, you’ll see that it’s been refreshed and reorganized. Much of the core content has been retained, but we’ve modernized the look and functionality, as well as added features that highlight the organization and promote relationship research to a wider audience.

Here’s what I need from you:

1) Links and articles about relationship research, either about your own work or from other sources. If

we want to elevate the profile of our discipline, we need interesting things for our audience to be reading.

2) Please contribute to the “250 words” project on the site. The goal is to have members, in their own words, describe some aspect of relationship research or the organization, so that a broad audience can see what we do. Each of us is passionate about relationship research and committed to IARR, so let’s share our enthusiasm with readers of the site!

3) Are there features that you would like to see added to the site? Your input is always welcome. How can we make the site more useful or interesting?

Lastly, please join me in thanking student-member Lydia Emery for helping launch the new site. Without her help, we wouldn’t have been able to get the new site up and running so quickly.

JOURNALS UPDATE

A Report on Personal Relationships **By Julie Fitness** **Macquarie University,** **Sydney, Australia**

I am delighted to be submitting my first report as Editor of *Personal Relationships* to the November, 2012 edition of Relationship Research News. As members of IARR will be aware, *Personal Relationships* has flourished over the last four years under the editorship of Professor Lorne Campbell and his outstanding team of Associate Editors (Chris Agnew, Anita Barbee, Gurit Birnbaum, Susan Branje, Chip Knee, Tim Loving, Nickola Overall and Theo van Tilburg). Although Lorne and his team officially handed over the reins on the 31st May, 2012, they

have been kept busy over the last few months, finishing up the manuscripts that were under review at the time of the handover. I am sure they will be experiencing strong feelings of satisfaction and relief as they process their final papers, except for Nickola Overall, who has generously agreed to serve another term as Associate Editor on my team. I am extremely grateful to Nickola, and to Ashley Duggan, Omri Gillath, Ed Lemay, Marian Morry, and Elaine Scharfe, all of whom have taken up positions as Associate Editors on PR for the next 2-4 years.

Like the outgoing team, we have also been kept busy since June with new submissions to PR (54 between 1st June and 1st October) and would like to express our appreciation to those who have submitted papers for their patience while we have been familiarizing ourselves with ScholarOne’s processes and idiosyncrasies. The publishers (Wiley) have been extremely helpful over the transition period, and I would also like to acknowledge the wonderful advice and support I have received from Lorne and Nickola at every stage of the handover process.

Each of the incoming Associate Editors has a strong research background in a diversity of disciplinary fields, and they all share a commitment to the overall goals of the journal – i.e., to promote world-class scholarship in the field of personal relationships from all parts of the world, using a wide variety of methodologies and throughout a broad range of disciplines. Most importantly, we are looking for research that exemplifies theoretical coherence, methodological rigor and communicative clarity, whatever its disciplinary origins. We believe that the study of personal relationships is itself a ‘discipline’ that must be founded on strong scientific principles and that relationship scholars should be striving to build an integrated and reliable body of knowledge about the whys and wherefores of relationship phenomena. In short, *Personal Relationships* is not a ‘last resort’ journal for papers that cannot find a home in mainstream social psychology journals; it is a specialist journal with its own ethos that aims for the highest standards in personal relationship research.

Currently the journal is in good shape, with an ISI impact rating of 0.859 and a 5 yr impact factor of 1.64. Our hope is that these impact ratings will continue to rise over the next few years, not simply because of current pressures for academics to publish in, and review for, high impact journals, but because we strongly believe that the caliber of scientific research published in PR is amongst the best in the world, and deserves the widest possible readership. Further, while the papers published in PR are scientifically important, they also have the potential to enhance the relationships of real people, in the real world. Thus, we will employ a variety of strategies to extend the reach and impact of PR, e.g., by undertaking reviews of citation records for PR papers over time and analyzing the themes of those that have had the most impact; by producing one or two special issues on cutting-edge relationship topics over our 4 year term; by soliciting the occasional article from distinguished scholars on ground-breaking topics; and by finding ways to increase international publicity coverage for PR papers, including notifying major international societies with a TOC alert when a new issue comes out.

In conclusion, Personal Relationships is doing well, and our new editorial team is committed to its ongoing success. I would encourage all IARR members to promote the journal to your colleagues and libraries, and to consider PR as a potential publication outlet for your most interesting and important research.

Tentative Contents of Upcoming Journals

Personal Relationships *December 2012 [Volume 19 #4]* *Table of Contents*

STEPHANIE S. SPIELMANN, GEOFF
MACDONALD & JENNIFER L. TACKETT
Social threat, social reward, and regulation of
investment in romantic relationships

JUDY EATON & CARRIE B. SANDERS

A little help from our friends: Informal third parties
and interpersonal conflict

JAYE L. DERRICK, KENNETH E. LEONARD &
GREGORY G. HOMISH

Dependence regulation in newlywed couples: A
prospective examination

MICHAEL W. MYERS & SARA D. HODGES

The structure of self-other overlap and its
relationship to perspective taking

GEROLD MIKULA, BERNHARD RIEDERER &
OTTO BODI

Perceived justice in the division of domestic labor:
Actor and partner effects

CAROLINA PANSERA & JENNIFER LA
GUARDIA

The role of sincere amends and perceived partner
responsiveness in forgiveness

SHELLI L. DUBBS, ABRAHAM P. BUUNK &
JESSICA LI

Parental monitoring, sensitivity toward parents, and
a child's mate preferences

CHRISTOPHER P. FAGUNDES & INES
SCHINDLER

Making of romantic attachment bonds: Longitudinal
trajectories and implications for relationship stability

BRITTANY L. WRIGHT & H. COLLEEN
SINCLAIR

Pulling the strings: Effects of friend and parent
opinions on dating choices

JASON T. CASTILLO & CHRISTIAN M.
SARVER

Nonresident fathers' social networks: The
relationship between social support and father
involvement

ANDY J. MEROLLA

Connecting here and there: A model of long-distance
relationship maintenance

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Help Wanted: 21 Ways You Can Contribute to IARR

The Soul's joy lies in doing.
Percy Bysshe Shelley

Below are 21 different ways you can contribute to IARR. Some can be accomplished in as little as five minutes. Others are projects that are more involved. Whichever activities you select, your time, energy and wisdom will be very much appreciated in helping IARR achieve its purposes.

- Be sure to renew your membership if expires this year (see <http://www.iarr.org/membership/>, click on Update your information to find your renewal date)
- Give a gift membership to a student (see <http://www.iarr.org/membership/>)
- Offer opinions and suggestions on the course IARR is following (contact Dan Perlman, d_perlma@uncg.edu)
- Translate IARR's membership brochure or other documents into a language other than English (contact Rozzana Sánchez Aragón, rozzara@servidor.unam.mx)
- Represent IARR at a meeting of another association that includes some relationship researchers (contact Rozzana Sánchez Aragón, rozzara@servidor.unam.mx)
- Provide advice on the policies and procedures IARR should follow in its efforts to collect and preserve key organizational materials (e.g., materials on the operation of the association, historical materials, etc.) (contact sdboon@ucalgary.ca)
- Send pictures, stories or records of historical value about IARR events and people to Susan Boon for a developing IARR archives (sdboon@ucalgary.ca)
- If you have accounting or financial investing skills, offer advice to the Finance Committee (contact Leah Bryant, lbryant2@depaul.edu)
- Prepare a 250 word answer to be posted on the IARR website addressing a question about relationship research (See <http://www.iarr.org/250-words/>)
- Let your students and others know about IARR's website as a link to members' blogs and media releases including Bjarne Holmes' Relationship Matters podcasts on current research published in *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships* (see <http://www.iarr.org/media-blogs/> and http://spr.sagepub.com/site/podcast/podcast_dir.xhtml)
- Suggest content that you would be willing to prepare or manage that would enhance the IARR web site (contact Ben Le, ble@haverford.edu).
- Offer teaching materials (e.g., syllabi, assignments, activities, lists of web sites, lists of videos, etc.) to Kelly Campbell (kelly@csusb.edu) for a developing web area on the teaching of relationship courses
- Let Jen Theiss know of ways you would be willing to help with mentoring or presenting at IARR-sponsored professional development workshops (jtheiss@rutgers.edu)
- Go to the bottom of the Resources for New Professionals page of the IARR web site (<http://www.iarr.org/new-professionals/>) and offer to be a contact willing to answer questions graduate students and new professionals might have
- Submit a manuscript to the *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships* or *Personal Relationships*
- Discuss your ideas about relationship research as a disciplinary, multidisciplinary or interdisciplinary activity with Ashley Duggan (ashley.duggan@bc.edu)

- Develop a proposal for an IARR sponsored mini-conference (contact Sue Sprecher, sprecher@ilstu.edu)
- Develop a proposal for an IARR sponsored book (contact Anita Vangelisti, vangelisti@austin.utexas.edu)
- Create a subgroup of members with similar interests (contact Rozzana Sánchez Aragón, rozzara@servidor.unam.mx)
- Create a webinar on a topic of potential interest to IARR members (contact Dan Perlman, d_perlma@uncg.edu)
- Offer a contribution that you can make that isn't listed..... (contact Dan Perlman, d_perlma@uncg.edu)

(caughlin@illinois.edu), or Susan Sprecher (sprecher@ilstu.edu). For examples of previously published volumes see: http://www.cambridge.org/us/knowledge/series/series_display/item3936806/Advances-in-Personal-Relationships/?site_locale=en_US

MEMBER NEWS & UPDATES

Awards Report

by Chip Knee
University of Houston
Chair of the Awards Committee

Call for *Advances in Personal Relationships*

IARR invites proposals for authored or edited volumes to be included in the *Advances in Personal Relationships* series, published by Cambridge University Press. The *Advances* series presents cutting edge research and theory in the field of personal relationships. Books in the Series may include integrative reviews, conceptual pieces, summaries of research programs, and/or major theoretical works. Each volume is devoted to a particular topic or theme. In some cases, commentaries on chapters may be included. Achieving the goal of the Series, to present advances in the field in a manner that will attract and stimulate readers, is more important to IARR than is format. The intent, however, is to balance any variation in format with the need for continuity across volumes in the Series. All proposals will be evaluated by anonymous reviewers selected by Cambridge University Press. Please send proposals to Anita Vangelisti (a.vangelisti@mail.utexas.edu). Inquiries can be addressed to Anita Vangelisti, Christopher Agnew (agnew@purdue.edu), John Caughlin

IARR converged upon the Chicago Cultural Center for an evening soirée of hors d'oeuvres, awards, and dancing to celebrate the achievements of our award winners. Nominations for 10 awards were invited earlier in the year. The committee received more than double the usual number of nominations for this particularly popular conference. Serving on the committee were Gurit Birnbaum, Leah Bryant, Eli Finkel, Catrin Finkenauer, and April Trees.

The **Dissertation Award** honored an outstanding dissertation in the field of personal relationships that was defended during 2010 or 2011 and came with \$300. The winning dissertation was conducted by Lindsey A. Beck at Yale University (Chair, Margaret Clark). Lindsey developed a new theoretical model of relationship initiation and then completed eight empirical studies testing various aspects of that model. The dissertation included longitudinal survey data, true experiments, mixed correlational and experimental studies, and studies conducted in both laboratory and real world settings. The dissertation itself was judged to be "distinguished" by the Yale Psychology Department. The work included within this dissertation resulted in four separate publications appearing in *Psychological Science*, the *Journal of*

Experimental Social Psychology, and the *Journal of Family Theory and Review*. Lindsey is senior author on all of these papers.

The **Steve Duck New Scholars Awards** provide a grant of \$500 each to a graduate student and to a new scholar who is within 3 years of receiving his or her Ph.D., in support of their research on personal relationships. The Steve Duck New Scholar Award for predoctoral scholarship went to Judith Gere at the University of Toronto at Mississauga. Her proposed studies investigate whether goal incongruence between partners in romantic relationships depletes self-regulatory resources, making it more difficult to be responsive to a partner's needs. The project involves two studies that experimentally manipulate goal congruence in couples, and tests whether this incongruence depletes self-regulatory resources using multiple tasks and outcomes. The Steve Duck New Scholar Award for beyond the Ph.D. went to Jennifer Tomlinson at Carnegie Mellon University. Her proposed three-component study uses a combination of longitudinal, survey, observational and physiological methods to assess partner support for the self-expansion of recent retirees.

The **Book Award** honored a book published by a member of IARR during 2009 or 2010 that has made a significant and original contribution to the study of personal relationships. The book award went to William Ickes for his 2009 book, "Strangers in a Strange Lab," published by Oxford University Press. The book presents the findings of over 30 years of scientific research on the impact of various individual difference factors on strangers' perceptions and judgments of one another in laboratory-based encounters.

The **Article Award** honored an article published in *Personal Relationships* or *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships* during 2009 or 2010 that has made a significant and original contribution to the study of personal relationships. The Article Award went to Leanne Knobloch and Jennifer Theiss for their 2010 paper titled, "An actor-partner interdependence model of relational turbulence: Cognitions and emotions," published in the *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*. Their paper is a well-conducted dyadic study using APIM and examining cognitions and emotions related to the theoretical model of relational turbulence. It is well-

grounded in relational theory and it is having an impact in the ways scholars are understanding episodes of relational turbulence.

The **Teaching Award** recognized excellence in teaching in the field of personal relationships at the undergraduate and/or graduate level. The Teaching Award went to Kelly Campbell at California State University at San Bernadino. Her graduate and undergraduate courses cover several domains of close relationships. She inspires her students in ways that anyone would admire with them commenting that "she is trying to make us better human beings." Her teaching has been recognized widely by her department and several other organizations as well.

The **Mentoring Award** recognized an outstanding mentor in the field of personal relationships. The award went to Denise Solomon who, unfortunately, was unable to attend the conference. Mike Roloff accepted the award for her and said some wonderful comments about her training and mentoring contributions. Many of Diane's former students have won dissertation awards, early career awards, and teaching awards, and most have gone on to enjoy faculty positions at some of the nation's finest academic institutions.

The **Gerald R. Miller Award for Early Career Achievement** honored the distinguished scientific achievements of a scholar who is still within 10 years of receiving the Ph.D. The award went to Omri Gillath. Omri received his Ph.D. just 9 years ago, yet he has published over 40 papers in refereed journals, plus nine chapters, and is first editor of a major close relationships book published by APA. His work has appeared in the top relationship journals and every top social and personality psychology journal and makes use of a remarkable array of state-of-the-art methods, notably including the groundbreaking application of fMRI to central issues in attachment theory, as well as use of other cutting-edge methods such as genetic analyses, implicit priming, virtual reality, and hormonal interventions. His work is also theoretically inventive, integrating in valuable ways traditional work on attachment theory with areas of the theory previously largely ignored, such as related behavioral systems and pro-social tendencies. Omri is also on the editorial boards of six major journals (including both *PR* and *JSPR*).

The **Berscheid-Hatfield Award for Distinguished Mid-Career Achievement** honored the distinguished scientific achievements of a scholar in the middle stage of her career, that is, between 10 and 25 years beyond the Ph.D. The award went to Terri Orbuch at Oakland University and the University of Michigan. One of Terri's many contributions to the field has been as PI of the ongoing Early Years of Marriage Project. Ever since the project's creators retired in the mid-1990s, Terri has been the driving force behind this project, including two large funded continuation grants. Her nominators explain that this project is the only long term longitudinal study that explicitly compares African American and Caucasian American couples. Its findings have shed important light on the impact of race in American families. It's also one of the most interdisciplinary (not just multidisciplinary) projects in the field, reflecting her three homes in Sociology, Psychology, and Gender Studies. She also recently served as IARR President.

The ceremony culminated with the **Distinguished Career Award** which recognizes a full career of eminent, notable contributions to research in, theories of, or the practice of relationship science. The award is intended to acknowledge a long span of work that has enriched our understanding of personal relationships and contributed much to the field. The award went to Harry Reis at the University of Rochester. Harry's research has contributed immensely to the scientific community. His contributions have come in several forms: theoretical developments, methodological innovations, empirical advances, and leadership. He provided steadfast leadership that truly shed light on the science of relationships. At a time when relationship research was marginalized within social psychology, Harry served as editor of *JPSP:IRGP* (1985-1991), and his tenure there was among the very most important factors in raising the prominence of relationship science, both within and beyond psychology. His role as president of SPSP shed even more of a spotlight on relationship science, and his more recent editorship of *Current Directions in Psychological Science* continues to promote a respect for relationship science in important ways.

Much gregarious celebrating and dancing ensued soon thereafter. While we wind down from this fantastic get-together, please take a moment to consider folks whose accomplishments stand out in

your mind, and plan to nominate them for the next iteration of IARR awards.

IARR BOARD

IARR OFFICERS

President

Dan Perlman
d_perlma@uncg.edu

Vice-President & President- Elect

Jeffrey Simpson
Simps108@umnedu

Past-President

Christopher R. Agnew
agnew@purdue.edu

Secretary & Treasurer

Leah Bryant
Lbryant2@depaul.edu

BOARD MEMBERS

Rebecca Pinkus (Program Committee Co-Chair)
r.pinkus@uws.edu.au

John Caughlin (Publications Committee Chair)
caughlin@illinois.edu

Susan Boon (Member-at-Large)
sdboon@ucalgary.ca

Emily Impett (Member-at-Large)
emily.impett@utoronto.ca

Kendra Knight (New Professional Representative)
Kendra.asu@gmail.com

COMMITTEE CHAIRS

Rozzana Sánchez Aragón (Membership)
rozzara@servidor.unam.mx

Jennifer Theiss (Mentoring)
jtheiss@rutgers.edu

Bjarne Holmes (Media Relations)
bmholmes@champlain.edu

Benjamin Le (Website)
ble@haverford.edu

Sue Sprecher (Future Conferences)
sprecher@ilstu.edu

Gery Karantzas (International)
gery.karantzas@deakin.edu.au

Scott Christopher (Awards Committee)
Scott.Christopher@asu.edu

Kelly Campbell (Teaching)
kelly@csusb.edu

EDITORS

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

Lorne Campbell, Masthead Editor (through 06/2012)
Julie Fitness, Incoming Editor
(Personal Relationships)
Personal_Relationships@uncg.edu

Marian Morry (through 10/2012)
marian_morry@umanitoba.ca
Justin Lehmler
lehmler@fas.harvard.edu
(Relationship Research News)

Editorial Coordinating Group:
Anita Vangelisti, a.vangelisti@mail.utexas.edu
Christopher R. Agnew, agnew@purdue.edu
John Caughlin, caughlin@illinois.edu
Sue Sprecher, sprecher@ilstu.edu
(Advances in Personal Relationships)