RELATIONSHIP RESEARCH NEWS

OFFICIAL NEWS JOURNAL OF THE INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR RELATIONSHIP RESEARCH

PRESIDENT'S COLUMN

Mid-Term Report

by Dan Perlman
University of North Carolina at Greensboro

In Greek mythology, Janus is the two-faced god who looks backwards and forwards. This is my mid-term, Janus report.

In terms of transitions, thanks go to outgoing Board member, Emily Impett, for her excellent, dedicated service as an IARR Board member. Fortunately for IARR, Emily has already agreed to serve in a new role: as chair of the IARR Student Travel Awards Committee that will grant financial awards to several students attending IARR's 2014 Biennial Conference in Melbourne, July 10-13. Adrianne Kunkel (Communication Studies, University of Kansas) has joined the Board and already chaired an ad hoc Committee to consider IARR's cooperation with the Science of Relationships web site.

The Board held what I believe is its first ever conference call meeting in August. In preparation for the meeting, various Committee Chairs and other governance members reported on their 2012-13 activities. These reports are available on IARR's website (available via the bottom of this page: http://www.iarr.org/about/). The reports indicated a plethora of good things are happening. The Board meeting allowed a review of IARR's budget situation and a judicious allocation of funds to enhance or initiate IARR activities.

A Sampler of 2012-13 Accomplishments
- IARR extended its contract with Cambridge University Press to continue publishing the Advances Series. Chris Agnew's volume, *Social*

Influences on Close Relationships: Beyond the Dyad, is moving ahead toward publication. New proposals are welcome (contact Chris Agnew).
- Susan Boon's efforts to establish an archive of administrative and historical materials continues to progress; Susan would appreciate hearing from members with material to contribute.
- F. Scott Christopher, chair of the Awards Committee, has invited nominations for various IARR Awards to be made in Melbourne next summer (contact: Scott.Christopher@asu.edu).
- The Future Conferences Committee has been hard at work with the sites of two 2015 Mini-Conferences (one in the US and another in Europe) as well as the 2016 Biennial Conference likely to be announced very soon.
- The International Committee is conducting a survey of members outside North America. The survey focuses on the extent to which IARR fulfills their professional development needs and also seeks to identify activities or capacity building initiatives that international members would like IARR to develop.
- The Melbourne Local Arrangements and Program Committees have acquired the assistance of a Conference planner, signed a contract with the Melbourne Convention Centre, obtained in-kind and financial support for the conference, and begun announcing the July 10-13, 2014 conference.
- In conjunction with the Media Relations Committee, the podcasts of featured *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships* articles have attracted over 15,000 visits between January 2010 and February 2013. Great going Bjarne Holmes and the JSPR interviewees!
- The Membership Committee has translated membership information into five languages (Spanish, Italian, Portuguese, Dutch and Japanese).
- Incoming PR Editor Julie Fitness now has her editorial board well established and is using the ScholarOne manuscript processing system.

Relationship researchers submitted 219 original manuscripts to PR during the period June 1, 2012 to June 1, 2013. In other PR news, the journal's impact factor score under Lorne Campbell's editorship was up over 10% in 2012.

- John Caughlin, single-handedly and in conjunction with members of the Publication Committee, has played key roles in IARR's relationships with our publishing partners (Cambridge University Press, Sage, and Wiley-Blackwell), most currently spearheading IARR's negotiations with Sage so that IARR members will continue receiving the *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships* as a membership benefit.
- RRN Editor Justin Lehmiller published his first issue of the Newsletter in May. The current issue marks a transition toward having an electronic format. Justin will be conducting a survey of member's RRN reading habits and preferred mode of delivery. Please participate in it.
- Following the recommendation of the IARR Finance Committee, Secretary-Treasurer Leah Bryant has moved a portion of IARR's assets from a low-yielding, fixed-income investment into a balanced mutual fund. She also brought forward a budget review and 2013-14 budget proposal for the Board's August conference call.
- The Teaching Committee, led by Kelly Campbell, has been collecting materials (e.g., syllabi, a list of textbooks, a list of recommended articles and book chapters that are considered essential reads for our field, a list of online resources, and grant funding sources concerned with the teaching of relationship courses). The Committee has prepared a Teaching web page for the IARR site (http://www.iarr.org) that will likely be open by the time you read this.
- Since assuming responsibilities in the spring of 2012, Web Master Benjamin Le has redesigned the IARR web site, enhancing its functionality. Since launching in July 2012, the redesigned site has received approximately 37,000 page views, from 16,000 visitors. This is about 3,200 page views a month (around 100 a day), and 1,400 visitors each month (about 45 a day). Material for the site, http://www.iarr.org, is welcome.

Budget Allocations
Over the years, IARR has grown in complexity as an organization and benefitted from all that members have done for the Association (e.g., successful conferences, the *Personal Relationships* journal contract) as well as from prudent financial management. Thus, at present, IARR can take steps to better support some of our activities and explore new ones. During its August conference call, the Board approved the following budget items:

a) IARR Student Travel Awards for 50 students attending IARR's 2014 Biennial Conference in Melbourne ($18,750),
b) Administrative support of $2500, if needed, for the Secretary-Treasurer,
c) Software for the RRN Editor to enable IARR to produce an online-based newsletter ($2700),
d) Support for the New Professional workshop to be staged in conjunction with the Louisville Mini-Conference ($2500), and
e) Added funding ($5,000) for the Editor of *Personal Relationships* to be used at her discretion to take a step toward making the support of the PR Editor more comparable to the support Sage provides to the JSPR editor.

As I write this column, I am preparing to go to IARR's 2013 Louisville Mini-Conference on Multi-level Motivations in Close Relationship Dynamics organized by Michael Cunningham and Anita Barbee. With over 115 participants from 27 states and 5 countries pre-registered, it portends to be a successful event with an exciting program. The Keynote Speakers include: Anita Barbee, Michael Cunningham, Karen Kayser, David Schmitt, and Peter Todd.

In sum, IARR is flourishing. Looking ahead, IARR's governance group is an energetic, well-functioning team. The core values of the Association include the fostering of relationship science via assistance to members, conferences, journals and media relations; welcoming newcomers to the field; being multidisciplinary and being international. IARR is moving forward on all of those values. I thank all who are dedicating their time and skills. A major highlight on the horizon is the 2014 Biennial Conference in Melbourne. The organizing group is preparing suggestions for visiting Australia on a budget. Tip one: book your flight several months in advance. The Program Committee plans to send out decisions by the end of 2013, which will give delegates at least 6 months to book their tickets. I encourage you to submit something for the program and to plan to attend.

INSIDE THIS ISSUE OF RELATIONSHIP RESEARCH NEWS

FROM THE EDITOR'S DESK

by Justin Lehmiller
Harvard University

On behalf of the *Relationship Research News* editorial team, I am pleased to present our final issue of 2013. My sincere thanks to Associate Editors Amy Muise and Deb Mashek, as well as everyone else who contributed to our news journal this year. I would also like to welcome a new addition to our editorial team, Jessica Eckstein, who assisted with this issue and will take on an expanded role next year.

RRN is in a transitional phase right now. I have had several discussions with IARR board members over the last several months about how RRN can best meet the needs of our members. One concern is ensuring that members have timely access to the contents, especially given that RRN is frequently used to communicate announcements. Another concern is making sure that members receive RRN in the format they find most convenient and readable in the digital era.

To that end, all members have continued to receive the print version of RRN; however, we have also made each issue immediately available on the IARR website as soon as it was finalized and emailed members a direct link to this.

We are considering moving to online-only distribution in the near future and using software that will produce a more dynamic and visually appealing newsletter. However, we want to be sure that any changes we make do not undermine readership of RRN or the value of this newsletter to our organization. As a result, we will soon be conducting a survey of members' RRN reading habits in the hope of figuring out how best to proceed. A link to an online survey will be sent out this fall and we would greatly appreciate hearing your feedback.

In the meantime, feel free to direct compliments about the newsletter to me via email (justin.lehmiller@gmail.com). If you have complaints, please send them to Dave Kenny. As you

will see in his column this month, he takes constructive criticism much better than me.

In all seriousness, please be sure to check out the contents of this issue. Deb Mashek has coauthored a fantastic piece with Ximena Arriaga and Kelly Campbell that provides incredibly valuable insight into organizing and teaching a close relationships course.

Amy Muise has authored a provocative article based upon her interviews with several IARR members about their experiences dealing with the media and the advice they would like to share with fellow relationship researchers.

You will also find a useful book review by Katy Wiss of the edited volume *Human Bonding: The Science of Affectional Ties*, as well as announcements of four new books authored by IARR members. Our members are clearly taking the book-publishing world by storm!

Please check out our Members in the News section for a look at some of the great media outreach and recognition our members have received, and please review the announcements section for details on submitting work to the 2014 IARR main conference as well as a call for nominations for editor of the *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*.

Thank you again to everyone who contributed to this issue of RRN. Happy reading!

-Justin

Submission deadline for the Next issue of RRN

April 1, 2014

Submit all materials to Justin Lehmiller

justin.lehmiller@gmail.com

FEATURE ARTICLES

Teaching Close Relationships

Part 2: Texts, Topics, and Assignments

by Debra Mashek
Harvey Mudd College

Ximena Arriaga
Purdue University

Kelly Campbell
University of Georgia

Editor's Note: To support new teachers' efforts to navigate the promises and challenges of teaching about close relationships, RRN will run a series of teaching-focused articles over the coming year. This column is the second in that series. The first column, which focused on objectives-driven course design, is available in the Spring 2013 edition of RRN.

Constructing pedagogically sound strategies to teach the issues, topics, and theories we love can be an engaging – even enjoyable – challenge. Yet, when asked to create a course from scratch, new instructors can feel a bit afloat. They might crave information about the range of possible topics, readings, and assignments. And, they might wonder if there are any "industry norms" they should be aware of as they construct their courses.

Such information could be found by peeking in on what others are doing or have done in their classes; yet this intelligence-seeking option is not always available. Sure, new instructors might have access to a syllabus from a course they took once upon a time, and the miracle of Google has provided increased access to examples. The problem, of course, is that the acquired collection might lack sufficient scope or a desired coherence, limiting new instructors' confidence that their found sources tell a complete story.

Where, then, can new instructors turn to find ideas for their close relationships courses, as well as some cohesive sense of what other instructors do in their courses? That's what we're here for. The purpose of this column is two-fold. First, thanks to the generosity of our colleagues, we share insights gleaned from an informal content analysis of undergraduate course syllabi drawn from multiple disciplines, countries, and types of institutions. Second, we highlight some key resources instructors can turn to for inspiration when teaching close relationships.

A Content Analysis of Undergraduate Close Relationship Syllabi

Instructors far and wide submitted their close relationship syllabi and assignment ideas in response to a call circulated in this newsletter and on relevant listservs. As we read the submitted materials, we compiled summaries of topics covered, texts employed, and so forth. Although our method fell short of a formal content analysis, it nevertheless offers a great opportunity to peek inside the courses taught by colleagues within different disciplines, at different types of institutions, and in classes of different size. We share the results of our inquiry here.

We received syllabi for 25 undergraduate courses in close relationships, all of which were taught in communication, family studies, or psychology departments. The courses varied in terms of their level (e.g., survey courses, advanced seminars), and in terms of the format (e.g., lecture, discussion, lab, activity-based).

Texts. Table 1 provides a list of the textbooks mentioned in the acquired syllabi as well as additional relevant texts that were added by members of the IARR Teaching Committee. Approximately two-thirds of the courses required readings (e.g., primary research articles) beyond an assigned textbook. The decision to use a textbook (and which textbook to use) is a highly personal one that often reflects class size. Jennifer Tomlinson (Colgate University) commented, "I chose to use a textbook rather than using articles because the class size was big enough that discussion of articles would have been more challenging. I think if I taught it again I

would try to integrate more articles." In contrast, Christine Proulx (University of Missouri), who teaches a smaller course stated, "The use of all empirical articles and the specific assignments I've created are all based on an upper-level seminar style class—the course would likely be very different if it were larger." Still, other instructors indicated that class size does not impact their choice of text or their decision to combine a text and additional readings.

Table 1: Textbooks
Bradbury, T. N., & Karney, B. R. (2010). *Intimate relationships*. New York: W.W. Norton & Co.
Dragon, W., & Duck, S. (2005). *Understanding research in personal relationships: A text with readings*. London: Sage.
Duck, S. (2007). *Human relationships* (4th ed.). London: Sage.
Erber, R., & Erber, M. (2011). *Intimate relationships: Issues, theories, and tesearch* (2nd ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
Lewandowski, G., Loving, T., Le, B., & Gleason, M. (2011). *Science of relationships*. Dubuque, IA: Kendall Hunt Publishing Company.
Fletcher, G., Simpson, J. A., Campbell, L., & Overall, N. C. (2013). *The science of intimate relationships*. West Sussex, UK: Wiley-Blackwell.
Miller, R. S. (2012). *Intimate relationships* (6th ed.). Boston, MA: McGraw-Hill.
Ogolsky, B. G., Lloyd, S. A., & Cate, R. M. (2013). *The developmental course of romantic relationships*. New York: Routledge.
Regan, P. C. (2011). *Close relationships*. East Sussex, UK: Routledge.
Vangelisti, A. L., & Perlman, D. (2006). *The Cambridge handbook of personal relationships*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
Willerton, J. (2010). *The psychology of relationships*. Basingstoke, England: Palgrave MacMillan.

Topics. Although the syllabi evidenced a good deal of variance in the topics covered, some topics emerged quite frequently. Table 2 lists most of the topics that were covered in the relationships courses that were sampled, and it specifies whether these topics were mentioned frequently, often, or rarely. We should note, however, that some topics in the "Rarely Included" list have received more attention

in recent textbooks, and therefore may figure more prominently in the future as courses are revised.

Not surprisingly, there are more potential topics for a course on close relationships than can feasibly be covered in a quarter or semester. To help narrow the field under consideration, Jennifer Bevan (Chapman University) takes the following approach: "I choose a textbook that I really like and see what its topics are. I also supplement that list with ideas from other relationship course texts. The Science of Relationships blog is also a great resource." Jennifer Tomlinson commented, "It was very helpful to have taken or TAed for several close relationships courses before teaching my own, so I was able to select the topics that I thought were most interesting from my experiences on the other side of the aisle." Geoff MacDonald's (University of Toronto) decision about what topics to cover in his course is guided by a desire to share with students information they can use. He notes, "My philosophy is that only about 1% of my students will go on to become researchers, whereas about 100% of them will have romantic relationships. So, I figure there is more good to be done by preparing students for what is ahead of them."

Assignments.   The syllabi submitted described a variety of assignments beyond taking exams, such as: short papers (e.g., reactions to published research); extended papers (e.g., research papers); journals, class presentations by individuals, dyads or groups; written reflections on relationship experiences, leading a class discussion, and conducting original research. Table 3 provides brief summaries of the various assignments described in the submitted syllabi.

Of course, the number and type of assignments given in a particular class is constrained by the number of students enrolled, as well as the availability of course support (including teaching assistants). Molly Metz (University of California, Santa Barbara) commented that course size has a large impact on the assignments she offers. "I *will* have a writing component," she notes, "but the number/length/depth will vary…just being in a large class is no reason not to engage with the material." Jimmie Manning (Northern Illinois University), who teaches a class of approximately 24 students, added that: "…the research participation and personal narrative assignments require more one-

Table 2: Most Popular Topics Covered in Collected Syllabi (Listed in Alphabetical Order)		
Frequently Included	**Often Included**	**Rarely Included**
Aggression	Commitment	Alcohol
Attraction processes (including initial impressions, speed-dating)	Gender comparisons	Belonging and other fundamental needs affected by relationships
Communication	Intimacy/closeness	Connection, tension, and dialectics
Conflict	Loneliness/rejection	Health
Dissolution	Relationship typologies	Infidelity
Maintenance	Same-sex relationships	Media effects (on beliefs and expectations)
Major theories and frameworks (e.g., Attachment, Interdependence, Evolutionary)	Social support	Methods
Negative emotions (e.g., jealousy)	Specific other nonromantic close relationships (parent relations, friendships, sibling relations)	Nonverbal communication
Positive emotions (e.g., love)		Online relationships
Relationship stages (e.g., dating, marriage, cohabitation)		Perceived partner responsiveness/trust
Sexuality/sexual relations (including hook-ups)		Personality
Social cognition		Post-dissolution
		Power
		Privacy and secrets
		Relationships across cultures
		Relationships in societal context
		Self-disclosure
		Treatment/intervention
		Uncertainty

Table 3: Sample Assignments from Undergraduate Close Relationships Courses
Accuracy of textbooks. Students select a citation of an empirical study from their textbook, read the paper cited, summarize the textbook's description of the research, and then critically analyze the fit between the textbook's description and their own independent reading of the paper.
Analysis of a personal experience. Students critically examine a personal life experience and write a paper in which they use theories and concepts to understand what occurred.
Analysis of a short story about a relationship. Students read a short story describing an intimate relationship, from a collection of short stories published in *American Salvage*. They write a paper applying course concepts to the relationship described in the story.
Applying research findings. Students identify a research study describing a phenomenon that interests them. Then, they select two examples – one that supports the phenomenon as described in the study, and another that does not. The examples are taken from students' own experiences, the experiences of others, or from popular cultural media (e.g., books, TV, movies). Students also discuss how the examples illuminate boundary conditions of the phenomenon and the applicability of the findings to real-world relationships.
Communication consulting project. Students identify a problem that occurs in interpersonal communication, analyze the problem by incorporating relevant literature, and propose solutions to relationships affected by the problem.
Critique of relationships in film. Students select a movie from a list that portrays a variety of relationship dynamics. They analyze whether the portrayal is realistic and grounded in the scientific literature. A closely related assignment involves watching *When Harry Met Sally* and writing an analysis of their relationship development.
Critique of relationships advice. Students find relationship advice in a popular media source (e.g., *Cosmopolitan* or *Men's Health*), and critically examine the accuracy of advice in light of actual research on the same topic.
Evaluating own relationship. Students reflect on a current or recent relationship and apply a specified number (e.g., seven) of concepts/theories discussed in the course.
Facebook postings. Students receive points for posting a video or article on Facebook and indicating how it relates class .
Literature review and research proposal. Students select a relationships topic. They review, critique, and synthesize a set (e.g., five) of journal articles on that topic, and then propose directions for new research on this topic.
Relationship How-To Guide. Students synthesize research on a relationship topic and write a practical guide for public dissemination.
Relationships in music. Students create a soundtrack (CD) or playlist with a minimum of 10 songs relevant to relationships, accompanied by a paper that explains the song choices, order, and relevance to course content.

on-one time to ensure students are getting proper guidance both in and out of class." Other instructors similarly noted that assignments such as journaling and term papers – as well as in-depth class discussions – would be reserved for smaller class sizes.

Where to Turn for Ideas and Inspiration?

Although our informal content analysis provides a nice snapshot of what a couple dozen instructors are doing in their close relationships courses at this point in time, it doesn't provide nitty-gritty details about how any single course or assignment is constructed. Where can new instructors turn for these more nuanced ideas and models? Drumroll, please!

We are excited to announce two initiatives to support relationship scholars' efforts in the classroom. First, IARR now offers several teaching resources on its website (http://www.iarr.org/). Just click on the Teaching Resources tab on the homepage to see what is available. Instructors will find sample syllabi, recommended textbooks, essential reads (articles and book chapters), media resources to support teaching, and funding opportunities for course development. To whet your appetite, here are just a few examples of resources already posted on this site:

--Sample close relationships syllabi from both undergraduate- and graduate-level courses in Communication Studies, Family Studies, and Psychology.

--Links to online scales used in close relationships research.

--Lectures by scholars in our field (e.g., Relationship Matters podcasts, TED talks)

--Links to blog posts about close relationships.

--Recommended DVDs and television episodes.

--Links to useful websites (e.g., Science of Relationships, socialpsychology.org, teachpsych.org).

--List of associations that fund teaching projects (e.g., Society for the Teaching of Psychology)

This resource site is in its infancy; IARR needs your help to make it bigger and better. Please send your content suggestions to kelly@csusb.edu

A second initiative designed to support our work in the classroom will unfold during the 2014 biennial conference in Melbourne. For the first time in the organization's history, the program will include a

series of teaching-focused sessions, an effort spearheaded by Kelly Campbell, Deb Mashek, Brian Spitzberg, and members of the IARR conferences planning committee. In order to be considered for one of these sessions, select the keyword "teaching" when submitting your proposal. If you would like feedback on your idea, contact Kelly Campbell at kelly@csusb.edu.

Closing Thoughts

Evidence from our field suggests that high quality relationships are built upon a norm of sharing our authentic selves with our partners (Aron, Melinat, Aron, Vallone, & Bator, 1997). Likewise, we suspect that *teaching* about relationships improves when teacher-scholars share their expertise, ideas, and materials with others. When asked about the ethics of such sharing, Rody Miller (Sam Houston State University) commented, "Give credit where credit is due, acknowledging the provenance of a particular idea. But share, and share widely and generously." We invite each of you to contribute your expertise and good ideas to the effort.

Author Note

Reference
Aron, A., Melinat, E., Aron, E., N., Vallone, R., & Bator, R. (1997). The experimental generation of interpersonal closeness: A procedure and some preliminary findings. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 23,* 363-37.

A Brave New World: Relationship Research in the Media

by Amy Muise
University of Toronto

The widespread use of the Internet has changed the way we share and access information of all kinds. For many of us, our daily life now includes updating our Facebook status, being alerted to the latest news via Twitter, or downloading podcasts for our commute to work. These changes mean that there are now more opportunities than ever before for relationship scientists to share their findings with the general public. This ease of information sharing coupled with immense public interest in what we do raises important questions about whether relationship researchers have a responsibility to disseminate their findings broadly and, if so, how to go about this in the most responsible way.

I have personally engaged with the media, both in terms of sharing my findings with journalists and by engaging in popular press writing through columns on *Science of Relationships* and *Psychology Today*. These experiences have led me to believe that there are important reasons for relationship researchers to consider dissemination of this sort. For one thing, the public could stand to benefit from learning about the findings published in academic journals because there are very few reliable sources of relationship information in the popular media—most sources are anecdotal. Of course, we are partially to blame for this, given that our journals are generally inaccessible to the general public by paywalls and the articles can be difficult for the average person to read and comprehend. But beyond informing the public, researchers may also benefit from this form of dissemination. In grant applications, it is now expected that your knowledge mobilization plan go beyond sharing your work at academic conferences and in academic journals, and include using online forums and media outlets to share your findings with the public. In addition, research has found that articles shared more via social media get more citations than those that are shared less or not all (Eysenbach, 2011). This suggests the intriguing possibility that sharing research via social media could potentially influence the impact of an article.

At the same time, I struggle with certain ethical issues when sharing information with the public. It often requires discussing findings in an easily accessible way and perhaps compromising some of the details and nuances that we are used to including when we present our academic work. Also, we know little about how the public applies these findings to their own lives; however, we do know that many of our effects are small and that they differ across individuals and groups, so they are not equally applicable to all people.

Geoff MacDonald, a professor at the University of Toronto, recalls that when he was a graduate student there was very limited space for talking about research beyond journals and conferences. Today, there is a public space for virtually any academic who wants it. He identifies potential benefits of this shift, such as creating more diversity in discourse on relationships, but cautions that this can "create a sense of consensus that emerges not from the correctness of the idea but from the popularity of movements at a particular time." To be sure, he asks us to imagine the consensus around behaviorism from academic experts if there had been blogs in the 1950s.

The purpose of this column is to discuss our responsibilities when sharing relationship research with the public, the ethics involved in disseminating research in the age of social media and blogging, and the benefits and challenges of disseminating relationship research broadly.

Do We Have a Responsibility to Share Our Research Findings Broadly?

The public is hungry for information about relationships. Terri Orbuch, former president of IARR, thinks it is a worthwhile goal to make our research accessible to the public. She states, "If I don't share my research findings in the media, the information is confined to academic journals and books, which the public is unable to read due to the academic jargon used or because the articles are reported in journals they cannot access … it is a shame that such great information from relationship scientists is read by only a few." In addition, there are many people speaking in the media claiming relationship expertise. One benefit of sharing our research more broadly is that relationship scientists

can contribute to the discourse on relationships that is currently dominated by self-proclaimed experts and "sexperts." Indeed, Orbuch suggests that many such folk (think Dr. Phil and Dr. Laura) are perpetuating incorrect information, myths, and stereotypes about relationships that the general public is listening to and applying to their own lives. She believes it is critical for us to share findings from our research in the hope of giving the public "higher quality" information about relationships.

In the past, researchers had limited options for sharing findings with the general public and primarily relied on media professionals to translate the information for the masses. Today, researchers have additional options for sharing their findings that may provide them with more control. Orbuch says that in addition to sharing her findings via media professionals, she also shares research directly with the public via popular books, blogs, and articles. Creating a direct channel from researchers to the general public was also one of the goals of Drs. Tim Loving, Gary Lewandowski and Benjamin Le, when they created *Science of Relationships,* a website that disseminates relationship research to the public in an accessible way. Lewandowski thinks that as relationship scientists, we have an obligation to communicate our findings, not just to other scientists, but to the public.

One opportunity gained from sharing our research broadly is the chance to engage with the public about our research. MacDonald thinks that one of the best features of the Internet is that it allows a meaningful way for the public to talk back to researchers. It can be eye-opening to see how the public responds to and questions our work. In a recent dissertation by Jeffrey Yen, a former graduate student at University of Toronto and a current professor at the University of Guelph, analyses were conducted on the comments sections of psychology-related *New York Times* articles. The results of this research suggest that the public is far from blindly accepting what we have to say and it can be humbling to be reminded of how the public actually engages with our work.

What are the Potential Benefits?

The goal of much of relationship research is to learn about the factors that contribute to satisfying relationships, as well as those that detract from relationship happiness. Given this, it would seem as though the public could potentially reap benefits in their own relationships by learning more about relationship science. Lewandowski believes our findings have the potential to help others. He also thinks sharing information about our research methodology can demystify relationship science and help make our work more transparent and understandable to the public.

Sharing research with the public can also have personal benefits for the researcher, and for the field more broadly. MacDonald views sharing information with the media as an opportunity for self-expression and a chance to make a meaningful contribution to public discourse. However, not all media requests are created equal and MacDonald tends to only pursue those in which he thinks he can contribute something important and his point will be accurately conveyed: "I'm more inclined to accept an interview request if I can talk about the issues that are of most interest to me or I can see that the slant a reporter is taking needs an alternative perspective. I'm also more inclined to say yes if it's a format that won't be edited or if it's a reporter I have experience with and trust to accurately convey what I'm trying to say."

We should also consider whether sharing relationship research more broadly benefits the field as a whole. Loving believes there are extrinsic payoffs to sharing relationship science. He mentions the dire research funding conditions in the U.S. and suggests that making more people aware of our work could ultimately lead to more research support. He believes that promoting greater appreciation of relationship science in the public arena can potentially help the current funding situation as well as benefit future generations of relationship scientists.

What are Some Potential Risks?

One concern about sharing research in the media that was mentioned by everyone I talked to was the risk of being misquoted or misrepresented. According to Le, this is one of his hesitancies about sharing his work in outlets where he has less control. Justin Lehmiller, a College Fellow at Harvard University and founder of the website *The Psychology of Human Sexuality*, recalls more than a few media experiences where he was misquoted or where his

quotes were truncated because of space considerations and his message lost an important nuance he wanted to convey.

MacDonald raises two important, but less discussed risks. He suggests that beyond the risk of being misquoted, there is the risk that we will share findings that were not genuine effects in the first place. Sharing findings that have yet to be replicated could actually be doing the public a disservice if we end up widely publicizing false positive results. "It's easy to be excited about a particular new piece of research that you've conducted, which can lead to some excessive zeal. So as a rule, I prefer to talk about broader issues (e.g., attachment theory) rather than piecemeal findings," he says. MacDonald also cautions against succumbing to the addictive nature of the label and role of the "expert." "As academics, we operate in an environment with limited short-term reward, and especially at an early career stage where you are uncertain of your place in the field but often a little over-certain of your perspective on the world, it can be quite a rush to be suddenly held up as an expert." The fear here is that if being an academic celebrity is drug-like in this way, it has the potential to lead to overstating findings with the goal of drawing attention to oneself rather than to the actual research.

Related to this, Lewandowski highlights key differences between conveying our research in academic circles and presenting our research in media outlets. In the media, we are competing with other relationship "experts," most of whom have more fame and exposure than we do and it can be tempting to "perform" in the media as they do in order to compete. Many academics are extremely careful about overstating their findings because this is actively discouraged by journal editors and reviewers; however, very tentative statements with lots of caveats are typically perceived as far less exciting in the media, and may either result in less exposure or compel the researcher to hype their findings to make them more exciting.

What are Some Best Practice Strategies?

Although there are challenges to sharing our research findings in the media, Loving suggests that the answer is not to remain silent about our work. He acknowledges that, "It can be tough to share

information in a way that remains true to the science while simultaneously making the findings accessible to the general public … and it's hard to walk that line that makes the work both interesting and relevant while also appreciating the nuances that qualify our findings." Despite these inherent difficulties, Lehmiller believes that "disseminating to an academic audience isn't enough, especially when you're studying one of the most fascinating topics in the world and it's something that people desperately want to learn about. If we don't share our findings with the media, not only are we missing out on opportunities to educate the general public, but we're also missing out on opportunities to shape the message and make sure it's reported accurately." Here are a few ideas that might help relationship researchers maximize the benefits of sharing information in the media and minimize the risks.

Be Mindful of Your Motivations for Sharing Research in the Media

One way to minimize the risks of overstating your findings or misrepresenting your work is to think about your motivations for sharing information in the media in the first place. If you are simply in search of your 15-minutes of fame or have a strong desire for "expert" status, proceed with caution. Far too many academic celebrities have achieved their media stature by claiming to have all of the answers and by sounding extremely confident in everything they say, regardless of whether it is right or wrong. MacDonald reminds us that there is a big performance element to being in the media. An authoritative tone is a required element of performance when playing the role of expert, but this authority may not always be consistent with the strength or generalizability of our findings.

Consider your Comfort Zone

Even if you have an interest in sharing your research in the media, you do not have to accept all media requests nor do you need to restrict yourself to providing quotes for reporters. Some people may choose to create their own content through personal blogs or websites such as *Science of Relationships,* where they have more control. However, Lehmiller suggests that although social media and blogging have created new opportunities for sharing our research, this does not mean that every relationship

scientist should start blogging or get actively involved in social media. This is not part of everyone's skill set and it is important to balance the potential risks and rewards in terms of your long-term career goals. For example, MacDonald says that he only shares research with the media under certain conditions: when he feels comfortable that the journalist will represent his ideas accurately and when he thinks he can make a meaningful contribution to knowledge.

For those interested in sharing research in the media, Orbuch has several tips for honing these skills and minimizing the risks that can accompany dissemination. She suggests taking steps to learn how to convey your research findings in an accessible way. This could include taking a media training workshop, consulting with IARR members who have an established media presence, sharing research with friends and family to see if your key points are accurately conveyed, and pursuing media opportunities with journalists you can trust.

Be Critical of Your Own Findings

One of the most common concerns scientists have when it comes to sharing research in the media is that you will spread misinformation, either by being misquoted or by conveying inaccurate content (e.g., a new research finding that is not supported over time). MacDonald suggests that even if your goal is to help people by disseminating knowledge, doing so without being appropriately critical of your own viewpoint can lead to the opposite effect of your intention (i.e., disseminating things that are not true). He suggests that it may be helpful to consider a few questions before sharing your findings: "Is the effect size in your research comparable with the importance of the finding that you convey in your interview? Have you looked at the scatterplot of your effect to remind yourself that there are lots of people in your own sample who are doing the opposite of what you're describing to the interviewer? Have you thought about the moderators that might account for that? Have you thought about your sample characteristics and the generalizability of the phenomenon?" To the extent that people make life decisions based on the knowledge disseminated, these interviews could do real harm and we should be cautious about overstating or overgeneralizing our findings.

Focus on Sharing Ideas Instead of Advice

In a recent article in *Scientific American* entitled "Psychological studies are not about you" Dr. Jamil Zaki, a psychology professor at Stanford*,* makes the point that popular psychology is often pitched as advice for the individual reader. He believes that this is not in line with the goals of psychology – as researchers we do not, by and large, claim that our findings reveal much about any one individual. By doing this we "can produce a false sense that psychology is over-promising and under-delivering." It also may make people feel like they are outliers or somehow damaged if certain "advice" doesn't work for them. He goes on to say that "the good news is that this type of writing is totally unnecessary, because averages provide just as powerful (or more powerful) a message when divorced from any one person." Dr. Zaki's key point is that we can still disseminate our research but that most sciences are much better suited to broad applications as opposed to providing advice to any one individual person.

In sum, sharing our research with the public may be a worthwhile goal. There are potential benefits for the public (e.g., learning more about their personal relationships), for the researcher (e.g., greater exposure and, potentially, more citations), and for the field as a whole (e.g., making more people aware of the practical value of our work). However, there are also challenges to conveying academic research in an accessible and responsible way and a risk of spreading misinformation. My hope is that this column makes relationship researchers think critically about how they can maximize the benefits and minimize the harm of sharing their findings with a broader audience.

Reference
Eysenbach, G. (2011). Can tweets predict citations? Metrics of social impact based on Twitter and correlation with traditional metrics of scientific impact. *Journal of Medical Internet Research, 13,* DOI: 10.2196/jmir.2012

NEW PROFESSIONAL'S COLUMN

Good Mentors are Good Colleagues: Reflections on Displaced Mentees

Kendra Knight
New Professional Representative
Christopher Newport University

Recently I had a visit from a student who had taken a summer course from me, named Liz[i]. Liz had asked for a letter of recommendation in support of her graduate school application, and I had suggested that we meet at the start of the Fall term to discuss the focus of the letter. As it turns out, we spent very little time during our meeting talking about the letter. Instead, Liz asked me a string of questions about applying to graduate school in Consumer Psychology (my own discipline is Communication): What are the best programs in Consumer Psychology? How difficult is it to get in to those schools? How many people will be applying? What do I need to get on the GRE to get into a Psych program? Should I get a master's in Psychology first or just go straight for the Ph.D.? Will I be doing my own research in graduate school or will I be working on a Professor's research team like I have done during undergrad? After ninety minutes with Liz, I learned two lessons. First, I learned that it is good practice, especially as a junior faculty member, to set *end* times as well as start times for meetings. Although I wish I had unlimited time for every student, I don't, and thus agreeing on a meeting *length* ahead of time helps to manage expectations for both parties.

Second, I learned that faculty members do not mentor (or evade mentoring) in isolation. Liz did not seek me out for career advice because of my expertise. After all, I am not a faculty member in her major (Psychology), I do not have extensive knowledge of the Psychology graduate school application process, and I cannot reliably estimate her competitiveness as an applicant. Liz sought me out because, in her words, I am a nice person. That makes me feel good, of course. The world needs nice people. Universities need nice people. However, at the moment she chose me, I would argue, *Liz* did not need a "nice person." What she needed was a mentor who had knowledge of her aspirational field, who understood what the typical graduate school application in Consumer Psychology might look like, and who could help Liz understand how she compared to the rest of the typical applicant pool. Someone like, say, the Psychology Professor Dr. Brown with whom Liz had completed six research projects, and who undoubtedly includes Liz as a "mentee" in his annual university activities report. What about him? Well, Liz had asked Dr. Brown for support. She asked him if they could meet to discuss the possibility of his writing a recommendation letter. He agreed to write a letter, so long as she provided a self-addressed stamped envelope, but rebuffed her request for a meeting. Thus she never had a chance to ask him her many questions.

My assessment of the situation is this: Liz got the impression from Dr. Brown that his willingness to mentor was limited to the hands-on research experience that working with him in his lab afforded. Liz felt grateful for this experience, and so when Dr. Brown didn't seem particularly keen on talking through her questions and uncertainty about graduate school, she didn't feel that negotiating the implied boundary was polite or appropriate. As a result, she sought support from a less qualified, albeit more welcoming (or perhaps just unwitting) source, like myself.

Liz's story, and variations of it, will be familiar to many of us. As I was pitching this column to a colleague, she reminded me how the terse demeanor of her own doctoral advisor was known to send his advisees scurrying for support from other, more available, graduate faculty. Students continued to ask him to chair their doctoral committees (and with good cause, he is a very well-respected researcher with unique expertise), but increasingly did so with the understanding that they would have to obtain much of their guidance from other sources. It became somewhat of a joke in my colleague's department, how being advised by this faculty member was akin to dating an unsupportive romantic partner. But of course this is not a joke, and not only because of the subpar quality of mentoring for students. When faculty inadequately mentor their advisees and apprentices, the needs of those students

don't evaporate. They are redistributed among other faculty members (who likely aren't reaping the benefits of those students' research activities).

There are two things I think we as faculty can do to make for a more just *and efficient* allocation of mentoring labor. First, commit to a model whereby the "compensation" for research apprenticeship includes full-scale mentoring. A colleague of mine who runs a Health Communication lab uses this model. When she invites undergraduate students to work with her (they, like Liz, are working "for experience" rather than pay or course credit), mentoring is part of the offer. She promises students ambient mentoring, in the form of lab and research experience, but also promises them access to her knowledge of the graduate school application process, her connections to faculty at other schools, and her familiarity with Health Communication graduate programs. As such, she is not only a better-than-otherwise resource for students, she is a better colleague.

Second, when we are approached by students whose mentoring needs have been displaced, we can help them in the long run by helping them negotiate access to the right mentor. Students often have limited negotiation skills, and power differences between faculty and students make this more daunting (hence the practice of asking the most "smiley" professor for assistance). Faculty can help with this. It is admittedly somewhat of an experimental process, and fraught with face concerns. But it's not impossible. In the spirit of practicing what I "preach," I have composed the following email. Pending Liz's permission, I plan to send it to Dr. Brown today.

Dear Dr. Brown,

I hope you are well. I wanted to briefly touch base with you, because I recently met with one of your research apprentices, Liz Smith, about her grad school application process. I am pleased to write a letter in support of Liz's applications, and was very impressed by the research she has conducted with you in your lab. Unfortunately, there were a number of questions she had about the specifics of Consumer Psych grad programs that I couldn't really answer. I'm hoping you don't mind my redirecting her to you

for your advice on those issues. I think your expertise would be a great help to her.
I'm happy to continue to support Liz in any way I can.

Best to you,
Dr. Knight

[1]Note: Names in this story have been changed

HUMOR COLUMN

R&R Does Not Mean "Relax and Recreation"

by David A. Kenny
University of Connecticut

There is an art to writing letters to editors when a revise-and-resubmit has been requested. Sad, but true, you cannot ever tell the editor exactly what is on your mind. At the risk of editors never believing anything that I shall say in a cover letter, I offer you an edited copy of a recent letter that I sent to an editor, [in brackets is what I was really thinking]. (I told Justin that this column was written by Phil Shaver, but he saw right through my ruse.)

Dear [Heil!] Editor:

I enclose a copy of … I first want to thank you for giving me an opportunity to revise our paper. [I have no idea in the world why you did not accept my brilliant paper. The reasons you gave for not accepting it were totally groundless.] I learned a great deal from the reviews [I learned that the reviewers were lazy and incompetent], and I have done my best to make changes accordingly. [I have generally made incredibly superficial changes. I have spent more time working on this &%$! letter than on making changes to the paper itself.] You did ask that I shorten the paper by five pages and I have done so. [You have made me gut an otherwise

perfect argument paper. Cutting this paper felt like amputating the limbs of one of my children. On top of that I had to add a couple of pages responding to the mad ravings of your two ignorant reviewers. Of course, I eliminated nearly two pages by narrowing the margins of the paper.] You also asked me to cite your publication, which I now do. [I cannot believe that you would ever indulge in such a self-serving suggestion, just to boost your bloated citation count.]

As you basically advised me to utilize the reviewers' suggestions as a guide for revision, let me now detail the changes that I have made in response to these reviewers. [You obviously just sent me a form letter, and you did not bother take the time to read my paper.] The reviewers did a crack job and their comments were most helpful. [More like they were smoking crack when they wrote their reviews.] Below are the extensive changes that I have made to their many valid points. [Please, why not just accept the paper as is, and not send it out for review?]

Reviewer 1

This reviewer is clearly very knowledgeable concerning the material in the paper. [I do not believe that at all, but clearly the editor must feel that way given that he or she picked her or him to be the lead reviewer, and, therefore, trusts this jerk's opinion.] Let me detail, the changes that I have made [i.e., dodges in response to this jerk's ignorant suggestions.]

I really think the first point is more of a suggestion for future research and so I do not need to make a change in the text. [The reviewer is incredibly naïve about this whole area and really has no idea what this research is about.]

The second point suggested several key papers by Smith that I should have cited. Those citations are now included in the paper. [Now I know that the reviewer must be that self-aggrandizer Smith.]

The third point of the reviewer is not exactly clear to me. [I have read this over 100 times and shown it to others, and no one can make any sense out of it.] Perhaps the reviewer is suggesting … and I have responded as follows … [I have taken the rambling incoherent point that was made and turned it into an

intelligent and intelligible point that I can address. Besides I wanted to talk about this anyway.]

Concerning the fourth point, the reviewer wondered about specific details regarding the procedure of the study. I have now provided more detail, something that should have been in the original submission. [Of course, those details were already there, but the incompetent reviewer missed them. I did reword the procedure a bit to make it seem as if I made a change.]

Finally in the fifth point, the reviewer questions whether I have done the correct statistical analysis when I reported … [The reviewer wrote "The statistical analysis is suspect." What the reviewer meant to say is "I do not have the competence to evaluate the statistical analysis."] I have now added a section that explains why I did what I did. [I took material that I usually present to undergraduates and I added it to the paper.]

Reviewer 2

This review is not quite as detailed as that of the first reviewer, but it does provide several useful suggestions. [This reviewer is so lazy, he or she did not read past page 7 as the comments end there.]

I especially appreciated the several comments alerting me to style changes required by this journal. [The reviewer is wasting my time on this because he or she has nothing really much substantive to say about the paper. Obviously, he or she does not realize that all of this can be handled by the copy editor?]

Also helpful was the reviewer pointing out several typographical errors in the paper which I have now corrected. [I would hope the editor would realize how useless this reviewer is. Why could not the reviewer have been even lazier and just recommended outright acceptance?]

In sum, the paper has clearly benefited from the comments of the reviewers. [I wasted a week of my life making a series of changes that turned a perfectly good paper into something that is now bordering on the incomprehensible. To borrow a quote from Dylan "You just kinda wasted my precious time." Also, I hope that the length of this

letter gives you the mistaken impression that I have sincerely responded to the points made by the reviewers.] I hope that you and your reviewers are as pleased as I am. [You had better accept this paper after all the hoops you have made me jump through.] Finally, let me thank you for the great service to our field that you are doing by being an editor. [You would think given that you are being paid to be an editor and getting a teaching release, you would do a better job.]

Sincerely [Sarcastically], …

If you really want some help on how to write a revise-and-resubmit letter, I suggest that you consult the blog by Tanya Maria Golash-Boza at http://getalifephd.blogspot.com/2011/03/how-to-respond-to-revise-and-resubmit.html

BOOK REVIEW

Review of *Human Bonding: The Science of Affectional Ties*

by Katy Wiss
Western Connecticut State University

Grounded in the premise that the nature and quality of human relational ties is crucial to our survival and quality of life, *Human Bonding: The Science of Affectional Ties* (edited by Cindy Hazan and Mary Campa) is a collection of readings that examines the nature of social connectedness over the life span from a variety of theoretical perspectives. Because each chapter includes a detailed review of literature on a variety of approaches and topics, the text would be a good choice for a graduate course on relationships or as a general reference text for scholars.

The first section of the book explores developmental themes such as infant-caregiver attachment and the changing nature of attachments over the lifespan (especially throughout young adulthood): Dykas and

Cassidy (*The First Bonding Experience*) provide a comprehensive overview of Attachment Theory, detailing the work of Bowlby and his student Ainsworth. Zeifman (*Built to Bond*) covers the biological aspect of infancy as it relates to caregiver attachment and focuses on senses, infant-caregiver communication and regulation, and hormones and neuroplasticity. Finally, Campa (*Developmental Trends and Bonding Milestones*) considers attachment theory from infancy through the bonds of childhood, puberty, and early adulthood.

Relatively new topics for research are taken up in the second and third sections (e.g., online dating, homosexuality, and finding reliable measures of attachment): Günaydin, Selcuk, and Hazan (*Finding the One*) consider standard elements of relationship formation such as propinquity and homophily, although cyber and social network dimensions are added. Eastwick and Tidwell (*To Pair Bond or Not*) explore an evolutionary psychology approach to monogamy and expand their overview of this perspective by including within- as well as cross-sex differences in their discussion. Also found in these sections are considerations of homosexuality's role in theories of bonding and mate selection (Diamond's *Links and Distinctions between Love and Desire*) and discussion of animal bonding by species (Curtis's *Insights from Animal Models of Social Bonding*). In perhaps the most innovative chapter topically-speaking and in contrast to the other chapters in this section, *Logging On, Hooking Up* by Sprecher and Metts includes current trends in bonding, such as the short-term event of "hooking up," the relatively new practice of "friends with benefits," and online dating. Finally, Shaver and Mikulincer (*Patterns of Relating and of Thinking about Relationships*) closely examine the ways in which attachment is currently measured and point out some useful distinctions, such as general attitudes about attachment versus relationship specific attachment.

The final section on health and well-being also provides a few relatively new approaches to relationship research. For example, Reis (*Relationship Well-Being*) puts forth a model for exploring the as-yet-untested (but intuitively sound) assertion that people will thrive in relationships where they feel partners' appropriate responsiveness. Not as often considered in health contexts,

relationship dissolution is addressed by Lee and Sbarra (*The Predictors and Consequences of Relationship Dissolution*), who suggest that the factors that shape the ways in which relationships dissolve correlate with physical and mental health. Finally, Hawkley and Cacioppo (*Social Connectedness and Health*) explore the effects of loneliness on health.

Overall, the book is carefully researched and includes extensive citations. It provides a thorough overview of a variety of topics and approaches to relationships. The focus on scientific approaches will attract many, but as a disclaimer, it is not my approach to research. Perhaps my outsider perspective can point out some areas for more careful exploration. Throughout the collection, there is a strong emphasis on the biological and evolutionary basis of relationships. In general, I find evolutionary theory applied to social phenomena to be an exercise in post hoc reasoning – there is not enough evidence from our evolutionary past presented to be convincing about our present. Too often evolution is talked about as a process that is somehow purposive. Do babies have big eyes and small chins because caregivers will be more attracted to them? How/why did that start in the first place? With animal models, there is always the question of to which animals we decide to compare ourselves. For example, the arguments for selecting birds as comparison groups do not seem biologically strong – but more social in nature (e.g., humans who like to view themselves as monogamous creatures can connect with the many birds who practice it as well). The way the research in this text is described and selected also has a tendency to be normative rather than descriptive. I would like to have seen more supporting research cited that examines actual behavior as opposed to self-reports. For example, are humans really monogamous? How many humans mate for life with their first sexual partner? If we are monogamous, is it biological and evolutionary or social and cultural? *Logging On, Hooking Up* is a refreshing acknowledgement that humans bond in all sorts of ways – including for brief sexual encounters or even sexually with our friends. When describing humans as monogamous, do we talk about monogamy as normal (as in, common) behavior or do we talk about monogamy as normative behavior? The two are often confused in this volume. The research cited tends to be culturally normative as

well. The process model considered in the chapter on mate selection refers to "finding 'the one'." Not all cultures find mates in the ways described in this chapter, nor does every culture conceptualize finding a mate as "finding the one" – although I realize the usage may have been a bit tongue-in-cheek. The book also tends to be heterosexually normative. In one chapter, women are described as preferring mates who are taller than they are (presumably this means heterosexual women). Although the chapter on homosexual relationships separates "falling in love" from sexual desire, the chapter tends more toward *explaining* homosexual relationships as opposed to re-theorizing relational bonding in an inclusive way. Ultimately, a closing chapter that tied all topics/themes together and assessed them would be a welcome addition to this volume. However, if read with these limitations in mind, this book offers an abundance of useful information and productive ideas for future research.

JOURNALS UPDATE

Tentative Contents of Upcoming Journals

KRISTIN L. SOMMER and JURAN YOON
When Silence is Golden: Ostracism as Resource Conservation During Aversive Interactions

KATHERINE L. FIORI and NATHAN S. CONSEDINE
Positive and Negative Social Exchanges and Mental Health Across the Transition to College: Loneliness as a Mediator

KENNETH S. MICHNIEWICZ and JOSEPH A. VANDELLO
The Attractive Underdog: When Disadvantage Bolsters Attractiveness

PASCALE I. VAN ZANTVLIET and MATTHIJS KALMIJN
Friendship Networks and Interethnic Union Formation: an Analysis of Immigrant Children

Personal Relationships
December 2013 [Volume 20 #4]
Table of Contents

AMY M. CANEVELLO, TERESA GRANILLO and JENNIFER CROCKER
Predicting Change in Relationship Insecurity: The Roles of Compassionate and Self-Image Goals

TYSON C. KREIGER and BECKY KOCHENDERFER-LADD
Gender Behaviors as Predictors of Peer Acceptance and Victimization

AMIE M. GORDON, RUGILE TUSKEVICIUTE and SERENA CHEN
A Multi-Method Investigation of Depressive Symptoms, Perceived Understanding, and Relationship Quality

BRIAN P. DON, KRISTIN D. MICKELSON and ANITA P. BARBEE
Indirect Support Seeking and Perceptions of Spousal Support: An Examination of a Reciprocal Relationship

EDWARD P. LEMAY JR., MARGARITE A. BECHIS, JESSAMINE MARTIN, ANGELA M. NEAL and CHRISTINE COYNE
Concealing Negative Evaluations of a Romantic Partner's Physical Attractiveness

JENNIFER C. D. MACGREGOR, GRAINNE M. FITZSIMONS and JOHN G. HOLMES
Perceiving Low Self-esteem in Close Others Impedes Capitalization and Undermines the Relationship

DEAN M. BUSBY, BRIAN J. WILLOUGHBY and JASON S. CARROLL
Sowing Wild Oats: Valuable Experience or a Field Full of Weeds?

JACKIE A. NELSON, MARION O'BRIEN, SUSAN D. CALKINS and SUSAN P. KEANE
Mothers' and Fathers' Negative Responsibility Attributions and Perceptions of Children's Problem Behavior

DANIEL BE, MARK A. WHISMAN and LISA A. UEBELACKER
Prospective Associations Between Marital Adjustment and Life Satisfaction

EMILY A. IMPETT, LEYLA JAVAM, BONNIE M. LE, BEHZAD ASYABI-ESHGHI and ALEKSANDR KOGAN
The Joys of Genuine Giving: Approach and Avoidance Sacrifice Motivation and Authenticity

DARYL R. VAN TONGEREN, JEFFREY D. GREEN, DON E. DAVIS, EVERETT L. WORTHINGTON JR. and CHELSEA A. REID
Till Death Do Us Part: Terror Management and Forgiveness in Close Relationships

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, our next teaching-related column will focus on demonstrations and active-learning strategies those in our field employ to

teach close relationships. If you teach an undergraduate course on close relationships, we need your help. 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 (please put "Demos" in the subject line) by February 3, 2013. We will summarize the results in the May 2014 issue of RRN.

IARR Publications Committee and SAGE Seek Nominations for *JSPR* Editor

The IARR Publications Committee and SAGE publishers are soliciting nominations for the Editorship of the *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships* (*JSPR). JSPR* is published by SAGE in association with IARR. The journal, currently edited by Mario Mikulincer, is committed to publishing high quality research on social and personal relationships, from multiple perspectives and disciplines. Following an initial period of preparation from July through December 2014, the incoming editor will begin processing new submissions on January 1, 2015; and be the mast-head editor beginning with the first issue of 2016. The expectation is that the length of the term will be 5 years. The job of the Editor along with his or her Associate Editors involves overseeing the review and publication process and exercising the full range of editorial skills, as well as soliciting manuscripts. Once selected, the Editor will choose his or her Associate Editors and editorial board.

Self-nominations for this important and rewarding role are welcomed. A vita and a brief email note of intent to apply should be sent by January 15, 2014 to John Caughlin (caughlin@illinois.edu). (Applicants who fail to receive an email receipt response within a few days should contact Caughlin at 1-217-333-4340). The publications committee will review the initial pool of candidates and invite finalists to submit a complete nomination package. Complete nomination packages will be due March 1, 2014 and should include the candidate's vita, the names of three references who can address the candidate's qualifications as an editor, and a letter from the candidate that describes his or her views on editing the journal. The letter could address issues such as editing philosophy, goals for the journal, description of how he/she would run the journal, and any initiatives to further enhance the journal. *JSPR* receives over 200 submissions a year and operates with a web-based on-line submission and review process (Manuscript Central). The journal benefits from financial support from SAGE, but a nomination package should also address additional institutional support available for the Editorship.

Queries may be directed to the current editor, Mario Mikulincer, at mario@idc.ac.il, or any member of the Publication Committee:
Susan Branje (s.branje@uu.nl)
Lorne Campbell (lcampb23@uwo.ca)
John Caughlin (caughlin@illinois.edu)
Sandra Metts (smmetts@ilstu.edu)
Harry T. Reis (reis@psych.rochester.edu)
Elizabeth Schoenfeld (eschoenfeld@utexas.edu)

In addition, Kerry Barner, Senior Publishing Editor for Social Sciences, at SAGE, is willing to address any questions you may have about the publication process. (Kerry.barner@sagepub.co.uk).

Call for Papers: IARRC 2014

On behalf of the International Association for Relationships Research, we invite you to submit a proposal for presentation at the 2014 conference to be held at the Melbourne Convention and Exhibition Centre, Melbourne, Australia. 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, gerontology) will gather at the conference to share their work in various formats (e.g., symposia, papers, rapid poster presentations, round table discussions).

The IARR conferences provide rich opportunities for professional growth, education and conversations

with colleagues who have similar professional interests. Please consider joining colleagues for five days of networking in beautiful Melbourne, Australia.

Submissions: The Program Committee invites proposals for symposia, papers, rapid poster presentations, roundtables and panels on topics relevant to research and practice in social and personal relationships. For all information about the call for papers and other information about the conference please visit:
http://www.conferenceworks.com.au/iarrc/

Can Science Intervene To End Hate Crimes?

Dr. Karen Blair, a CIHR post-doctoral fellow at the University of Utah has launched a crowdfunding campaign to raise funds for her latest study on the physiology of prejudice. Specifically, the study will examine prejudice toward same-sex couples and same-sex public displays of affection. To date, there has been very little research on the physiology of prejudice and what has been done has predominantly focused on the physiology of racial prejudices. This study will be one of the first to examine homonegative prejudice from a physiological standpoint and will have important implications for reducing prejudiced attitudes and behaviours. Our biggest challenge in raising the funds required for this important research is just getting the word out there, so please, share this campaign in as many places as possible.

As of October 1, 50% of the fundraising goal has been met. The campaign will run until November 18th, 2013 - leaving just a few weeks to raise the remaining $3750.00. Any way that you can help would be greatly appreciated. For more information, or to make a donation, you can visit the campaign's website: http://www.endhatecrime.com. All donations will be processed through the University of Utah and used in their entirety to fund this project.

MEMBER NEWS & UPDATES

Members in the News

IARR member Paul Eastwick was recently named a "Rising Star" by the Association for Psychological Science. Congratulations, Paul!

IARR member Jaye Derrick's research on parasocial relationships and self-control published in *Social Psychological and Personality Science* was picked up by several outlets, including Forbes, NBC News, MSNBC, The Atlantic, Chicago Tribune, Miami Herald, Los Angeles Times, and Pacific Standard.

Terri Orbuch, a Past President of IARR, recently hosted a television special on PBS entitled *Secrets from The Love Doctor*.

IARR member Gary Lewandowski was recently interviewed for articles published in Men's Health and Scientific American. He was also named one of 10 Top-Rated Psychology Professors.

Justin Lehmiller was quoted in The Wall Street Journal, Time, and CNN.com.

IARR member James Giles recently appeared in a TEDx video in which he presented his vulnerability and care theory of love

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 justin.lehmiller@gmail.com

Book Announcement:
The Developmental Course of Romantic Relationships

Announcing the publication of *The Developmental Course of Romantic Relationships*, by Brian Ogolsky, Sally Lloyd, and Rodney Cate and published by Routledge Academic Press.

This multidisciplinary text highlights the development of romantic relationships, from initiation to commitment or demise, by highlighting the historical context, current research and theory, and diversity of patterns. Engagingly written with colorful examples, the authors examine the joy, stress, power-struggles, intimacy, and aggression that characterize these relationships. Readers gain a better understanding as to why, even after the pain and suffering associated with a breakup, most of us go right back out and start again. Relationships are examined through an interdisciplinary lens – psychological, sociological, environmental and communicative perspectives are all considered. End of chapter summaries, lists of key concepts, and additional readings serve as a review. As a whole the book explores what precipitates success or failure of these relationships and how this has changed over time.

Highlights of the book's coverage:

- Incorporates both cross-sex and same-sex romantic relationships
- Examines the roles of gender, race, class, culture, age, and sexuality in relationship development
- Looks at multiple types of romantic relationships in emerging adulthood, including dating and cohabitation
- Explores both positive and negative relational processes
- Analyzes the latest and most important scholarship.

The book opens with an introduction followed by a historical overview of the development of relationships. Next relationship development models are examined including the influence of social factors and the interaction of the partners involved. This volume examines how partners initiate romantic relationships, including infatuation, sexual attraction, and the impact of technology; how cohabitation affects the quality of the future of the relationship; and the individual, social, and circumstantial factors that predict stability or break-ups in romantic relationships. The book ends with an examination of the "dark side" of relationships, and suggestions for future research on romantic pairings.

Intended as a supplement for advanced undergraduate or graduate courses in marriage and family, personal/close/intimate relationships, or interpersonal/family communication taught in human development and family studies, psychology, social work, sociology, communication, counseling and therapy, this book also appeals to researchers and practitioners interested in romantic relationship processes.

Book Announcement: *Handbook of Families and Aging (2ⁿᵈ Edition)*

Announcing the *Handbook of Families and Aging*, Second Edition by Ruth Blieszner.

This book is both an updated version of and a complement to the original *Handbook of Families and Aging*. The many additions include the most recent demographic changes on aging families, new theoretical formulations, innovative research methods, recent legal issues, and death and bereavement, as well as new material on the relationships themselves—sibling, partnered, and intergenerational relationships, for example. Among the brand-new topics in this edition are step-family relationships, aging families and immigration, aging families and 21st-century technology, and peripheral family ties.

Unlike the more cursory summaries found in textbooks, the essays within *Handbook of Families and Aging,* Second Edition provide thoughtful, in-depth coverage of each topic. No other book provides such a comprehensive and timely overview of theory and research on family relationships, the contexts of family life, and major turning points in late-life families. Nevertheless, the contents are written to be engaging and accessible to a broad audience, including advanced undergraduate students, graduate students, researchers, and gerontology practitioners. Serious lay readers will also find this book highly informative about contemporary family issues.

Book Announcement:
Spiritual Resiliency and Aging: Hope, Relationality, and the Creative Self

Announcing *Spiritual Resiliency and Aging: Hope, Relationality, and the Creative Self* by Ruth Blieszner.

Spiritual Resiliency and Aging offers a corrective to anxious, dichotomized visions of aging that either deny the realities of growing old or present romanticized views of aging. It contributes to theorizing a positive psychology of aging by highlighting the importance of spirituality as a core resource in the lives of older adults. The research is based on interviews with strong, courageous elders in the United States and Germany who are deeply anchored in their relationships and communities. They not only have coped well with aging but have transcended numerous losses in their lives. The authors use narrative and developmental theory to explore the dynamic intersection of gerontology and spirituality by examining tensions of hope versus reality, interconnected personhood versus self-differentiation, and creative change versus stability. Chapters address personal and communal emotions, forgiveness, the creative self, spiritual practices, hope and gratitude, rediscovering vocations, and the practice of critiquing self and community. Each chapter concludes with suggestions for scholars, educators, and practitioners. Intended audiences are educators, researchers, professionals, and students in aging studies, psychology of aging, family studies, lifespan human development, religious studies, counseling and MFT, health promotion, long-term care, and intergenerational programming.

Book Announcement:
The Psychology of Human Sexuality

Announcing the publication of *The Psychology of Human Sexuality*, by Justin Lehmiller and published by Wiley-Blackwell.

The Psychology of Human Sexuality offers a comprehensive overview of human sexual behavior from a biopsychosocial perspective. The text highlights psychological research and theory on human sexuality whilst also considering the biological, evolutionary, social, and cultural factors that influence our sex lives.

Highlights:

- Comprehensive coverage of topics including sexual arousal and response, gender and sexual orientation, relationships, sexual behaviors, sexual difficulties and solutions, prostitution, and pornography
- Offers more in-depth treatment of relationships than comparable texts, with separate chapters dealing with attraction and relationship processes
- Written from a sex-positive perspective, and is inclusive and respectful of a diverse audience
- Instructors' materials include numerous activity ideas to facilitate a dynamic and interactive classroom environment

This text is ideal for undergraduate courses on human sexuality taught in psychology, sociology, human development, and other social science departments. Instructors who desire a textbook that is thoroughly grounded in psychological research and theory, yet written in an accessible and engaging way will find much to like. This text may also serve as a useful reference resource for both relationship and sexuality scholars.

IARR BOARD