

# RELATIONSHIP RESEARCH NEWS

OFFICIAL NEWS JOURNAL OF THE INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR RELATIONSHIP RESEARCH

May 2013

VOL 12, NO. 1

## PRESIDENT'S COLUMN

### Steady as She Goes...Finances and Conferences

by **Dan Perlman**  
**University of North Carolina at  
Greensboro**

In starting to write this column, the phrase “steady as she goes” came to mind. In Googling it, I focused my attention on two ways the phrase has been used. The first was the nautical term meaning “Steer as needed to continue current heading.” The second was its use in a song performed by a group called the Raconteurs.

*Your friends have shown a kink in the single life  
You've had too much to think, now you need a wife  
Find yourself a girl, and settle down  
Live a simple life in a quiet town  
Steady as she goes (steady as she goes).*

The juxtapose of these themes is apt for where IARR is today: the first reflects how IARR is moving as an organization and the second reflects IARR's concern with close relationships.

In the last issue I wrote about two developments on IARR's horizon. I am pleased with progress on both.

#### **Onward: Financial Management**

First, Secretary-Treasurer Leah Bryant as Committee Chair assembled a distinguished set of IARR members to form the Finance Committee: Chris Agnew, Bob Milardo and Sue Sprecher. Thanks to long-term prudent management, increasing revenue from IARR's Wiley-Blackwell contract, and the

recent success of the Chicago conference, IARR has developed capital assets. Previously these assets have been smaller and simply held in bank accounts or term deposits. At this point, these fixed income vehicles are generating historically low levels of return.

After considering our present use of bank accounts for IARR's assets and other options for IARR's financial management arrangements, the Finance Committee came up with three recommendations: 1) dealing with financial institution(s) with whom we have our account(s), and 2) the allocation of funds devoted to current operating expenses (e.g., cash on hand) vs. funds considered as capital assets (e.g., for new initiatives, for a rainy day, as a source of dividend and interest income to support ongoing IARR activities), and 3) how to invest IARR's capital assets. Apropos of financial institutions, the Finance Committee recommended Vanguard. They selected Vanguard because of its wide range of financial services, its low fees, its good customer service and the ease it offers for accommodating IARR officers who might live outside the United States. Apropos of allocation to various purposes, the Finance Committee recommended leaving about two years of IARR operating expenses in a checking account and placing other surplus funds in a capital assets type account.

As the vehicle for investing IARR's capital assets, the Finance Committee recommended Vanguard's Life-strategies Conservative Growth Fund. This is a mutual fund that the highly-regarded rating agency, Morningstar, gives a very high evaluation (4-Star). Although mutual funds can be more volatile than savings account, over time equity investments have historically provided higher rates of return than bank accounts. The Vanguard's Life-strategies Conservative Growth fund is a well-diversified fund that invests 40% in equities including large, mid, and small caps (meaning corporations big, medium and

small), and a small amount in real estate. The remainder, 60%, is invested in US bonds short term (30%), intermediate (40%), and long term (30%). Thus this fund should provide a balance of stability and moderate growth potential. IARR can withdraw (or add funds) at any time.

IARR's Board reviewed and unanimously approved the Finance Committee's recommendations.

### **Onward to Louisville and Melbourne: IARR's Upcoming 2013 and 2014 Conferences**

The second development on IARR's horizon when I last wrote was the possibility of a 2013 mini-conference. I am delighted the planning is now in place. Spearheaded by Michael Cunningham and Anita Barbee (with help from Becky Antle and Jesse Owen) a mini-conference is scheduled for October 4-6, 2013 at the University of Louisville. The Louisville conference will focus on relationship dynamics that are influenced by diverse, sometimes contradictory motives. The so-called Multi-Level Motivation perspective to be taken in the conference is defined as the analyses of behavior as a simultaneous product of both biologically-based and socioculturally-based needs. This perspective is consistent with investigators such as Richerson and Boyd (2005; *Not by Genes Alone*) and Barish (2012; *Homo Mysterious*), who recognized that human nature is based on a "dual inheritance," stemming from both genetic and cultural evolution. In conjunction with the conference, there will be a New Scholars Workshop organized by IARR's Mentoring Committee Chair, Jen Theiss. See <http://www.iarr.org/conferences/>

Louisville—It is not just college basketball, the Kentucky Derby and bourbon country. The *Lonely Planet* travel guide just named it the Top U.S. Travel Destination for 2013. On top of that, Louisville has been rated one of the "Foodiest Cities" by *Bon Appetite Magazine* and one of the "Tastiest Towns" by *Southern Living Magazine*. Louisville offers wonderful parks including the Waterfront Park along the Ohio River and a 100-mile trail encircling the entire community. It also has an exciting entertainment complex downtown and many historic neighborhoods. Clearly Louisville is a city on the move worth visiting in its own right. See <http://www.louisvilleky.gov/visitors/>

Further down the road, put IARR's biennial main conference in your calendar (July 10-13, 2014; Melbourne, Australia). The Program Committee is now constituted (Rebecca Pinkus, Chair; Julie Fitness, Marita McCabe) and the contract to hold the meeting in the Melbourne Convention and Exhibition Centre has been signed.

Note also, during this summer (July 19-22) the Third Brazilian Conference on Interpersonal Relationship Research and the First Latin-American Meeting on Family and Interpersonal Relationship Research will be held in Vitória, Brazil. Although not an IARR sponsored conference, IARR members are especially invited.

For now, IARR's universe is unfolding as it should:

- its journals are humming,
- its media group is fostering public attention to close relationships research (most recently in the *Wall Street Journal* and the CBS Morning show, see <http://www.iarr.org/research-news-feed/>),
- a teaching committee is working,
- the Publication Committee is seeking potential IARR sponsored books,
- the International Committee is advancing the interests of relationship scholars around the world,
- Susan Boon has a group in place to develop IARR's archives,
- the IARR web site keeps growing,
- the Future Conferences Committee has invited proposals for sites for conferences in 2015 and 2016,
- the Membership Committee is working to retain members and expand IARR's membership base, and
- the Awards Committee is gearing up for identifying outstanding IARR members to be honored in Melbourne.

Many hands make light work and means IARR can do more. In the previous *RRN*, I identified 21 ways IARR members can help the organization. I invite you to participate and look forward to reporting more developments in the next issue.

On the horizon for the next installment: a new, more web-based format for *RRN*.

**INSIDE THIS ISSUE OF RELATIONSHIP RESEARCH NEWS**

**PRESIDENT’S COLUMN**

*Steady as She Goes...Finances and Conferences*  
by Dan Perlman .....1

**FROM THE EDITOR’S DESK**

by Justin Lehmiller .....4

**FEATURE ARTICLES**

*Where Is the Sex in Relationship Research?*  
by Amy Muise ..... 5  
*Teaching Close Relationships: Course Design with Objectives in Mind*  
by Debra Mashek..... 8  
*Building Relationships with the Media*  
by Elizabeth Bernstein..... 11

**NEW PROFESSIONALS COLUMN**

*Get Fit in 12 Weeks! (For the Academic Job Market, That Is)*  
by Kendra Knight ..... 14

**HUMOR COLUMN**

*The Answer Is: You Are Going to Look Stupid*  
by David Kenny .....15

**BOOK REVIEWS**

*The Science of Intimate Relationships*  
by Bev Fehr ..... 17

**JOURNALS UPDATE**

*Tentative Contents of Upcoming Journals..... 19*

**ANNOUNCEMENTS..... 20**

*Share Your Approach: Teaching Close Relationships*  
*Call for Papers: 2013 IARR Mini-Conference*  
*Call for Proposals for 2015 IARR Mini-Conference*  
*2016 IARR Main Conference Location: Call for Proposals to Host the Conference*

**MEMBER NEWS AND UPDATES..... 25**

*Members in the News*  
*Book Announcement: The Communication of Jealousy*

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

**RELATIONSHIP RESEARCH NEWS**

**Editor**

Justin J. Lehmiller  
Harvard University

**Associate Editors**

Amy Muise University of Toronto Mississauga	Debra Mashek Harvey Mudd College
--	-------------------------------------

*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, 33 Kirkland Street, Cambridge, MA, USA, 02138; lehmill@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 **Justin Lehmler**  
**Harvard University**

Our new editorial team is pleased to present this year's first issue of *Relationship Research News*. We sincerely hope that you find the content to be practical, thought-provoking, and occasionally humorous. This issue could not have come together without the help of two fantastic Associate Editors, Amy Muise (University of Toronto Mississauga) and Deb Mashek (Harvey Mudd College), both of whom wrote exceptional feature articles.

Amy's piece addresses a very timely and important question: *Where is the sex in relationship research?* Like Amy, I study both relationships and sexuality; however, the two of us have had a number of conversations over the years about the disconnect that exists between the literatures in these two areas. One of the main goals we hope to accomplish during our tenure at *RRN* is to bring a bit more sex into your mailbox in the hope that we can spark some conversations and help bridge this gap in some small way. Plus, I figure the more sex there is in the newsletter, the more likely people are to read it.

A second goal of this editorial team is to compile a valuable set of teaching resources for IARR members. To that end, Deb's piece is the first in a two-part series aimed at offering concrete advice on teaching close relationships courses. In this issue, Deb consults with the experts about how to design the most meaningful and compelling course possible. Please consider helping Deb prepare for her follow-up piece by sending her your course syllabi and some sample assignments and activities (for more information on this, please check out the Announcements section).

One additional goal we have is to help relationship scientists become more comfortable interacting with the media and to increase the visibility of our work. To that end, Elizabeth Bernstein of the *Wall Street Journal* has graciously provided a piece offering tips

for us academic types when dealing with journalists. Building on this theme of becoming more media-savvy, I have added a "Members in the News" feature in order to highlight the popular demand for relationship science. Check out the incredible recognition and press coverage our members are receiving, and please send me your accomplishments to include in future issues of *RRN*.

But that's not all! In this issue, we also get an update from President Dan Perlman on the financial state of the organization and our upcoming conferences. New Professionals Representative Kendra Knight offers sage advice on preparing oneself for the academic job market.

Dave Kenny lightens things up by teaching us how to answer questions after giving a presentation. If only I had his advice when I was a graduate student...I probably would have included pictures of my dogs at the end of every job talk.

Next, Bev Fehr offers a review of *The Science of Intimate Relationships*, a new text authored by the superstar team of Garth Fletcher, Jeff Simpson, Lorne Campbell, and Nickola Overall.

Finally, be sure to check out the Announcements section for a Call for Papers for this year's Mini-Conference. You will also find a Call for Proposals for locations for the 2015 Mini-Conference, as well as the 2016 Main Conference.

Thank you again to all who contributed to this issue. I look forward to working with you on the next edition and bringing you even more sex, teaching resources, and media tips (not necessarily in that order).

---

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

**October 1, 2013**

**Submit all materials  
to Justin Lehmler**

**lehmler@fas.harvard.edu**

## FEATURE ARTICLES

### Where Is the Sex In Relationship Research?

by **Amy Muise**  
**University of Toronto**

Although sex can be a solo activity or occur in casual relationships, most of the sex we have is in the context of ongoing romantic relationships. But, until relatively recently, much of our knowledge about sex and romantic relationships developed separately. Sexuality research and relationship research have developed as two distinct disciplines, each with their own professional organizations, academic journals, and conferences. In 2010, Dr. Lisa Diamond gave two provocative and interrelated talks, one at IARR in Israel (Diamond, 2010a) and the other at the Society for the Scientific Study of Sexuality (SSSS) in Las Vegas (Diamond, 2010b), where she questioned why there was such little cross-pollination between sex research and the study of romantic relationships. I was in attendance at the SSSS talk, *Where are the relationships in sex research?*, when she asked audience members to raise their hand if they had attended a relationships conference in the past. Only one person raised their hand. Similarly, during her IARR keynote, *Where's the sex in relationship research?*, she polled the audience to see who had attended a sexuality conference in the past. Again, only one person raised their hand (from what I was told it was the same person who raised their hand at SSSS). At the time, very few articles in top relationships journals focused on sexuality and very few articles about romantic relationships appeared in sexuality journals. Given the natural overlap between these topics, this was surprising. Following the talk, I thought a lot about my own identity as a researcher and what the advantages might be of more closely merging these two fields.

Today, I identify as a social psychologist who studies sex and relationships, but my research identity has evolved over time. Although I began my research career studying romantic relationships in

Dr. Lorne Campbell's lab at the University of Western Ontario, I pursued a master's degree in human sexuality and as a young graduate student, I identified as a sex researcher (if relationship researchers think they are popular at cocktail parties, try telling people you study sex!). During my graduate studies, I primarily attended sexuality conferences and published most of my work in sexuality journals. After my master's degree I pursued a PhD, and now a postdoctoral fellowship, in social psychology, where I began to merge my interests in sex and relationships. Today, I continue to attend sexuality conferences, but also attend IARR and the Society for Social and Personality Psychology (SPSP). In the few years since Diamond asked, "where is the sex in relationships research and where are the relationships in sex research?", there seems to be some movement toward better linking these two research areas and I think more cross-pollination between sexuality research and relationship research would benefit both fields.

Recently, my mentor, Dr. Emily Impett, and I wrote a chapter on sexuality in the context of romantic relationships for Lisa Diamond and Deborah Tolman's *APA Handbook of Sexuality* (Impett, Muise, & Peragine, in press), during which I thought a lot about the intersection of research on sexuality and relationships. Given that relationships provide the context for most sexual interactions and sexuality can inform key questions about relationship development and maintenance, sexuality research and relationship research have a lot to offer each other. This column is not meant to suggest that all relationships researchers should study sex, but instead to consider, for those interested in both topics, why it might be important to better merge these fields and what next steps we might take. I elicited thoughts from a few leading researchers who study sex and romantic relationships and drew on some things I have learned about merging an interest in studying sex with an interest in studying romantic relationships to consider a few questions relevant to these issues.

#### **Why Have Researchers Not Traditionally Merged Sex and Relationships and Is This Changing?**

One explanation for the division between sex and relationships research is that, in general, sex researchers and relationships researchers have approached research in different ways and been

focused on different types of research questions. I asked Dr. Gurit Birnbaum, a social psychologist who studies the complex role played by sexuality in the broader context of close relationships, for her thoughts on why these fields have not traditionally been merged. Sexuality researchers, she said, have tended to focus on physiological and behavioral aspects of sexuality and have often been less exposed to broader theories. Relationship researchers, on the hand, tend to ground their work in broader theoretical perspectives, have been more focused on other relationship dimensions, and in some cases, may not feel comfortable addressing this “fascinating, but loaded topic.” I would also suggest the sexuality researchers have been more focused on diversity in sexual experiences and sexual minority identities, whereas relationship researchers have been most interested in more general relationship processes.

Birnbaum also discussed what she believes has been a barrier to relationships researchers incorporating sexuality into their work. She indicates that sex research has occurred outside the context of relationship research: “Sex researchers are less likely to attend relationship conferences and to publish in relationship journals (and to read and cite papers published in these journals) and vice versa.” This lack of cross-pollination means that researchers from both sides may not be exposed to all relevant research to inform their questions.

Despite this, in recent years it seems more researchers have begun to merge these topics. As I described above, although I am still a young researcher, my identity has evolved over the years. When I asked Impett about her identity evolution, she indicated that, like me, earlier in graduate school, she would have labeled herself exclusively a sexuality researcher, but is now doing work that bridges the gap between sex and relationships. She also mentioned that it seems as though people who would have labeled themselves exclusively as relationships researchers are now doing more work on sexuality. Dr. Jim McNulty describes himself as one of these people. He now includes measures of sexuality in many of his studies and is interested in studying sexuality because he believes it can inform our understanding of romantic relationships. Both felt that although these topics have not traditionally merged, they can inform each other and there are

benefits to studying sex and romantic relationships together.

### **What Might We Gain From Better Merging These Two Fields?**

It is an exciting time for research in both areas of inquiry given that many important questions remain unanswered. By understanding the various contexts in which sexuality occurs, we can better understand how sex contributes to relationship quality and personal well-being. Similarly, sexuality can help inform the development and maintenance of romantic relationships. When I asked Impett why she thinks it is a worthwhile goal to merge these two areas of research, she responded:

*The overwhelming majority of sex takes place in the context of ongoing, committed relationships. How can we truly understand the bulk of sexuality without understanding the relationship context in which it takes place? On the flip side, sexuality is such an integral part of relationships (one of Bowlby's three major systems), so how can we study adult romantic relationships without studying the sexual context?*

Birnbaum mentioned that although love and sex are not always intertwined - people can feel emotionally attached to someone without being sexually attracted to that person and sexual partners may have sex without being emotionally attached to each other, such as in the case of one-night stands-- sex does not usually occur in a “relational vacuum.” She says:

*When it comes to romantic relationships, attachments and sex do go together, and romantic partners are typically both attracted to and attached to each other. Thus, within the context of romantic relationships, sex has the potential for representing an intensely meaningful experience, one that may serve as a powerful motivational force across different stages of relationship development. Sexual desire is what brings potential partners together to begin with and determines whether subsequent interaction will or will not take place. In later stages, sexual desire may provide the magnetism that holds partners together long enough for an attachment bond*

*to form and then help to keep partners together in a committed relationship. Yet, toward the end of a weakening relationship, sexual desire, or more specifically, lack of it, may be what makes partners grow apart.*

It seems then, that sex research and relationship research have a lot to offer each other. In general, sexuality research has been largely atheoretical. Relationship research, on the hand, is strongly grounded in theory and many of these theoretical perspectives may offer insights into the role of sex in relationships. Research on romantic relationships, however, has primarily focused on heterosexual, monogamous relationships. In contrast, sexuality researchers study various relational contexts and diverse sexual identities. Applying relationship theory to more diverse relationships and identities may offer new insights about when and for whom specific factors promote relationship quality and provide new ways to test our theoretical claims.

### **How Can We Better Merge These Two Fields?**

When I asked McNulty about how we might better merge research on sex and romantic relationships, he responded that although there are certain barriers to studying sexuality—sex is considered taboo, is difficult to talk about, and is not something we can directly observe—relationship researchers have many important tools that can inform the study of sex. In his words, relationship researchers “understand emotion, individual difference, cognition and dyadic processes, which are likely important factors in understanding the role of sex in relationships and vice versa.” In addition, recent methodological and statistical advances have given researchers more tools to study important dyadic processes such as sexuality and romantic relationships. Today there are many resources and workshops on dyadic analytical techniques, and the Internet has provided more opportunities to collect data from both partners on sensitive topics. For example, in my lab at the University of Toronto, we often use online daily experience methods, which provide unique opportunities to study relationship events, including sexuality, as close in time to when they occur. The use of these methods is especially beneficial given that sex with a partner is not something we can directly observe in the lab (at least not without creating a big media and IRB fuss).

McNulty mentioned that one thing people interested in studying romantic relationships can do to further bridge these two fields is to collaborate with sex researchers, “we have a lot to learn from them and I think they have a lot to learn from us.” In my experience, this is true—there is a lot that sexuality and relationships researchers can learn from each other. For example, applying theories of close relationships to sexuality has extended our understanding of when sexuality is a positive, rewarding experience and when it can detract from relationship quality. Similarly, studying sexual aspects of romantic relationships allows us to consider how sexuality is associated with relationship outcomes as well as how relationship processes influence a romantic partner’s sexual experiences. Since beginning my post-doc at the University of Toronto about a year and a half ago, I have realized that many social-personality psychologists and relationships researchers are what I call “closeted sex researchers”—that is, they have an interest in extending their work to focus on the domain of sexuality but do not identify sex as one of their research interests. When I arrived at my current institution, I was one of the only social psychologists studying sexuality and now I am collaborating with several faculty members and students. These collaborations have given us both new insights into our research and helps to bridge the gap between sex research and relationships research.

### **What Are the Next Steps?**

Although we have made significant advances in both fields, there are still many gaps to be addressed. When I asked Impett what directions she thinks are important to pursue in the future, she had several ideas. First, she suggests that, although this is slowly beginning to change, the field of sexuality (and the study of relationships to some degree) has had a laser-like focus on negative processes and risk avoidance: “We’re starting to see more work on positive processes on sexuality, and now that we’ve started to move in this direction, I think we need to get into more nuanced questions like when seemingly ‘positive’ processes end up helping vs. hurting relationships.” Second, she felt that when studying sexuality, gender differences should not be overemphasized without providing sufficient theoretical and conceptual explanations for why they exist. Although gender may be important to consider in some cases, often it is not the most important

factor influencing sexuality or relationships. Third, Impett also suggests that we need “more dyadic work that looks at the interaction between partners, as well as more longitudinal work that follows couples over the time.”

Birnbaum believes that researchers should follow their hearts and study what interests them, but if they are interested in studying sex she has some ideas about how to advance the study of sex in the context of romantic relationships. She believes we need to focus on theory-driven questions that use sophisticated methodologies. This includes considering innovative ways to study sexuality that do not rely solely on self-reports. In addition, “We should take into account that the effects of sex on relationship quality and longevity may vary in individuals and across contexts and relationship phases. We should also examine processes in the reverse direction, from relationship experiences to sexual expressions.”

In sum, there are many advantages to be derived from continuing to merge relationship research with sex research. As relationships researchers, we have strong theoretical perspectives and methodological and statistical tools to study dyadic processes that can provide important insights into sexuality. Sexuality researchers have insights into diverse contexts where sex occurs including masturbation and casual sex, and have knowledge about participants with diverse identities and about the varieties of sexual expression that can inform important questions about romantic relationships. Moving forward, when relevant, relationship researchers can include sexuality measures in their studies, collaborate with or gain insights from sexuality researchers, present research at a sexuality conference (if applicable) or invite people who primarily study sex to present at a relationships conference, and think about how sexuality might inform the research questions they have been asking. In closing, according to Birnbaum, “sex is important for relationship well-being and no understanding of relationship processes will be complete without appreciation of the functional significance of sex in romantic relationships.”

*Special thanks to Emily Impett, Jim McNulty and Gurit Birnbaum for their contributions to this column.*

## References

Diamond, L. M. (July, 2010a). *Where's the sex in relationship research? Where are the relationships in sex research?* Keynote address, Biennial meeting of the International Association for Relationship Research, Herzliya, Israel.

Diamond, L. M. (November, 2010b). *Toward greater integration of sex research with relationship research: Do we have the right teams, methods, and questions?* Plenary, Annual meeting of the Society for the Scientific Study of Sexuality, Las Vegas, NV

Impett, E. A., Muise, A., & Peragine, D. (in press). Chapter 10: Sexuality in the context of relationships. In D. Tolman & L. Diamond (Eds.), *APA Handbook of Sexuality*.

---

## Teaching Close Relationships

### Part 1: Course Design with Objectives in Mind

by Debra Mashek  
Harvey Mudd College

Teaching courses about close relationships is at once thrilling and daunting. On the one hand, students arrive eager and motivated, certain the course will help them understand their own relationships. On the other hand, they sometimes arrive with entrenched assumptions housed in narrow cultural frames, volumes of anecdotal experience that can get in the way of comprehending systematic research, and impossibly high expectations about the certainty and universality of our field's knowledge.

This constellation of attributes sets those of us who teach about close relationships on a challenging pedagogical path. Ashley Duggan, Associate Professor of Communication at Boston College, characterizes the challenge as follows: “The strength in students' ease in seeing a course in relationships as immediately applicable also means that they can think they know more than the reading and research indicate.” Brian Spitzberg, a professor in San Diego State University's School of Communication, agrees:

“Students, like all of us, are inclined to trust our instincts and intuitions far more than what we learn in books, articles, and instruction. Overcoming, or at least budging, such ideological filters is always a challenge when teaching about close relationships.”

To support new teachers’ efforts to navigate the promises and challenges of teaching about close relationships, RRN’s editorial team will run a series of teaching-focused articles over the coming year. (Check out the Announcements section for a preview of what we hope to cover, and a call for your assistance to make these topics possible.)

In this first in a series of teaching-focused columns, we consider two big-picture questions. First, what do you want your students to take away from your relationships course? And, second, how can you use these goals to guide your course design to ensure the students learn what you want them to? A multitude of books exist that address these very ideas (see, for example, Angelo & Cross, 1993; Richlin, 2006; Wiggins & McTighe, 2005). We don’t claim to break new ground here; rather, we seek to offer first-hand insight into the usefulness of objective-driven course design in creating compelling and cohesive relationships courses.

### **What Do You Want Your Students to Take Away From Your Course?**

The gist of objectives-driven course design is fairly straightforward: figure out what it is you want your students to be able to do or to know by the time they finish your course, and then let those objectives guide your every decision about the course – what topics to include, which theories to leave out, what sources to assign, what assignments to give, what kind of feedback to provide, etc. This general approach to course design can be employed regardless of the course’s audience (e.g., majors vs. non-majors), the level (e.g., undergraduate vs. graduate), size (e.g., small seminar vs. huge lecture), and disciplinary focus.

Before you select your articles or texts, before you sequence your class sessions, and before you settle on an exam schedule, *you need to know what it is you want your students to get out of your class.* Thus, the first step in objective-driven course design is to articulate what it is you want the students to be able to do or to know upon completion of the course.

Do you want them to memorize key findings? To find and evaluate primary research? To evaluate current events through the lenses of multiple theories? To design a relationships study that utilizes specific methodologies? To employ primary research to critique the accuracy of claims made in the media about relationships? These are your objectives.

Here are just a few examples, drawn from the syllabi of our colleagues quoted throughout this column, of objectives one might have in a course about close relationships:

- To develop familiarity with major theories and methods (Aron).
- To recognize distinctions and connections between research on relationships as compared to their own experiences (Duggan).
- To connect theory and research findings with practice, by becoming aware of how the information can be used to enhance one’s own relationships as well as one’s bonds in the larger community (Sprecher).
- To formulate new theoretical models of (in)competent interactions and relationships (Spitzberg).

Not surprisingly, a plethora of possible objectives exists. Any one course will include a relatively small set of objectives; and, even within this small set, some will be arguably more central than others. In Benjamin Karney’s (Professor of Psychology, UCLA) case, one meta objective drives the entire course: “...mostly what people know is that intimate relationships are wonderful and terrible, a source of our greatest joys and our darkest heartbreaks. I want students in my course to understand how it is that one phenomenon -- and even one relationship! -- can be both. Put another way, if almost everyone in an intimate relationship wants to be loved, supported, and cared for by their partners, why are intimate relationships nevertheless so difficult to form and maintain? Over the ten weeks of my course, I pursue this question pretty single-mindedly, adopting a range of perspectives to understand how it is that intimate relationships develop, thrive, or deteriorate over time.”

When working to articulate your own course objectives, Arthur Aron, Professor of Psychology at

Stony Brook University, encourages instructors to “keep in mind *who* the students are—are they mainly ones who will be researchers or clinicians? Are they MA or PhD? What subareas are they focused on, and what is their background?” Sue Sprecher, Professor of Sociology at Illinois State University, agrees. In her graduate course titled Seminar on Personal Relationships, Sprecher wants students to be able “to identify topics on personal relationships that need further investigation.” This is an important, albeit challenging, goal. In order to figure out what we don’t know, we need a solid appreciation of the boundaries of what we do know. Graduate students, most of whom are working toward making a discernible contribution to the field, need to develop this ability. Undergraduates probably do not.

For guidance on strategies for writing course objectives, check out the recommended reading list below.

### **How Do You Design Your Course to Ensure Students Learn What You Want Them to?**

Once you have a sound sense of what it is you want your students to know or to be able to do upon completion of your course, you’re ready to start making decisions about how to achieve these objectives. That is, you’re ready to actually design the course. As any seasoned instructor knows – and as new instructors soon discover – it is impossible to include all possible topics, readings, demonstrations, or assignments in a single course. The possibilities are too vast; the available time is too short.

Thankfully, a set of well-articulated course objectives can make “what to keep, what to dump” decisions substantially easier. If something doesn’t obviously support one of your course objectives, dump it. If a wildly influential theoretical paper, even one written by “the” guru in the field, doesn’t obviously advance the objectives you have for your course, don’t assign it. If spending an hour of class time discussing the intricacies of a researcher’s clever experimental manipulation supports a course objective, roll with it, without guilt that you “should” be teaching a different slice of content.

Harry Reis, Professor in the Department of Clinical and Social Sciences in Psychology at the University of Rochester, wants students to leave his relationships course with a renewed appreciation for

the power of the scientific method and the links between academic research and personal well-being. He wants students “to understand that it is possible to do real science about relationships and that the science can be very informative.” Not surprisingly, he assigns a lot of primary research articles so students can learn the nuts and bolts of how our science gets done. A general overview textbook alone wouldn’t do the trick.

In my course for non-majors, one objective I have is for students to employ empirical research to evaluate the accuracy of relationship advice they find in popular media. In order to be able to do this successfully, they need to be able to find empirical research, to read and to understand that research, and to recognize the limits of that research in addressing the validity of the media claim. Thus, in service of this objective, students spend a good deal of time in class learning to use PsycINFO, learning basic research design and statistics (things I might assume my students would already know if they were advanced majors), and critiquing key validities in published research. With these experiences under their belts, they’re better equipped to be able to evaluate relationship advice. This means, of course, that we don’t get to spend a ton of time discussing the nuances of key theories in the field, and I’m perfectly comfortable with that trade off. I’ve designed a course that meets my objectives.

As another example, Jeff Simpson, Professor of Psychology at University of Minnesota, wants students “to be able to better understand and appreciate their own relationships as well as the relationships of their friends and family members within the context of the different theories and research we cover in the course.” In support of this objective, Simpson brings in loads of examples from the real world to bring to life the theories and studies the students are learning about in any given week. When a high-profile extra-marital affair hits the news, Simpson stands ready to seize the teaching moment.

In her undergraduate research seminar titled *The Interplay of Attachment and Sex within Romantic Relationships*, psychologist Gurit Birnbaum (Interdisciplinary Center Herzliya) emphasizes the mutual roles of creativity and critical engagement. Her course objectives communicate a clear desire for

students to be both very critical and very creative. “This is exactly why,” she says, “I ask students to generate ideas without limiting themselves and think of it critically only later.”

The point is this: while most anything is possible within a single course, not everything is doable. By articulating your objectives before designing a course, you give yourself a compelling filter through which to evaluate the swarm of possibilities. In addition to using these objectives to guide content selection, they are also used to guide assignment selection.

For example, returning to my course for non-majors and building on the objective that students marshal empirical research to evaluate the accuracy of media claims about relationships, I require students to write papers that interrogate the accuracy of advice they find in *Glamour*, *GQ*, and other popular sources in light of at least three peer-reviewed, empirical studies. Of course, any mention of assignments requires the caveat that course size and teaching support resources necessarily inform the number and types of assignments an instructor can utilize in support of course objectives. If I were teaching a large lecture course with 300 students, rather than my small section of 20 students, I couldn’t imagine assigning this same paper. That said, I *could* imagine writing multiple choice items that would draw on these same critical thinking skills (e.g., “In light of the research abstract provided below, which of the following hypothetical headlines is LEAST likely to be a valid assertion about breaking up?”).

### Why We Do What We Do

Of course, students are a key cog in the system if instructors actually want to achieve their objectives. The students, after all, are why we do what we do (in addition to that whole knowledge creation enterprise). Thus, it isn’t surprising that advocates of objectives-driven course design also encourage instructors to communicate their goals to students early and often. Beginning in the syllabus document (if not the course description that appears in your institution’s course catalogue), tell students what they’re in for. Keeping in mind the high-expectations and vested interests that students bring to our relationships courses, telling students up front what they will – and will not – get from our courses can head-off possible disappointments and

misunderstandings (“What?! You’re not going to tell me how to fix my sister’s relationship?”).

Ultimately, we are a lucky lot. We get to spend entire semesters talking with young people about a topic that sits at the center of their--and our--worlds: close relationships. As Aron points out, his relationships courses allow him to focus on topics he knows well and cares deeply about. Karney adds, “It’s a cliché, but I really do learn a lot from the students in this course, and that is a constant thrill. I love that students arrive eager to receive this material, and am gratified by the number of times that people say they have applied the ideas from this course to their own lives. That’s the whole point.”

### Recommended Reading

American Psychological Association. (2007). *APA guidelines for the undergraduate psychology major*. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved from [www.apa.org/ed/resources.html](http://www.apa.org/ed/resources.html)

Angelo, T. A. & Cross, K. P. (1993). *Classroom assessment techniques: A handbook for college teachers* (2<sup>nd</sup> edition). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Richlin, L. (2006). *Blueprint for learning: Constructing college courses to facilitate, assess, and document learning*. Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing, LLC.

Wiggins, G. & McTighe, J. (2005). *Understanding by design* (2<sup>nd</sup> edition). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education, Inc.

---

## Building Relationships with the Media

by Elizabeth Bernstein  
*The Wall Street Journal*

*Editor’s Note: Elizabeth Bernstein writes a regular column for the Wall Street Journal entitled Bonds, which explores the dynamics of interpersonal relationships. You can follow her column at [www.Facebook.com/EBernsteinWSJ](http://www.Facebook.com/EBernsteinWSJ). Elizabeth is also an invaluable member of the IARR Media Relations committee and truly believes in the real world value and relevance of relationship research.*

*I asked Elizabeth if she would be willing to write a piece for RRN that would help members of our organization better prepare themselves for interacting with the media because I have a lot of academic friends who feel anxious and intimidated by media requests, either because they have had no formal training in how to speak to the press or because they have had bad experiences in the past. Going forward, I hope to include a standing column from Elizabeth and the Media Relations committee in RRN as a means of compiling a set of resources that will help improve the quantity and quality of our media communications.*

I love to tell people what I do for a living. When they ask, I tell them I write a column on relationships. Then I pause and deliver what feels like a punch line: “For the *Wall Street Journal*.”

People unfamiliar with the *WSJ* are surprised that the august and serious publication would focus on something that many consider “light” or “fluffy.” But the *WSJ* understands what relationship researchers understand: that human interactions lie at the very center of our lives—and of our success, both personal and professional.

I created my column, called “Bonds” (a little *WSJ* humor there) four years ago, at the request of editors. It runs every other Tuesday and has a very strong presence on both our web site and in the Personal Journal section of the print paper. The *WSJ* is the largest newspaper in the country—and my column runs in our European and Asian editions, too—so the readership is in the millions, and I receive letters from readers all over the world. I’ve recently written columns on “Marriage Advice from Divorced People,” the little white lies we tell our spouses, mixed-weight couples, and how to make fast friends (based on a lab technique pioneered by IARR member Art Aron and his colleagues).

Last year, I was excited to become a member of IARR. I attended my first IARR conference in Chicago in June and have since become a member of the Media Relations committee. I feel like I’ve finally found a community of people as obsessed with relationships—and why people behave towards each other as they do—as I am. I find everyone at IARR fascinating and have made many new friends.

But I was dismayed at the IARR conference to realize that many relationship researchers shun media attention. I heard the same reasons repeated: “Reporters get it wrong.” “They just want a quick quote.” “They will jump to conclusions that are not supported by the research.” I’ve reported on numerous hefty topics for the *WSJ*—education, religion, philanthropy, health—and I’ve never run into such disdain of reporters.

I can certainly understand the hesitation of academics who have never been taught how to speak to journalists and the frustration of researchers who feel that their work has been misconstrued by careless reporters. Those are fair reasons for limiting your media contact, and it is entirely appropriate to not accept every interview request that comes your way in such cases. But why dismiss *all* reporters? (That seems similar to getting divorced and then never wanting to have a romantic relationship again.) I thought of my colleagues at the *WSJ* and at other top publications, and all I could think about was how hard we work to get it right—and how these are some of the very smartest people I have met anywhere. (And I’ve met a ton of smart people, trust me!)

I also know that readers are desperate for real, scientifically validated information that can help them improve their relationships. You are the ones who produce and hold this vital information. And I am a reporter with a wide audience, writing for a publication that takes real research very seriously, and who is primarily interested in this very topic. If we can’t form a bond and work together, who can?

I am here to help. I believe that my column can be good for scholars—it can get your research out to a very wide audience. And the *WSJ* is unique, as well, in that our readership includes many of the wealthiest and most well-connected people in the country. To put this bluntly: Philanthropists and people who fund research and donate to universities read the *WSJ*.

(Some relevant information: In addition to the column itself, I give numerous radio interviews each week, on local and national stations, plus on radio shows produced by the *WSJ* and distributed nationally. I do at least one video interview about each column; it runs on a live TV show on our web

site and then is attached to the column permanently. I do a live web chat about the column, which is very popular. All of these outlets are interested in the research. And, quite often, national morning TV will produce a segment about the column—and often invite the researchers I have quoted onto the show.)

I know it can be intimidating to feel you have no control over how a reporter will present your work. So in the spirit of forming healthy relationships, I'd like to give some tips for working with the media to make you feel more at ease and to help ensure your work is represented in a way that you are comfortable with:

- Choose your reporters carefully. When a reporter calls you, Google that person to see how they typically present topics. Read about that reporter's credentials. Ask your colleagues (or other researchers interviewed by that reporter) what their experiences were like. Look at how the reporter presents the research: Is it credited? Is it nuanced?
- Build a relationship with individual reporters who cover your niche or relationships in general. I have relationships with researchers who sometimes help me on background material or point me to research—not always their own—for a topic I am working on. We get to know each other that way and can start to trust each other. Often times, the best columns I have, for me and for the researcher, were brainstormed together, through a number of conversations.
- Remember that there is shoddy research out there (and lots of silly studies conducted by companies to serve their own interests). Reporters are as interested in figuring out who is a good, smart researcher as researchers are in discovering who is a good reporter. We need each other!
- Understand that reporters are comfortable with nuances. For example, I don't expect a researcher to be able to connect all the dots or nail down the causality. I understand that there are things the research doesn't address. I can explain this in my article—and then flesh out the topic by talking to clinicians, or lay people, who will explain what they are seeing too.
- Expect a good reporter to fact-check their article meticulously. For example, I call every person quoted in a story right before it goes to press (after it is edited) and go over every single thing I am saying about their work. This is an opportunity for you to tell me anything I need to tweak or change. I do this over the phone, not via email. (The *WSJ* does not allow me to send the article itself to the researcher before publication.) But you can ask a reporter up front, before you agree to be interviewed, if they will fact-check on the phone. And you can choose to participate based on the answer.
- Make the interview a real conversation. A good, thorough reporter is not looking for sound bites, but information. We see you as the experts and—as much as I hate this term—want to “pick your brain.” Take a little time to teach the reporter, as you would a student. I promise it will pay off. And feel free to ask to speak off the record during the interview, to explain something that is complicated or to talk through an idea.
- Lay off the academic jargon. Help us explain your work plainly, in language that our readers will understand. We will have to do that anyway, so why not guide us? (Also, we will use much more of the interview if it is compelling. Jargon is never compelling!)
- Make us laugh. Reporters are often stressed and crabby from working under extremely tight deadlines (much like you!). As in any relationship, a little humor goes a long way, especially in breaking the ice in the beginning. And all people work better together when they know each other, right? Remember: We don't bite!
- Call or email someone on the Media Relations committee if you aren't sure what to do. That's what we're here for!

I keep a list of people I query via email from time-to-time when I am starting a new column topic. If you'd like to be on this list—and I'd love that—please write me at [Bonds@wsj.com](mailto:Bonds@wsj.com). Be sure to let me know what topics you focus on. And feel free to give me a heads-up on your research when you're ready. (I can write about research before it is published in a

professional journal, as long as you're ready to present it to me.)

I look forward to hearing from you—and to building some very fruitful relationships!

-Elizabeth

## NEW PROFESSIONAL'S COLUMN

### Get Fit in 12 Weeks! (For the Academic Job Market, That Is)

**Kendra Knight**  
New Professional Representative  
Christopher Newport University

To say that your first job search is *daunting* is an understatement. As a doctoral candidate, I felt physically ill the first time I saw a job announcement for my market year. My main concern was: how does a person prepare job applications and *simultaneously* complete a dissertation? Below, I offer what I wished I'd had then: a 12-step program for first time academic job-seekers. With apologies to our readership in the Southern Hemisphere, I've created this with the upcoming "summer 'break'" in mind. At time of publication, there are about 12 weeks until the job season kicks off. Use this guide, and the next 12 weeks, to "get fit" for your job search.

#### Week 1: Assess

In the first week, have a strategy session with your advisor or another mentor. Honestly assess your strengths and weaknesses as an applicant. Recognize insufficiencies *now*, while you still have time to do something about them. Be sure to discuss teaching experience. Are there courses that you really should have taught by now but haven't? If so, contact the course scheduler, and make the case to them that a particular assignment would make you more competitive as a job candidate.

#### Week 2: Compile Search Resources

If you haven't already, subscribe to listservs and publications that contain job announcements. Discipline-specific lists are key, but don't overlook general lists and resources (e.g., <http://chronicle.com/jobs>). Academic 360.com is a meta-compilation of academic job search websites. From this site, you can find and browse job search sites organized by type of position, discipline, and general location (e.g., United Kingdom).

#### Week 3: Begin to Court Letter-Writers

Candidates are typically asked to submit 3-4 letters of recommendation in support of each application. As a general rule, you'll want to submit one more letter than is requested, in case something (or someone) falls through the cracks. Identify potential letter-writers early, and ask them *in person* if they feel comfortable supporting your job search. Ask them the lead time they require for submitting letters, and ask what you can do to reduce their costs of helping you. (Pre-addressed stamped envelopes are a no-brainer; my committee requested them with due dates attached via sticky notes).

#### Week 4: Organize in Advance

Design a system for managing relevant job calls. Will you use an email filter or folder? Will you save job calls as documents on a computer? In some "cloud" interface? How will you manage deadlines? I used an Excel spreadsheet with the details and deadlines for each position to which I applied. I linked this to my email calendar, and shared the file with my letter-writers (see Week 3) to help keep them up-to-date.

#### Week 5: Update and Polish your CV

Give your CV a *thorough* grooming. CV models abound, but I would offer two tips: First, make sure there is ample white space on the page. Generous margins and spacing make your document easiest to read. Second, use your CV to present yourself as an *academic professional*, rather than a student on the verge of graduation. Find the CV of a current professor you admire, and emulate it.

#### Week 6: Narrate your Research Persona

Coming out of graduate school, or even a postdoc, your CV may include a number of research projects on seemingly disparate topics. Spend time in week 6 crafting a mini-narrative that interconnects the

projects you've worked on. You could write, for example: "My primary research focus is the processes that bring individuals closer. This has been articulated in projects such as..."

### **Weeks 7 & 8: Draft your Base Application Letters**

In weeks 7 and 8, draft a "base" version of your application letter. Likely, you'll need two base versions: one for more research-focused positions, and one for more teaching-focused positions. View sample letters. Write a draft and have your advisor look it over. Make revisions. Repeat.

### **Weeks 9 & 10: Compile Evidence of Teaching Effectiveness**

This typically refers to some combination of: 1) objective scores on student evaluations of teaching, 2) subjective comments on student evaluations of teaching, 3) evaluations conducted by colleagues or supervisors, and 4) pedagogical training or development. Start by gathering objective and subjective evaluations (as far back as five years). You may have to dig through your records, and/or request information from department archives. Some applications require paper copies of evaluations, and for others a summary or sample is sufficient. Have both ready. Scan paper evaluations to PDF. Create a summary table or graph of your objective teaching scores. For teaching development, make a list of courses/seminars/webinars taken, by whom it was offered, and a short description of the content. Include these materials in your CV and/or list them separately in a teaching portfolio. You may also wish to include sample syllabi and course assignments that demonstrate sound pedagogies, especially if you are applying to teaching-oriented jobs.

### **Week 11: Write a Statement of Teaching Philosophy**

A statement of teaching philosophy will round out your teaching portfolio. Statements, like philosophies themselves, are highly varied. They may cite pedagogical theory, describe the applicant's classroom demeanor, or reflect on broad teaching objectives. In mine, I focus on how I know when my students are learning. Whatever your approach, you need a statement of teaching philosophy. Keep it to one page, single-spaced. As with your application letter: view samples, get feedback, and revise, revise, revise.

### **Week 12: Draft your Base Job Talk**

Last, but not least, outline the research presentation you'll give when you visit campus. Typically 30-45 minutes is allotted to your "job talk" during the interview visit, with an additional 20-30 minutes for questions. Some departments prefer to hear about your dissertation, while others want you to discuss your broad research program. Either way, you'll need: 1) the narrative you worked on in Week 6, 2) an idea of where you'll be in the dissertation process, and 3) a point of entry for those in the audience who aren't familiar with your theory and/or method. Later, when your first campus visit is scheduled, find an audience for a "practice" job talk. Depending on the nature of the school, you may be asked to prepare a teaching talk in addition to or instead of the research presentation. However, schools will vary in terms of how long this talk should be and they may even assign a specific topic to you, so it can be difficult to prepare the final teaching talk far in advance. That said, it isn't a bad idea to prepare a 15-20 minute teaching demonstration on something related to your area of expertise if you plan on applying to more teaching-focused jobs.

### **Off you go!**

You know you have your work cut out for you. Relax, and take it one week at a time. I'm hopeful that this guide will help make your workload manageable, and support steady progress. With any luck, when the first job announcement lands in your inbox, you'll be as cool as a cucumber.

---

## **HUMOR COLUMN**

### **The Answer Is: You Are Going to Look Stupid**

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

A large part of what we do is give talks: a talk to one's colleagues, a convention presentation, a

colloquium at another university, a talk to public, and the dreaded job talk. We work diligently on our slides, sometimes making changes while we are being introduced (or at least I do). We worry most about the science, but we also obsess over minor issues of font size (16 font vs. 18?), color choice (white or pink background?), and page numbering (to do or not to do?). We practice our talk, and if it is an important one, we give a rehearsal presentation to friends who provide us feedback to improve our talk. After we give the presentation, we feel a great sense of relief, but then comes the most difficult part of a talk: the questions. We can work carefully on our slides and practice our talk repeatedly, but we cannot possibly anticipate the wide range of questions that we might receive. We should not relax during questioning because it is the most difficult part of any presentation.

A fundamental fact of question answering, ironically based on the fundamental error of attribution, is that questioners tend to look smart and answerers to look dumb (Ross, Amabile, & Steinmetz, 1977). Because we can be asked almost any sort of question, it is difficult, if not impossible, to appear knowledgeable and intelligent when answering. We need to face facts: We are going to appear dumb.

We need to realize that the questioner is usually not asking a question for which they seek an answer. Rather, they already have their own answer, and it is usually nearly impossible for us to provide them with the answer that they want (especially given how incoherently the question is often phrased). We are hardly ever going to satisfy the questioner. It is much more important that we give a plausible answer, as well as one that is basically consistent with the rest of the talk, so that other members of the audience feel you have given a credible response. Generally, the rest of the audience will be sympathetic with the speaker, because they will have no idea what the “right” answer is. Of course, if the person who is asking the question is a member of the search committee and it is a job interview, then a good answer is required.

As I alluded to above, I find the hardest part about answering a question is trying to figure out just what the heck is the question that is being asked. Very often the question is incoherent and of course, we cannot look less dumb if we respond to a questioner

with a blank look, or by saying that we think the question is incomprehensible. It helps sometimes to ask them to re-phrase the question or to begin your answer with “If your question is such and such (i.e., a question we can answer), my answer is such and such.”

You need first to understand why it is that people ask questions: They typically have no interest at all in getting an answer, but rather they ask a question just to show how smart they are. (See an example of me doing this at the end of this column.) Sometimes they want to show you how smart they are, sometimes they want to show their colleagues, but most of the time they want to just show themselves. Their question will reference their work or their publications, and most annoyingly they will name drop (something I am going to do twice in this column). Very often all you need to do in this situation is just listen patiently to the question and then say something complimentary after the question, such as, “I am indeed aware of your important work and it has influenced me profoundly.” My favorite answer to this sort of question, especially if it is very long winded, is the one-word response of “Yes.”

Although giving a one-word answer to a long-winded question might amuse the audience, it does violate a fundamental rule of answering questions: Take a long time when answering a question. Go on in detail in your response. Go off on tangents. Or say, “That reminds me of a point I forgot to make during my talk” and go into that. Prepare some extra slides and work them into your answer session. The longer you take in answering questions, the fewer questions there will be for you to answer, and so fewer opportunities to look stupid.

Some questioners want to show people how smart they are by showing to others how stupid you are, and so they will criticize your work. If the question starts with “I do not see why you did such and such” or “I wonder why you did not do such and such,” you may well be in a demanding situation. I think it is perfectly acceptable to be aggressive in this situation and strongly defend your work as best you can. The questioner started it, and if you do not respond by defending your work, you will give the impression that your work is not worth protecting. Especially difficult, is when you are asked why you

have not considered, or what do you think of the work by Dr. so and so, and you may have never read that work or for that matter ever even heard of Dr. so and so. Do not admit to not knowing this work. One tactic would be to be first to defend your work and then say that perhaps later you and the questioner might get together to discuss that paper.

Fortunately in most contexts, there is a norm of politeness and the tone of questioning is typically very polite. I once made the mistake of telling my students that when someone fails to do a good job answering one of my questions, I routinely say "Thank you" which translates to "That is a terrible answer." Now whenever I say "Thank you" to student speakers, I can feel them cringing.

Another piece of advice is to be careful about the last slide in your talk, as that slide will be visible for all to see and think about during questioning, and used to frame questions. So for instance, you would never want your last slide to be a list of the limitations of or problems with your research. Better it be a depiction of your conceptual model, or even better a picture of you hugging a puppy.

Speaking of puppies, my biggest pet peeve about people answering questions is that it is now common practice to start your answer by saying "That is a very good question." It is obviously an ingratiating tactic, but people love to be flattered even when they know it is just flattery, so I guess ingratiation works. However, that expression really annoys me, especially the second and third time it happens. Why doesn't anyone ever say, "That is a terrible question"?

My favorite story about questions was one that Jack Block told me years ago. A very famous personality psychologist (you would all recognize him) finished his talk, and afterwards, someone equally distinguished got up and said, "I do not believe your results." The speaker, without blinking an eye, responded, "They are pretty extraordinary, but I have a replication!" That shut up the questioner, but what the speaker neglected to say was that the replication study failed to replicate the results! I do not endorse lying while giving an answer, but I like this story.

I conclude this column with a question I once asked Steven Pinker, the now famous Harvard cognitive

psychologist, when he was a first year graduate student. (Yes, the very same Steven Pinker who has appeared on *The Colbert Report*.) He had done a study in which he had correlated the perceptions of distance with actual distance and had obtained large correlations in the 80s. The question I asked him was "Why was not the correlation a perfect one?" For one of the very few times in his life, Steven Pinker was speechless if only for a few seconds. Eventually, all he could say was that it was virtually impossible that the correlation could be one. I told him that it could be one. Yes, I was doing the obnoxious thing of trying to show how smart I was, likely to my more senior colleagues. In a later meeting with Pinker, I did show him that the correlation was indeed one.

*Note: Dave Kenny has recently posted several webinars at [davidakenny.net/webinars/intro.htm](http://davidakenny.net/webinars/intro.htm) on dyadic data analysis that may be of interest to relationship researchers.*

---

## BOOK REVIEW

### *Review of **The Science of Intimate Relationships***

**by Bev Fehr**  
**University of Winnipeg**

The field of close relationships is thriving. The fact that there are now several textbooks on close relationships is a telling indicator of growth in the field. The *Science of Intimate Relationships* (authored by Garth Fletcher, Jeff Simpson, Lorne Campbell, and Nickola Overall) is another significant marker of progress. This book is intended for upper-level undergraduate and graduate students, although close relationships scholars will find it to be a valuable resource as well. It was written by four heavy hitters in the field. All have made important contributions to close relationships research and all have served, or presently serve, in editorial positions in field's top journals. Journal editors are in a prime

position to take the pulse of a field and are extremely well-poised to offer a state-of-the art compendium of close relationships research. That advantage is evident here. Coverage of close relationships research is broad and comprehensive.

### **Conceptual Framework**

Although the standard social psychological theories of relationships are presented (e.g., interdependence theory), this book is written primarily from an evolutionary psychology perspective. (Evolutionary psychology is framed as a distal explanation of behavior; social psychological theories are framed as proximal explanations). The emphasis on evolutionary theory throughout the book provides cohesion and allows for integration of diverse findings. However, those who are less enamored with evolutionary psychology may have difficulty fully embracing the content of this book. It should not be overlooked that the authors also bring in research from cross-cultural psychology, developmental psychology, clinical psychology, and neuroscience. But the dominant emphasis is on evolutionary psychology.

### **Content**

To start at the beginning, I really like the word “Science” in the title. I always feel a little bashful about describing myself as a “relationship scientist”, but that is who we are and it is relationship science that is being presented in this book. The use of the word “Science” sends a clear message that this is not a self-help, pop psych book. This is an important message given that the market is flooded with non-scientific books claiming to be authorities on relationships.

In the Introduction, the authors state that they will be focusing on “intimate relationships that are sexual or romantic” (p. 4). The term that they generally use in the book is “sexual relationships.” I wasn’t sure why they chose this over the more commonly used term “romantic relationships.” It made me wonder if a dating couple whose relationship is nonsexual because of religious beliefs, for example, or an older couple who experiences companionate love and the waning of sexuality would feel as though this book isn’t intended to apply to them. This may seem like splitting hairs over semantics (I can easily imagine a counterargument along the lines of “why use the term ‘romantic relationship’ for dating and marital

relationships that may not actually be at all romantic?”). The emphasis on sexuality is apparent not only in the use of the term “sexual relationship” but also in the statement that “one of the main goals in life is to have a satisfying sexual relationship” (p. 54). I’m not sure that everyone would agree.

The authors cover the topics that one would expect to see in a close relationships textbook (e.g., mate selection, attachment, love, communication, positive illusions). There also were some surprises. These include research on lay theories of relationships, mindreading, life history models of development, different philosophical positions on the relation between mind and body, human variability in production of the enzyme lactase, emotion-focused couples therapy, to name a few. Given the evolutionary focus, there also is substantial coverage of Darwin, the history of homo sapiens, amount of DNA that modern-day humans share with chimps and early humans, sexual dimorphism, sexual reproduction, the menstrual cycle and mate selection, individual differences in sociosexuality, and the like. As is apparent from these examples, the authors cover a lot of ground.

It also should be mentioned that the authors of this book do not shy away from the complexities of research on close relationships. There are places where they could have side-stepped inconsistencies or apparent contradictions in findings or glossed over them, but they don’t take the easy way out. I felt that they made heroic attempts to provide explanations or reconcile conflicting findings and also were honest in admitting when there aren’t easy answers. This is a definite strength of this book, although readers who are looking for a simple, clear bottom line (e.g., many of the undergraduates I teach) may be disappointed.

### **Writing Style**

Although the authors state in the Preface that this book is intended for university courses at the upper undergraduate or post-graduate levels, I felt that the level at which this book was written might be a bit challenging for some undergraduates. To give some examples, the undergraduates that I teach wouldn’t necessarily know what is meant by a “lay theory” or would need a bit more explanation to understand what is meant by statistical terms such as confirmatory factor analysis or multiple regression.

As another example, in the chapter on the Intimate Relationship Mind, the authors state that a general relationship theory differs from a general social theory because it is more “content-loaded” (p. 48). I’m not sure that undergraduates would understand what that means. A little later (on p. 55), they raise the question: “When do people think about their relationship?” An answer is provided: “If our general model is correct, the online processing should not normally occur, without also, willy-nilly, calling up various stored dispositional constructs that are relevant to the relationship, and these may include aspects from all three knowledge categories (general social theories, general relationship theories, and local relationship theories)” (p. 55). I hasten to say that I was pleased to see that the authors didn’t “dumb down” their writing. My point is that instructors who adopt this textbook should be aware that this book is written at a high level. When the authors say that it is recommended for upper-level undergraduate courses, I suggest taking the “upper level” part seriously.

### **A Quibble**

Reviewers are expected to find things to quibble about. My quibble (and it’s a small one at that) is that I felt more could have been done to “grab” the reader in the first chapter. I always like reading about the history of the close relationships field, including William Proxmire’s infamous indictment. However, I’m not sure that the primary audience, namely university students, will find this as interesting. Similarly, graphs of the number of articles on relationships that were published from 1970 to 2010 bring joy to my heart, but I’m not sure that this is what will get students hooked on the material. There certainly is value in providing the reader with historical background. It also is important to tell the reader about research methods in the field and to do so early on, but I had hoped that this might be reserved for Chapter 2. Put another way, Chapter 1 may not be what students expected when they opened a book on intimate relationships, but once they get going, they will find plenty to intrigue them. I certainly did.

### **My Wish List**

It is, of course, impossible to provide extensive coverage of every topic that is researched in the close relationships field. I realize that the authors had to make very difficult decisions about what to

include and what to exclude. If page constraints (and the limits of human attention) had not been an issue, here is my wish list of topics that would have been nice to include: research on online relationship formation, more research on same-sex relationships, research on power dynamics in relationships, recent research on prosocial relationship variables (e.g., sacrifice, gratitude, communal responsiveness, compassionate love). I also would have liked more research on relationship maintenance strategies (there is a section titled “Maintaining Relationships” that includes chapters on love, communication, sex, and violence, but doesn’t specifically cover research on maintenance strategies). My wish list also includes a chapter on commitment which would house the investment model (now currently residing in the chapter on Ending Relationships). Returning to the real world, authors had to pick and choose. There is no doubt that they made some very wise choices.

## **JOURNALS UPDATE**

### **Tentative Contents of Upcoming Journals**

*Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*  
May 2013 [Volume 30 #3]  
*Table of Contents*

MAGDALENA BUDZISZEWSKA, ELZBIETA DRYLL

Narratives about relationships with parents from the perspective of middle-aged and older adults

ANDREW K. PRZYBYLSKI, NETTA WEINSTEIN

Can you connect with me now? How the presence of mobile communication technology influences face-to-face conversation quality

DAVID M. FROST

The narrative construction of intimacy and affect in relationship stories: Implications for relationship quality, stability, and mental health

ELIZABETH A. BABIN

An examination of predictors of nonverbal and verbal communication of pleasure during sex and sexual satisfaction

MASUMI IIDA, MARY ANN PARRIS STEPHENS, MELISSA M. FRANKS, KAREN S. ROOK

Daily symptoms, distress and interaction quality among couples coping with type 2 diabetes

FRANKLIN O. POULSEN, THOMAS B. HOLMAN, DEAN M. BUSBY, JASON S. CARROLL

Physical attraction, attachment styles, and dating development

MARTIJN J. A. HOGERBRUGGE, AAFKE E. KOMTER, PEER SCHEEPERS

Dissolving long-term romantic relationships: Assessing the role of the social context

BRIAN G. OGOLSKY, JILL R. BOWERS

A meta-analytic review of relationship maintenance and its correlates

*Personal Relationships*  
*June 2013 [Volume 20 #2]*  
*Table of Contents*

NATASHA D. TIDWELL, PAUL W. EASTWICK, ELI J. FINKEL

Perceived, not actual, similarity predicts initial attraction in a live romance context: Evidence from the speed-dating program

JENNIFER A. THEISS, ROI ESTLEIN, KIRSTEN M. WEBER

A longitudinal assessment of relationship characteristics that predict new parents' relationship satisfaction

CAROLYN BIRNIE-PORTER, JOHN E. LYDON

A prototype approach to understanding sexual intimacy through its relationship to intimacy

KOEN PONNET, DIMITRI MORTELMANS, EDWIN WOUTERS, KARLA VAN LEEUWEN, KIM BASTAITS, INGE PASTEELS

Parenting stress and marital relationship as determinants of mothers' and fathers' parenting

JILL M. LOGAN, REBECCA J. COBB

Trajectories of relationship satisfaction: Independent contributors of capitalization and support perceptions

GURIT E. BIRNBAUM, MARIO MIKULINCER, MICHAL AUSTERLITZ

A fiery conflict: Attachment orientations and the effects of relational conflict on sexual motivation

DEBRA M. ZEIFMAN, JENNIFER E. MA  
Experimental examination of women's selection criteria for sperm donors versus life partners

RICHARD E. MATTSON, RONALD D. ROGGE, MATTHEW D. JOHNSON, ELIZABETH K. B. DAVIDSON, FRANK D. FINCHAM

The positive and negative semantic dimensions of relationship satisfaction

APRIL S. MASARIK, RAND D. CONGER, MONICA J. MARTIN, BRENT M. DONNELLAN, KATHERINE E. MASYN, FREDERICK O. LORENZ

Romantic relationships in early adulthood: Influences of family, personality, and relationship cognitions

THERESA E. DIDONATO, MELLISHA C. BEDMINSTER, JOANNA J. MACHEL  
My funny valentine: How humor styles affect romantic interest

## ANNOUNCEMENTS

### Share Your Approach: Teaching Close Relationships

If you teach an undergraduate course on close relationships, we need your help in generating content for future columns in the Teaching Close Relationships series. Specifically, we need:

1. **COURSE SYLLABI.** Consider contributing your syllabus to an informal content analysis of how members of our organization approach their classes.

Submit syllabi and course schedules to: [teachingcloserelationships@Sakai.Claremont.edu](mailto:teachingcloserelationships@Sakai.Claremont.edu) (please put "Syllabus" in the subject line) by June 1, 2013. We will summarize the results in the November edition of *Relationship Research News*.

2. CLASSROOM DEMONSTRATIONS. Consider contributing a description of any in-class demonstrations you use to bring to life particular methodologies, findings, or theories from our discipline. Submit your ideas to [teachingcloserelationships@Sakai.Claremont.edu](mailto:teachingcloserelationships@Sakai.Claremont.edu) (please put "Demos" in the subject line) by June 1, 2013. We will summarize the results in a forthcoming edition of *Relationship Research News*.

---

**Call for Papers: IARR Mini-  
Conference  
October 4 – 6, 2013  
Louisville, Kentucky**

**Multi-Level Motivations in Close  
Relationship Dynamics**

We invite you to submit a proposal for presentation at the 2013 mini-conference to be held in Louisville, KY. The conference will provide an opportunity to present and learn about cutting-edge research in the field of personal relationships. Scholars from different countries representing a broad range of disciplines (e.g., psychology, sociology, communication, family studies, social work, gerontology) will gather at the conference to share their work in various formats (e.g., symposia, papers, posters, round table discussions).

**Multi-Level Motivations Theme**

The mini-conference will focus on relationship dynamics that are influenced by diverse, sometimes contradictory motives. The Multi-Level Motivation perspective is defined as the analyses of behavior as a simultaneous product of both biologically-based and socioculturally-based forces. Sometimes, motives from the two levels work in concert and sometimes they are in conflict. Any need that functions in dialectic with another need could fit within such an analysis.

The tension between biological and social motives has been emphasized in areas such as gender differences, sexual behavior and attachment. Yet there are biologically-based tendencies to respond positively to beauty and negatively to strangers and those with illness, to respond to frustration with aggression, to imitate the behavior of other people, to echo warnings, and verbally express pain. The tendencies may be followed, or they may be suppressed, due to other motives arising from social training.

Tensions among needs arising within and between different motivational levels occur in such domains as health behavior, financial decision-making, interpersonal conflict, adoption and step-family dynamics, gender role issues, social support and a host of other areas, including impression management on social networking sites. The complex interplay of unconscious biologically-based inclinations, hormones and feelings with socially-based norms that are transmitted through modeling, language, education and religion are important to understand for theoretical, personal insight and public policy goals. Equally important to explicate are how such decisions are framed by the culture, expressed by the partner, and conceptualized by the decision-maker.

Relationship researchers are aware of both biological and social motives, yet the field remains largely divided between investigators who focus on evolutionary variables and explanations, and those who emphasize cultural and cognitive determinants of behavior. The Multi-Level Motivation perspective, by contrast, consistently seeks to explicate the simultaneous influence and interplay of both categories of motives in relationship behavior.

In this conference, we will offer keynote addresses and seek papers, posters and symposia from investigators striving to explicate the multiply motivated nature of relationship behaviors, including the enactment, self-perception and communication of those motives. **Thus, this is a call for investigators who are willing to creatively address a multi-level motivational explanatory framework in explicating their relationship research for this venue.**

**Potential Topic Areas** include but are not limited to: (a) attachment and social support, (b) attraction mate-selection and self-expansion; (c) sexual behavior, life history dynamics and pregnancy; (d) competition, conflict and interpersonal violence; (e) emotion regulation, terror management and health behavior; (f) methodological and measurement challenges involved in assessing multi-level motives (g) dialectics between showing off and maintaining modesty on social network sites, and (h) **other topics offered by creative and insightful IARR members**. Thus, this theme is meant to be inclusive, and is intended to tie together many traditional topics in the field of personal relationships through the lens of multi-level motivation.

**New Scholars Workshop:** A workshop for New Scholars (graduate students, post-docs, instructors and assistant professors) will be offered on October 4th. Jennifer Theiss will be coordinating and supplying additional details (Department of Communication, Rutgers University, 4 Huntington St., New Brunswick, NJ 08901 [jtheiss@rutgers.edu](mailto:jtheiss@rutgers.edu))

### Submissions

*The Program Committee invites proposals for symposia, papers, posters, roundtables, and interest groups on topics relevant to research and practice in social and personal relationships. Detailed information about the conference (e.g., how to submit proposals, how to register for the conference) will be available on the IARR website (<http://www.iarr.org/conferences/>). Submissions should be sent electronically via the conference website: <https://iarr.conference-services.net/authorlogin.asp?conferenceID=3588&language=en-uk>*

**Due to the circulation dates of RRN, the deadline for submissions has been extended to May 15, 2013.** Acceptance letters are expected June 30, 2013.

### Program and Local Arrangements Committee:

Michael Cunningham and Anita Barbee can answer your questions. Please feel free to contact them via email if you have questions/comments about the Call, the conference program, and conference arrangements ([iarr2013@louisville.edu](mailto:iarr2013@louisville.edu)). Others on the Committee include: Becky Antle (Marriage and Family Therapy- U of L), Jesse Owen, (Counseling Psychology- U of L) and more.

## Call for Proposals for 2015 IARR Mini-Conference

The Future Conferences Committee (FCC) of the International Association for Relationship Research (IARR) **invites letters of intent** to host a regional or thematic mini-conference to be held in 2015.

**The deadline for a letter of intent is May 1, 2013.**

The letters of intent will be screened by the FCC, followed by invitation to those selected to submit a **full proposal** with more detail. The FCC and the IARR Board will review the full proposals and make a final decision about mini-conferences. There can be more than one mini-conference selected for 2015, in different geographical areas.

For a mini-conference, the applicants are in charge of both local arrangements and developing the program, although these tasks could be divided among different individuals. In addition, assistance could be obtained by IARR members in near-by universities. Often mini-conferences have been held in university settings; therefore, it's an excellent way to showcase your university and to build up an interdisciplinary group at your university or geographical area interested in relationship science. In many cases, the Chair of the IARR Mentoring committee has been involved in organizing a new scholar workshop as a full day attached to the mini-conference.

The mini-conferences have a theme which has provided a focus for the submissions and keynote speakers. Past themes have included: Compassionate Love, Health and Relationships, Integrating across Disciplines, Health & Emotions, Generations of Relationships, and Multi-level Motivations in Relationships.

### Requirements for the Letter of Intent

A letter of intent to host a 2015 mini-conference (**due by May 1, 2013**) should contain the following information:

1. *Name, title, and contact information of applicants.* Include mailing address, telephone number, fax

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

2. *Site.* Include city, state or province, and country. Specify the physical site of the conference, such as a university campus or a conference center. Provide a brief description of the ambience and amenities of the site, including hotel options.

3. *Proposed dates.* Specify the proposed dates of the event. Past mini-conferences have held at various times, ranging from late May to November.

4. *Theme.* Explicate the theme of the conference. Discuss how the theme fits into the mission of IARR.

5. *Any possible co-sponsors.* Estimate the funding that might be available from your university or other sources.

6. *State why your location is ideal for the 2015 IARR mini-conference.* Provide a brief justification for the committee as to why your location would be ideal by noting any additional information not covered above. Please note that while the committee will consider the attraction of the location, there are many other factors that make an ideal location for a mini-conference, including: having dedicated IARR members on-site or near by who are willing to organize the conference, venue (conference space), having experienced university conference organizers, partnering with a university, ease of travel into the site, interesting conference theme, and potential sponsorship.

If you are selected to write a longer proposal (**to be due approximately July 15, 2013**), additional information to be requested in the proposal may include, but is not limited to:

### **Additional Requirements for Full Proposal**

1-6. *Update the information* requested above.

7. *Major venues.* Include descriptions of the following:

a. Meeting places, for sessions and poster sessions (if included).

b. Presentation equipment, including access to (a) computers for power point presentations; (b) computer projectors and screens for power point presentations; and (c) poster stands for poster sessions.

c. Eating facilities, including cafeterias, dining rooms, and banquet halls.

d. Lodging facilities, including local hotels, dormitories, and on-site housing. Describe any low-cost housing options.

8. *Hospitality.* Describe plans for lunches, dinners, and coffee breaks.

9. *Projected costs of travel and lodging.* Provide current airfares from gateway cities around the world (i.e., Beijing, Sydney, Chicago, Montreal, Buenos Aires, London, and Cairo), as well as travel options (e.g., Amtrak, bus) for those near by (many mini-conferences draw primarily from scholars from the surrounding areas). Estimate lodging costs for participants (for both regular and low-cost housing options).

10. *Projected registration fee.* The fee structure should include (a) a rate for members of IARR; (b) a rate for non-members of IARR; (c) a rate for graduate students; and (d) a rate for participants from underrepresented countries (based on World Bank classifications). Is there a late fee?

11. *Projected budget.* Complete and attach the *Mini-Conference Budget Form* available on the IARR website ([www.iarr.org](http://www.iarr.org)) or from Susan Sprecher ([sprecher@ilstu.edu](mailto:sprecher@ilstu.edu)). Estimate revenue (from registration fees, co-sponsors, etc.) and costs (for venue, meals, equipment rentals, conference program, speaker honorariums, etc.). Provide both overall and itemized estimates of revenues and costs.

Please note that FCC recognizes that any particular conference site may not be able to provide every ideal aspect of an IARR mini-conference. The committee is interested in working with you to develop your proposal, if you are interested in hosting the conference.

Please send your letter of intent via an email attachment by **May 1, 2013** to Susan Sprecher, Chair of the Future Conferences Committee ([sprecher@ilstu.edu](mailto:sprecher@ilstu.edu)). Please direct any questions to her.

---

## 2016 IARR Main Conference

### Location: Call for Proposals to Host the Conference

The Future Conferences Committee (FCC) of the International Association for Relationship Research (IARR) **invites letters of intent** to host the 2016 main conference.

**The deadline for a letter of intent is May 15, 2013.**

The letters of intent will be screened by the FCC, followed by invitation to those selected to submit a **full proposal** with more detail. The FCC and the IARR Board will review the full proposals and make a final decision about conference location.

The applicant(s) will serve as Local Arrangements Chair (or Co-Chairs) for the conference. The Local Arrangements Chair(s) will be responsible for coordinating the venue, meeting spaces, lodging, and meals for the conference. The Local Arrangements Chair/s will also work closely with the Program Chair/s, who is/are responsible for developing the program.

Because the 2014 site will be in Australia, FCC is especially interested in submissions for a North American location. However, we welcome submissions from anywhere.

Conference attendance has ranged from 300 to 650, with the higher attendance in recent conferences and in North American sites.

#### **Requirements for the Letter of Intent**

A letter of intent to host the 2016 conference (**due by May 15, 2013**) should contain the following information:

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

2. *Site.* Include city, state or province, and country. Specify the physical site of the conference, such as a university campus or a conference center. Provide a brief description of the ambience and amenities of the site, including hotel options.

3. *Proposed dates.* Specify the proposed dates of the event. The conference is usually held during a 4-5 day period in July, which is a reasonably convenient time for most IARR members.

4. *State why your location would be ideal for the 2016 IARR conference.* Provide a brief justification for the committee as to why your location would be ideal by noting any additional information not covered above. Please note that while the committee will consider the attraction of the location, there are many other factors that make an ideal location that you could highlight about your location, including: having dedicated IARR members on-site, the venue (conference space), having experienced university conference organizers, partnering with a university, and ease of travel into the site.

If you are selected to write a longer proposal (**to be due approximately July 15, 2013**), additional information to be requested in the proposal may include, but is not limited to:

#### **Additional Requirements for Full Proposal (due July 15, 2013)**

1-4. *Update the information* requested above.

5. *Major venues.* Include descriptions of the following:

a. Meeting places, including (a) auditoriums for plenary sessions; (b) a central area for breaks between sessions; (c) large rooms for symposia, book exhibits, registration, and poster sessions; and

(d) smaller rooms for paper sessions and interest groups.

b. Presentation equipment, including access to (a) computers for power point presentations; (b) computer projectors and screens for power point presentations; and (c) poster stands for poster sessions.

c. Eating facilities, including cafeterias, dining rooms, and banquet halls.

d. Lodging facilities, including local hotels, dormitories, and on-site housing. Describe any low-cost housing options.

6. *Hospitality*. Describe plans for lunches, dinners, and coffee breaks. Traditionally, all lunches and at least two dinners are served in community to encourage interaction among attendees. One coffee break in the morning and one coffee break in the afternoon (with beverages and light snacks) have been included in some prior conferences, when it has been cost-effective (this was not possible in the downtown Chicago conference).

7. *Awards dinner*. Include plans for an awards dinner with a social event (typically a dance) afterwards. The awards dinner can be included in the registration fee or available at an additional cost. Recent organizers have included it in the registration fee to encourage attendance.

8. *Optional excursion*. Describe plans for an optional excursion (if desired). This excursion should not be included as part of the registration fee.

9. *Local environment*. Describe the distance and availability of area restaurants, sights, bars, shopping.

10. *Projected costs of travel and lodging*. Provide current airfares from gateway cities around the world (i.e., Beijing, Sydney, Chicago, Montreal, Buenos Aires, London, and Cairo). Estimate lodging costs for participants (for both regular and low-cost housing options).

11. *Projected registration fee*. The fee structure should include (a) a rate for members of IARR; (b) a rate for non-members of IARR; (c) a rate for graduate students; and (d) a rate for participants from underrepresented countries (based on World Bank classifications).

12. *Projected budget*. Complete and attach the *Main Conference Budget Form* available on the IARR website ([www.iarr.org](http://www.iarr.org)) or from Susan Sprecher ([sprecher@ilstu.edu](mailto:sprecher@ilstu.edu)). Estimate revenue (from registration fees, co-sponsors, etc.) and costs (for venue, meals, equipment rentals, conference program, speaker honorariums, etc.). Provide both overall and itemized estimates of revenues and costs.

Please note that FCC recognizes that any particular conference site may not be able to provide every ideal aspect of an IARR conference. The committee is interested in working with you in developing your proposal, if you are interested in hosting the conference.

Please send your letter of intent via an email attachment by **May 15, 2013** to Susan Sprecher, Chair of the Future Conferences Committee ([sprecher@ilstu.edu](mailto:sprecher@ilstu.edu)). Please also direct any questions to her.

## MEMBER NEWS & UPDATES

### Members in the News

IARR member Edward Lemay was featured as a Rising Star in the April edition of *The Observer*, published by the Association for Psychological Science. Congratulations, Ed!

IARR members Ben Le, Gary Lewandowski, and Tim Loving were awarded the Media Prize by the Society for Personality and Social Psychology for their work on the Science of Relationships website ([www.scienceofrelationships.com](http://www.scienceofrelationships.com)). Way to go, guys!

Research published by IARR members Marianne Dainton and John Caughlin in the *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships* was recently featured in a *Wall Street Journal* article entitled "The Little Lies Spouses Tell." Marianne also appeared on the CBS Morning show along with Elizabeth Bernstein (a member of the IARR Media Relations committee) to discuss this research.

The work of IARR members Art Aron, Ben Karney, Lisa Neff and Terri Orbuch was highlighted in an article in the April 2013 issue of the *APA Monitor* entitled "Can This Marriage Be Saved?"

Research published by IARR members Justin Lehmiller and Laura VanderDrift in *the Journal of Sex Research* was featured in several media outlets, including the *Huffington Post*, *Yahoo! News*, and the *Daily Mail*.

IARR member Ximena Arriaga was interviewed by the *Journal & Courier* about her recent study published in *Social Psychological and Personality Science* that examined the consequences of ending an abusive dating relationship. Her co-authors on this research were Nicole Capezza, Wind Goodfriend, Elizabeth Rayl, and Kaleigh Sands.

Research published in the *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships* by Ben Le, Miriam Korn, Erin Crockett, and Tim Loving was featured in a *Wall Street Journal* article entitled "When it Never Gets Easier to Say Goodbye."

Gary Lewandowski was interviewed for articles published in *USA Today* ("Professor Researches, Teaches Science of Love"), *Redbook* ("Get Ready to Crush on Your Husband"), and *Women's Health* ("Curious if You're a Normal Couple?").

Justin Lehmiller was interviewed for articles published on *CNN.com* ("Why You Should Talk About Sex Before Marriage"), *Live Science* ("First-Date Sex May Harm Couples"), and in *Cosmopolitan* ("Take Your Love to an Epic Level").

IARR members Eli Finkel and Benjamin Karney published a popular editorial in the *New York Times* entitled "The Dubious Science of Online Dating."

**Have your contributions to relationship science been recognized in some way? Has your research been featured in the media or have you done some media outreach? Email your announcements to [lehmill@fas.harvard.edu](mailto:lehmill@fas.harvard.edu)**

---

## **Book Announcement:** *The Communication of Jealousy*

Announcing the publication of *The Communication of Jealousy*, by Jennifer L. Bevan and published by Peter Lang: Informed by a wide variety of academic disciplines as well as offering a unique interpersonal communication approach to the study of jealousy, *The Communication of Jealousy* examines, integrates, and informs research on jealousy experience and expression.

The book's integration and interpretation of academic jealousy research is through a jealousy expression lens, meaning that the focus will be particularly (but not exclusively) on jealousy research that includes a behavioral or interpersonal communicative component drawn from a number of academic disciplines as diverse as communication, social and clinical psychology, sociology, criminology, forensic anthropology, and the biological sciences.

To date, no academic book has considered jealousy primarily from an interpersonal communication perspective and in doing so will effectively connect jealousy research from related academic disciplines as well as develop a theory that advances the state of jealousy expression research.

## 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

Julie Fitness  
(Personal Relationships)  
Personal\_Relationships@uncg.edu

Justin Lehmillier  
(Relationship Research News)  
lehmillier@fas.harvard.edu

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)