

RELATIONSHIP RESEARCH NEWS

OFFICIAL NEWS JOURNAL OF THE INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR RELATIONSHIP RESEARCH

May 2016

VOL 15, NO. 1

PRESIDENT'S COLUMN

May 2016 Report by Jeff Simpson University of Minnesota

This is my final column for RRN as president of IARR. The last two years have gone by very quickly, and serving as president of this fine and active organization has been one of the highlights of my career.

We have a lot going on in the next few months. As everyone knows (or should know by now), the 2016 Toronto conference, which will be held from July 20-24, is rapidly approaching. Geoff MacDonald (the conference organizer), Lorne Campbell (the Program Committee Chair), and numerous people behind the scenes are working diligently as the big event draws near. The Program Committee received over 620 submissions, the vast majority of which were accepted as talks or posters. We are hoping that this will translate into high registration and attendance numbers. Early this year, the IARR Board approved funds to reduce graduate student conference registration costs for the Toronto conference. We received 90 applications, and were able to fund 75 of them at \$100 off the regular registration rate for graduate students. IARR was delighted to fund such a high percentage of applications. In addition, some of the new Mentoring Committee program plans, developed by Nickola Overall and her committee, will be implemented at the Toronto conference. There will, for example, be a few special events at the conference intended to help facilitate the professional development of our emerging scholars.

Please participate in and take advantage of these events, especially if you are a graduate student.

In terms of other events, a lot has taken place in recent months:

1. New IARR membership rates and categories for 2016-2017 were announced on January 1, 2016. All of the relevant information can be found on the IARR webpage.
2. Susan Bjarne is chairing an ad hoc committee that will offer suggestions for possible ways to improve research methods and the way our journals operate. This initiative is in response to general concerns about the reliability and validity of scientific findings across many different scientific fields. The committee will provide their report and recommendations to the IARR Board in Toronto.
3. Deborah Kashy from Michigan State University has been appointed the next editor of *Personal Relationships*. Congratulations, Debby! She will take over the reins from Julie Fitness, whose editorial term ends this year. Many thanks to you, Julie, for all the time and effort you devoted to running *PR* so well during the past 4 years!
4. Lisa Neff has been named the Program Chair for 2018 conference in Fort Collins, Colorado. Welcome, Lisa!
5. The Board approved a 2017 mini-conference proposed by Laura VanderDrift and her colleagues on the topic of "Interdependence, Interaction, and Relationships." The event will take place June, 2017 in Syracuse, New York. Further information about the mini-conference will appear on the IARR webpage soon. Please mark it on your calendars!

6. The 2016 elections are underway; please vote!
7. The IARR Awards Committee, chaired by Garth Fletcher, has identified people who will receive various IARR career awards. The announcement of the recipients will be made at the Toronto conference.

As my term as president concludes, I want to acknowledge our hardworking committees, committee chairs, and officers. IARR is a fairly large and very diverse organization, which means that those who provide service often spend a considerable amount of time and effort working to advance its goals and mission. Thanks to everyone who has generously devoted their time, effort, and resources to our cause during my term as president. Here are some of the people who have made notable contributions:

Chris Agnew, *Advances in Relationships Book Series*
 Susan Boon, *Archives*
 Leah Bryant, *Treasurer*
 Kelly Campbell, *Teaching Committee chair*
 Lorne Campbell, *Toronto Conference Program Committee chair*
 Silvia Donato, *Membership Committee chair*
 Jessica Eckstein, *Secretary*
 Julie Fitness, *Editor of PR*
 Garth Fletcher, *Awards Committee chair*
 Jennifer Harman, *Media Relations Committee chair*
 Sean Horan, *Future Conferences Committee chair*
 Gery Karantzas, *International Committee chair*
 Geoff MacDonald, *Toronto Conference Organizer, Editor of JSPR*
 Brian Ogolsky, *Relationship Research News Editor*
 Nickola Overall, *Mentoring Committee chair*
 Dan Perlman, *Election Committee chair, Finance Committee chair*
 Dylan Selterman, *Webmaster*
 Denise Solomon, *Publications Committee chair*
 Susan Sprecher, *President-elect*

I also want to thank the many behind-the-scenes people who continue to make IARR the vibrant, efficient, and well-run organization that it is.

In closing, it has been a privilege serving as president of this fine organization. What we all do and study—how people think, feel, behave, communicate, and relate to each other in the context of close relationships—is central and essential to all fields in the social, behavioral, and life sciences. Families, romantic dyads, friends, co-workers, and other types of personal bonds are the foundation upon which all larger groups and societies are built. They are also the glue that holds almost everything together. Understanding how and why interpersonal relationships function as they do and documenting the strong impact they have on people is one of the most important missions in science. This is what keeps many of us in the game.

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

October 1, 2016

**Submit all materials
to Brian Ogolsky
bogolsky@illinois.edu**

INSIDE THIS ISSUE OF RELATIONSHIP RESEARCH NEWS

PRESIDENT’S COLUMN

May 2016 Report
by Jeff Simpson1

FROM THE EDITOR’S DESK

by Brian Ogolsky4

JUNIOR SPOTLIGHT ON...

Casey Totenhagen
by Casey Totenhagen.....5

SENIOR SPOTLIGHT ON...

Sue Sprecher
by Sue Sprecher6

HUMOR COLUMN

The Tale of Sally and Sadie
by David A. Kenny8

NEW PROFESSIONAL’S COLUMN

Reaching the Top: Tips for Navigating the Job Market
by Brian Don and Ashley Randall.....9

BOOK REVIEW

A Parent-Partner Status for American Family Law
by Laura VanderDrift 12

JOURNALS UPDATE

Tentative Contents of Upcoming Journals..... 13

ANNOUNCEMENTS 15

IARR BOARD..... 17

RELATIONSHIP RESEARCH NEWS

Editor

Brian G. Ogolsky
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

Associate Editors

Laura VanderDrift
Syracuse University

Casey Totenhagen
University of Alabama

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 Brian Ogolsky via bogolsky@illinois.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 **Brian G. Ogolsky**
**University of Illinois at Urbana-
Champaign**

I want to start my first column as editor with a huge thank you to Justin Lehmillier for his service to IARR over the past three years. His hard work has made my job that much easier. Thanks also to his editorial team, Jessica Eckstein, Deb Mashek, and Amy Muise, for helping to assemble the outstanding content that has graced the pages of RRN. Justin and his staff helped make my transition smooth and seamless.

I am happy to announce that I have appointed two associate editors, Casey Totenhagen and Laura VanderDrift, who will serve with me over the next three years. I am still looking for a third associate editor to round out our team. In support of IARR's commitment to diversity, the third associate editor should come from outside the United States. If you (or someone you know) are interested in being considered, please send a copy of your CV to bogolsky@illinois.edu.

As you peruse the contents of this issue you will surely notice that we made a few changes. Most notably is the addition of two new recurring columns that will "spotlight" the work of our esteemed members. In each issue we will feature the work of a junior and a senior researcher in hopes that we can help promote the work of our members and facilitate collaboration. In this issue I have asked one of the associate editors, Casey Totenhagen, to contribute the inaugural junior spotlight column. The inaugural senior spotlight will feature the work of the incoming president of IARR, Sue Sprecher. Please consider volunteering yourself or nominating someone you know and respect to be spotlighted in upcoming issues. Although admittedly arbitrary, we will draw the line between junior and senior scholars at roughly 10 years post-PhD.

In this issue you will find an outstanding humor column written by David Kenny. He provides a thoughtful commentary on the use of social media complete with a mention of the ever-important Kardashian index. I encourage the readership to take heed of his closing challenge.

Next up is the new professional's column that provides a useful how-to guide to success on the job market. Ashley Randall and Brian Don provide their own insider's guide to the ups and downs of academic life.

Laura VanderDrift then reviews a thought-provoking book entitled *A Parent-Partner Status for American Family Law*, by new IARR member Merle Weiner. This book is a unique attempt to apply relationship research in the policy context and should stimulate a fascinating conversation between legal and relational scholars.

Be sure to read to the end to get the latest information including Harry Reis's announcement of the inaugural IARR fellows, the details about the upcoming conference in Toronto, and the announcement of two exciting future conferences.

In closing, I hope that you will take a moment or two to find me or one of the associate editors at the conference and give us comments or suggestions for future content. We want to continue to make RRN interesting and appealing to all of our readers.

Happy travels...in advance.

JUNIOR SPOTLIGHT**Casey Totenhagen****University of Alabama**

Dr. Casey Totenhagen earned her Ph.D. in Family Studies and Human Development from the University of Arizona and did postdoctoral work as a Research Scientist at the Arizona Center for Research and Outreach (AZ REACH). She is presently an Assistant Professor of Human Development and Family Studies in the College of Human Environmental Sciences at the University of Alabama. Totenhagen's overall research interests focus on relational quality in adult romantic relationships with an emphasis on daily experiences. Within this domain, she is particularly interested in understanding how different stressors (e.g., daily stressors, minority stressors, military-related stressors) and the stress process impact close interpersonal relationships.

Strongly influenced by interdependence theory, Totenhagen became particularly interested in the *relational* implications of daily stress, as well as how couples' daily experiences and processes might serve to either erode or protect well-being in the face of daily stress. Subsequently, she makes it priority to collect data from both members of couples given their inherent interdependence, and has largely focused on daily diary studies collecting data from both members of couples over 7-14 days. Doing so permits her to examine micro-level experiences across partners.

Totenhagen has published a number of articles in this area, focusing on the ways in which stressors outside of the relationship, such as "hassles," seep into the relationship and impact both partners. For example, in gay and lesbian couples, Totenhagen and her colleagues found that when individuals reported greater daily stress, their relationship satisfaction was protected when they felt close to the partner on that day. When a *partner* had a particularly stressful day and felt close, however, the individual reported *lower* satisfaction (Totenhagen, Butler, & Ridley, 2012). Thus, feeling close to a partner might protect an

individual's sense of relationship quality on a stressful day, but be experienced as taxing for the partner who is presumably providing the support on that stressful day.

Her work has also explored daily hassles as a context for relational processes, demonstrating that although daily sacrifices can (and from interdependence theory would be expected to) be beneficial for relationships, making sacrifices on a day with high hassles may no longer be beneficial (Totenhagen, Curran, Serido, & Butler, 2013) but perhaps detrimental (Totenhagen & Curran, 2011). Recognizing that daily experiences can be experienced as both hassling *and* uplifting (e.g., caring for a child may be a hassle in some ways, yet uplifting in other ways), she has also examined the concurrent and lagged effects of hassles and uplifts. Here, Dr. Totenhagen and her colleagues found that daily uplifts were uniquely important (beyond hassles) in predicting positive relationship outcomes on the same day those uplifts were experienced, but effects were short-lived and did not carry to the following day (Totenhagen, Serido, Curran, & Butler, 2012). Collectively, this work has demonstrated the salience of both positive and negative daily experiences in understanding relationship quality for both partners in a relationship.

Totenhagen has become increasingly interested in the different types of stress that individuals may experience and how these unique stressors impact relationship quality. To this end, Totenhagen and her colleague, Dr. Ashley Randall, were awarded the National Council on Family Relations Innovation Grant to study the effects of daily stress on same-sex couples, with a focus on understanding vulnerabilities, resilience, and dyadic coping. In this work, Totenhagen and Randall have been interested in the common external stressors that all couples face (e.g., work stress) as well as stressors unique to same-sex couples (e.g., sexual minority stress such as discrimination and harassment).

They collected data from both members of 95 same-sex couples who were asked to complete baseline surveys as well as daily surveys for 14 consecutive days. They are currently examining questions about the interplay of stress, outness, internalized homophobia, and dyadic coping in understanding individual and relational well-being in these couples.

In moving this line of research forward, Totenhagen hopes to continue examining daily stress and resilience factors with a relational focus to understand health outcomes in sexual minorities.

Totenhagen is also interested in the stressors unique to military couples. Her work in this area has thus far focused on questions about connections between partners during an active duty Service member's deployment. She serves as co-chair of the Family and Children track for the Service Member to Civilian National Summit (<http://servicetocivilian.ua.edu/>), which focuses on understanding and supporting Service members/veterans and their families through transitions from military life to civilian life. She is also presently co-editing, along with Dr. David Albright, a special issue of *Journal of Family Theory and Review* on Military/Veteran-Connected families. Stay tuned for a call for proposals!

Dr. Totenhagen is currently accepting Master's students to work with her in the Human Development and Family Studies program at the University of Alabama. More information about Dr. Totenhagen can be found at <http://ctotenhagen.people.ua.edu/> or you can contact her directly: ctotenhagen@ches.ua.edu. You can also check out some of Totenhagen's research on the Relationship Matters podcast page (#22 and 48): spr.sagepub.com/site/podcast/podcast_dir.xhtml

References

- Totenhagen, C. J., Butler, E. A., & Ridley, C. A. (2012). Daily stress, closeness, and satisfaction in gay and lesbian couples. *Personal Relationships, 19*(2), 219-233.
- Totenhagen, C. J., & Curran, M. A. (2011). Daily hassles, sacrifices, and relationship quality for pregnant cohabitators. *Family Science, 2*, 68-72.
- Totenhagen, C. J., Curran, M. A., Serido, J., & Butler, E. A. (2013). Good days, bad days: Do sacrifices improve relationship quality? *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 30*(7), 881-900.
- Totenhagen, C. J., Serido, J., Curran, M. A., & Butler, E. A. (2012). Daily hassles and uplifts: A diary study on understanding relationship quality. *Journal of Family Psychology, 26*, 719-728.

SENIOR SPOTLIGHT



Susan Sprecher

Illinois State University

Susan Sprecher was a student (in the late 1970s and early 1980s) of experimental social psychologist, Elaine (Walster) Hatfield, but it wasn't until 2010 that she was able to begin running lab experiments. She had a prolific career over two decades in the Department of Sociology and Anthropology at Illinois State University, surveying college students and others about their relationships and exploring such topics as attraction, love, equity, and breakups.

Sprecher's research took a new direction in 2010 when a newly hired chair of the department convinced higher administration to convert a classroom in her building to "sociology lab space." Sprecher took over a corner of the large room (that once seated 45 students), and happily prepared for her first experiment. She had just finished co-editing a handbook on relationship initiation and was an admirer of the experimental closeness induction technique created by Art Aron and his colleagues as a way to generate closeness in a laboratory setting; therefore, it is not surprising that the first lab experiment that she designed was focused on pairs of strangers becoming acquainted in a lab setting using a structured self-disclosure task. She had the members of the getting-acquainted pairs interact over Skype from two different rooms, using an adaptation of Aron et al.'s (1997) closeness induction technique (now also called the fast friends approach) and she finally (after 30 years of correlational-survey research) MANIPULATED something in a study.

In her first experimental study, she had participants take long disclosure turns and manipulated which member disclosed and which listened, and examined whether giving disclosure or receiving disclosure leads to more liking (it was receiving!).

In a second study, she manipulated whether the pairs engaged in immediate, reciprocal self-disclosure or engaged in the long turn-taking referred to as extended reciprocity (Want someone to like you? Use immediate reciprocity!). Among other variables she has manipulated in various experiments are: the medium of the communication (e.g., face-to-face vs. video-chat), bogus similarity versus dissimilarity information presented about the other in advance of the interaction, and whether the participants are allowed to check their cell phones during the interaction.

After running a few experiments, Sprecher was seeing the fruits of this experimental paradigm, not only in terms of publications, but also in the number of students impacted positively. Unlike ever before in her career, she was able to work with (interdisciplinary) teams of undergraduate and graduate students, who were enjoying the process of being experimenters and also generating the results to the studies and presenting them at a university symposium. Students who stayed around for more than one semester became lab directors; this position often gave them an edge for getting into graduate school. Two students who were instrumental to her lab and are current IARR members are Stan Treger (finished his PhD in Psychology at DePaul, 2015) and Adam Hampton (who will start the PhD Program in Psychology in fall of 2016, working with Chris Agnew).

Although some of Dr. Sprecher's more macro-oriented sociology colleagues may scratch their heads about what she is doing on the second floor of their building (Students interacting from different small classrooms over Skype? Experimenters standing in the hallway with clipboards looking official? Sprecher literally running down the hallway if there is problem that needs an immediate fix? Is this a new form of sociological research?), Sprecher is enjoying her new line of research! She still does a few correlational studies and writes an occasional chapter, but most of her research time (when she isn't teaching or doing President-elect duties for IARR) is devoted to manipulating something and giving students -- both the experimenters and the participants -- a meaningful experience.

Next time she presents her research at an IARR conference, she will introduce her findings by proclaiming proudly, "in the EXPERIMENTAL research conducted IN MY LAB...."

At this date, her very latest experimental finding is that having participants be hyperconnected (checking their Facebook and cell phone) while getting acquainted over Skype-video with an interaction partner does not negatively affect their experience in the interaction, contrary to one of the most cited recent articles from *JSPR* (see Przybylski & Weinstein, 2013). Maybe her past-president speech at the 2020 conference will be a summary of her latest experimental findings!

For examples of some of her recent experimental findings, see:

Sprecher, S., Treger, S., Wondra, J. D., Hilaire, N., & Walpe, K. (2013). Taking turns: Reciprocal self-disclosure promotes liking in initial interactions. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *49*, 860-866.

Sprecher, S., Treger, S., & Wondra, J. D. (2013). Effects of self-disclosure role on liking, closeness, and other impressions in get-acquainted interactions. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, *30*, 497-514. (A podcast was also done on this article: <http://spr.sagepub.com/content/30/4/497/suppl/DC1>)

Sprecher, S., Treger, S., Fisher, A., Hilaire, N., & Grzybowski, M. (2015). Association between self-expansion and actual and perceived (dis)similarity and their joint effects on attraction in initial interactions. *Self and Identity*, *14*, 369-389.

Sprecher, S., & Treger, S. (2015). The benefits of turn-taking reciprocal self-disclosure in get-acquainted interactions. *Personal Relationships*, *22*, 460-475.

Sprecher, S., Hampton, A., Heinzl, H., Felmler, D. (in press). Can I connect with both you and my social network? Access to network-salient communication technology and get-acquainted interactions. *Computers in Human Behavior*.

HUMOR COLUMN

The Tale of Sally and Sadie

By David A. Kenny

Sally and Sadie are twin sisters who both decided to become relationship researchers. (It may seem strange that two sisters were both given a diminutive name for Sarah, but amazingly that is just what their fictional parents did.) The two sisters have adopted radically different research styles.

Sally works very hard at making sure that everyone knows how good she is. She works especially hard at trying to impress important people. She spent £500 making sure she had a top notch head shot. She picked the one in which she has her hand on her chin. Sally works very hard at branding herself. She has multi-colored business cards. She spends at least an hour a day on Twitter and Facebook, and most of the time she's sending out self-promoting tweets and Facebook posts like "Read the amazing study I just published in JSPR!" Her profile picture for Facebook is an image capture of her being interviewed by CNN. Her Twitter handle is DrSally. She regularly Googles herself and she hired someone to do an SEO (Search Engine Optimization) on her. Besides her own university hosted webpage, she has her own domain name, dr_sally_s.com and her personal website where she authors a blog called DrSallySays, which is generally considered the best possible way "to establish your brand." She also has a staff member who manages her pages on LinkedIn, ResearchGate, Quora, and Academia. Her one major disappointment is that she has never been asked to give a TED Talk.

Sally is an accomplished networker. She goes to conventions and tries to establish contacts with important people. She is continually writing press releases and contacting the media about her findings. She regularly works on her "elevator speech" to describe herself and provide a glowing description of her work in two minutes.

When she has the time, she works hard at research but she is more of a manager or supervisor than a scientist. She tries to get her students and collaborators to do much of the hard work. In some ways she acts very much like a WalMart manager who looks for associates who will work hard with minimal compensation. She spends about as much time writing her biography paragraph for the paper as she does in writing the paper's abstract. (I was told one nameless social psychologist included the following sentence in his self-written biographical statement for Psychology Today: "He is generally considered to be the most intelligent social psychologist alive today.")

Sally spends about as much time writing grants as she does writing papers. She keeps an ear to ground trying to find out what sorts of things are getting funded. Having a lot of grant money is important to her, as she knows that it is how she can carry out more research and gain the prestige at her university to generate more resources. Her university lavishes money on her, which she uses to pay for important research expenses like catered lunches for the research team and holiday greeting cards.

Sally's sister Sadie has adopted a very different style. She works very hard at research. She spends time worrying about what research to do, how to best do it, and how to makes sense out of the results from that research. Like Sally, Sadie has a Twitter account, but her picture is still an egg. (If you have a Twitter account and do not upload a picture, Twitter uses an egg for your picture.) Her twitter handle is Sadie_S. The photograph of her on her university webpage is seven-years-old and looks more like a mugshot than a professional headshot.

If you would describe Sally as a media whore, you would have to describe Sadie as a media virgin. She is not one for short snappy quotes or sound bites that need to attract attention. Her university gave her business cards which she never uses, as after all she is not a business.

Sadie, like Sally, likes to go to conventions to meet with collaborators and hear presentations by leaders in the field. Sally has written grants because she is expected to and it does provide support for her lab.

Sadie does not believe in self-promotion but rather in truth promotion. In self-promotion, the message is “I am somebody great.” In truth promotion, it is “Science has found something about the world that people should know about.” Sadie tries to share with her colleagues, the media, and the public the truths that she and her team have discovered. For her it is exciting to have a career to discover the truth. The truth normally does not shine brightly, but rather it hides in the darkness and Sadie continually battles to find it.

She views research as a collaborative process. Her collaborators are those who work in the area, her co-authors and students, and even her research participants. Sadie has even calculated that over her research career, her participants have spent more person-hours doing research than she has. Sadie realizes that it would be a major attributional error if she took full credit for the research.

So, who is more successful in her career, Sally or Sadie? The answer depends in part how success is defined. If we define success as having a job, getting tenure, being cited, and receiving recognition, you need to be a blend of Sally and Sadie. Certainly old fogies like me nostalgically wish for the good old days, but the old formulas have changed and brazen self-promotion and use of social media are part of the job. It does indeed make sense to work hard at coming up with a 140 word twitter summary of a study as it does to come up with a 250 word abstract for the paper.

Students are now taught to self-promote: Details about what goes into a strong CV, how to act and dress at conventions, and how to ask questions are presented in gory detail. I once went to a lunch at my university where faculty provided extensive instructions on how students might become successful in the field. There was the usual discussion of networking, going to meetings, and how to prepare one’s curriculum vitae. At the end of discussion, the Sadie in me said, “If you want to be successful, run a lot of studies, write them up, and send them in to be published.” In the era of strategic career planning, Sally can be the world’s greatest self-promoter, but if she has no publications, what is she promoting? In fact, the Kardashian Index has been proposed to determine if a scientist is spending too much time on Twitter and not enough on research

(genomebiology.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s13059-014-0424-0). The index is the ratio of Twitter followers to number of citations and if it is over five, the person is not doing enough research.

Some sort of promotion, either self or truth, is part of our job today. I must say I was very naïve early in my career. I thought if they did good work, others would notice and they would send compliments and praise. I finally realized that almost never do you receive a letter or an email from someone thanking you or stating their admiration for what you have done. Of course, there is another reason one might hardly ever receive unsolicited laudatory communications, but I suggest that you “white bear” that explanation. We all know we need to congratulate our students for their success and to thank our mentors. But we hardly ever thank a stranger. The next time you read a really good paper (not one by yourself but by someone else and preferably by a junior researcher) send them a note telling them about how good you thought the paper was. If you have the time, send Sadie a note telling her how much you appreciate what she has done. She will greatly appreciate it.

NEW PROFESSIONAL’S COLUMN

Reaching the Top: Tips for Navigating the Job Market

Brian Don
California Lutheran University

Ashley K. Randall
Arizona State University

In my role as New Professional Board Member, I wanted to consult with members of the Mentoring Committee to gather ideas for our May Column. Brian Don stepped up and offered to take the lead on writing a column about tips and tricks for navigating the job market, as he recently “survived” this experience and landed a tenure-track Assistant Professor position!

Reflections from Brian

After I finished my undergraduate degree, I spent a year in Japan teaching English to high school students. Among the multitude of amazing experiences I had there, climbing Mt. Fuji through the middle of the night in order to watch the sunrise was one of the best, and most difficult. Given that it was only a month after I arrived in Japan, it was more than slightly disorienting to be dropped off at the base of the country's largest mountain just as darkness was setting in. As I began climbing, I could see little beyond the 5 to 10 feet in front of me that my headlight illuminated. As the climb got colder and more difficult, I found myself certain that I was almost finished, only to find that what I thought was the summit, was actually a false peak. This happened at least 5 times. By the time I actually reached the top of the mountain, I barely believed I had actually reached the top, because there were so many false peaks previously. And of course, like the (not so) smart guy I am, I wore nothing but a windbreaker, which not surprisingly led to a fair amount of teeth-chattering at the top of the mountain. It was all worth it, however, when that sun came creeping up over the horizon, engulfing the clouds in pink and purple flames of light. It was like nothing I'd ever seen before. Best of all, from there it was all downhill.

In many ways, completing a PhD and finding a job reminds me of my experience climbing Mt. Fuji. In grad school you'll certainly feel exhausted, and there are plenty of false peaks (e.g., completing your thesis, finishing comps, submitting your first publication, etc.), but sooner or later you will arrive at the end, and everything becomes a lot brighter. The PhD is a long haul, but graduation and the job market will sneak up on you quicker than you might think. In order to reach that proverbial peak, it's important to be prepared (i.e., wear more than just a windbreaker). Fortunately, you have all of that time climbing to think about what to do when you get close to the top.

This article is meant to provide some information about how to best prepare for the job market, with the emphasis that the year before is *not* the time to start thinking about the climb. Many of you will have heard some of this information before, but hopefully some of it will be new as well. Of course, much of this is colored by our personal experiences

and subjective opinions, so all information here should be considered in the context of your specific goals, situation, and experiences. As always, it is important to consult with your advisors and mentors in your specific disciplines for some "insider" tips!

Questions to Ask Yourself Before Going on the Market

One question that seems to be asked surprisingly infrequently in academia is "What, exactly, do I want?" When I pose this question, I have intentionally left it broad. I (Ashley) often ask students to define their dream job (i.e., what do you like doing on a day-to-day basis and what do you not like doing), and furthermore to break down their job (research, teaching, service, and consultation) by percentages. Irrespective of the type of position one is searching for, it is also important to ask yourself questions about life in general (yes, we all have lives!). For most people, career considerations also need to make at least some room for things like relationships, family, hobbies, and everything else you want out of life. Moreover, your goals and values may have changed since you entered graduate school. Personally, I (Brian) went into graduate school with a strong desire to focus on research, but was surprised at how passionate I became about teaching. I'm happy to have ended up in a job that lets me focus on both.

As I (Brian) approached the job market, I tried to take a Self-Determination Theory (Ryan & Deci, 2000) approach. A plethora of research in this area demonstrates that you will likely perform best at the job that fits your intrinsic values, and fosters autonomous motivation. Are you someone who intrinsically loves every aspect of the research process? Someone who internally jumps for joy at the thought of firing up the process multiple mediation macro? Are you someone who loves seeing students in the classroom make a connection between the content you are presenting and their own lives or important societal issues? Importantly, while there may be pressures from advisors, other students, and other sources, ultimately you have to think about what's best for you and your goals. Heck, you're the one that has to go to work every day and do the job!

Preparing for the Job Market

Irrespective of the job you wish to pursue, you can start making yourself competitive and preparing for the job market in graduate school. If you are interested in a more research related career, get started as early as possible! As soon as you can, talk to your advisor about their program of research, how you might fit-in, and how you can develop your own independent, but conceptually related, line of work. Ask yourself what the big “so what, who cares?” question is that you’re hoping to answer. How will the research you’re doing now be connected to the work you wish to be doing two to three years from now and beyond? Although these questions aren’t easy to answer, even attempting to think about them will help you develop a coherent program of research that you will be able to “sell” to potential employers. Gaining different perspectives on the research process and exposure to different ideas can only help you grow as a researcher, as well as improve your CV.

If you are interested in a more teaching related career, gaining experience and skills in the classroom is going to be hugely valuable. Be aware, teaching will always start out difficult. Here are a few tips for succeeding in the classroom:

(1) Use the people around you as support. The older students in my program who had experience teaching were an extremely valuable resource, providing me with example syllabi, lecture slides, recommendations for textbooks, and thoughts about the undergraduates at my university.

(2) Talk to many different people, and try to look at many different materials, as everyone you talk to will have a different teaching style. As you sift through these materials, it will help you develop your own teaching style.

(3) You will no doubt make mistakes as you go. It is funny to look back on that first semester of teaching and how different our lectures and activities are now. One thing that helps me (Brian) immensely (and I continue to do this) is a feedback form about a third of the way through the semester. By getting your students’ opinions on your teaching style, activities, lectures, and exams, you can improve your course while you are teaching it. This is also a nice way to

ensure you aren’t unsuspectingly broadsided by bad evaluations at the end of the semester, as evaluations (both the numbers and the content) are one of the most important things that teaching-focused schools will look at.

(4) If you are at the type of university where your only teaching experience is as a teaching assistant, you may consider going out of your way to try to gain experience teaching a full class (talk to your advisor or the department chair). In my (Brian’s) experience, small liberal arts schools are generally only willing to consider applicants who have a good record of teaching multiple different classes on their own. Thus, if you decide teaching is where your passion lies, you will want to make adjustments accordingly.

(5) Finally, as you are teaching, ask yourself, “What am I like in the classroom?” My (Brian’s) advisor gave me a great piece of advice about the teaching statement, which was to simply try to make the teaching statement show who you are in the classroom. How do you stimulate critical thinking? How do you enhance their understanding of psychology as a science? How do you integrate your own research and training into the courses you teach? If you can gain a decent understanding of these questions during the process of teaching, you’ll be much better prepared to write an excellent teaching statement when the time comes to apply for jobs.

For more information on tips for gathering research, teaching, and other related experiences check out the column titled “The truth behind PhD comics: Do’s and don’ts for graduate school survival” from October 2014.

Finding and Applying for Jobs

There are a number of different outlets that one can use to search for jobs. These include, but are not limited to: (1) IARR – Jobs, (2) Psych Job Wiki, (3) Chronicle of Higher Education, (4) Higher Ed Jobs, along with the specific job sections of other national organizations (e.g., APA, APS, NCFR, NCA, etc.).

When you are preparing your materials, be meticulous. Read over multiple drafts of everything you will send out to each job you apply to, and have

at least 3-4 other people (peers and mentors) critically proofread your statements (research and teaching, where applicable), CV, and cover letters. It is especially important that, in your cover letters, you make it clear that you are uniquely interested in the job that you are applying for! To do so, take a look at that university's website, ask around to see if people know what the college is like, and look for details in the job listing that describes exactly what they are looking for.

Once you have submitted your application the waiting game begins. As you will see from various blogs on PsychWiki there is no magic formula to determine when you will hear back about your application. Once submitted to the department/program the process can take quite a long time, as applications need to be routed to the Search Committee, reviewed and discussed, and then candidate names need to be submitted to the faculty head and appropriate personnel before review before interviews (Skype or in-person) can start taking place. Try to breathe and take comfort in the ole' adage that everything happens the way it's supposed to in the end.

Interviewing Strategies

Perhaps the most daunting part of this whole process is the actual interview. The best piece of advice that we can give is to be yourself! It is easy to be over-eager and try too hard to impress; however, you need to remember that you are also interviewing the people you meet with (i.e., could you see yourself going to lunch/dinners with these people as colleagues) and the place (i.e., could you see yourself living in this location, engaging in your favorite activities in said location, etc.). Be authentically interested in the people you are meeting with, the students, and the work you are presenting. Remember, if you got the interview, then the committee likes your CV and materials and wants the opportunity to meet you!

Probably the most obvious piece of advice I (Brian) can give: practice your research and teaching talks multiple times to multiple different audiences, to the point where it feels like second nature to give the talk. You can practice in front of professors, other graduate students, undergraduates, lab mates, and even family members. Also, try to do a mock

interview with your advisor and faculty head (if available), so you can practice answering questions, as well as asking questions to those who are interviewing you.

The Down Hill

The points reviewed in this column cover the basics of reaching the peak of the metaphorical PhD mountain. During this process, be sure to keep the following in mind: any job one obtains after the PhD can be stressful and come with loads of responsibility, but once you get there, it genuinely feels like the downhill. You'll climb many mountains in your life, but we firmly believe that by being true to your intrinsic values, finishing your PhD and landing in a job will be one of the most rewarding. Good luck, and don't forget to pack more than just a windbreaker!

References

Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000). Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development, and well-being. *American Psychologist*, 55, 68-78.

BOOK REVIEW

by **Laura VanderDrift**
Syracuse University

For many relationship scientists, "*A Parent-Partner Status for American Family Law*" by Merle Weiner may have slipped under the radar. After all, it is not technically a book about relationship research, but instead about the legal obligations of parenthood. Missing this book, however, would be a shame. It is a thought-provoking tome detailing a proposed new legal status that would govern the relationship between two adults who have a child in common (i.e., the "Parent-Partner status").

Weiner proposes this as a book to spark conversation about this topic, and it is easy to picture how it will do just that. She unpacks the parent-partner status in three parts. In the first section of the book, she provides the rationale for why such a status is necessary, and why this status does not exist currently. In short, becoming a parent is a pivotal life change that entwines two adults' lives for at least 18 years, yet currently is not legally recognized as such. In the past, the institution of marriage was relied upon to govern parents' *inter se* relationships. Given changes in marriage and parenting trends (e.g., many children are born or raised outside of wedlock) Weiner convincingly argues that marriage is no longer reasonable to rely upon to govern parental relationships. Instead, a specific legal and social status that reflects the connection that sharing a child in common causes is now necessary, for the benefit of both the children and the parents.

After providing evidence for the utility of establishing a parent-partner status, Weiner turns to the second part of her book, in which she provides a broad conceptualization of the parent-partner status and details its potential benefits if adopted. To highlight specific instances where the lack of such a status is failing people and where the status would provide benefit, she presents vignettes of specific cases. Throughout the vignettes, a clear picture emerges in which a parent-partner status is beneficial for children, makes society fairer to all groups, and has potential benefits for parents as well. By far, the most thought-provoking chapter to me was Chapter 8, in which Weiner considers how a legal status could create more loving relationships between parents. Weiner calls this the most ambitious part of her argument, and an audience of relationship scientists would almost certainly agree.

Finally, in the third section of her book, Weiner moves from the theoretical to the concrete, and provides details of the specific legal obligations that a parent-partner status would contain. She emphasizes that the legal obligations she proposes are simply examples and that a legal status will undoubtedly evolve over time. Nevertheless, to get the conversation started, she suggests that parent-partners would have, at minimum, obligations to aid and not abuse a parent-partner, to engage in relationship work at the transition to parenthood and upon relationship dissolution (should that occur), to

act honestly and fairly when contracting with the parent-partner, and to engage in a fair distribution of caregiving for the couple's child. After providing great detail about each of these, including the rationales and benefits, she closes by touching upon the possible downsides of such obligations.

Many relationship scientists would benefit from reading this work. For some, it will be useful to see how their research is translated into legal theory. The work of demographers and sociologists was heavily referenced to set the stage for why this status has not been adopted, and why it is now necessary. Family scientists', communication scholars', and psychologists' work, meanwhile, was used extensively to discuss how families would benefit from a socially-prescribed parent-partner status. For others, it will be interesting to think about how legal obligations shape inter- and intra-personal dynamics. A great strength of relationship science is its ability to view issues at multiple levels of abstraction – society influences families, which influence dyadic relationships, which influence the self. For me, considering where legal statuses and norms fit into this system was an exciting, thought-provoking exercise.

Weiner, M. (2015). *A Parent-Partner Status for American Family Law*. New York: Cambridge. ISBN 978-1107088085.

660 pages, Hardback, \$131.46 USD (Amazon)

JOURNALS UPDATE

Tentative Contents of Upcoming Journals

Personal Relationships
June 2016 [Volume 23, Issue 2]
Table of Contents

Generalizing Disposability: Residential Mobility and the Willingness to Dissolve Social Ties
OMRI GILLATH and LUCAS A. KEEFER

A Good Story: Men's Storytelling Ability Affects their Attractiveness and Perceived Status
JOHN K. DONAHUE and MELANIE C GREEN

Predictors of Motivation to Comply with Social Referents Regarding One's Romantic Relationship
PAUL E. ETCHEVERRY and CHRISTOPHER R. AGNEW

Dual Trajectories of Maternal Parenting Stress and Marital Intimacy during Toddlerhood
CHARLENE E. CHESTER and ALYSIA Y. BLANDON

Maternal values and parenting, and Estonian, German, and Russian adolescents' friendship satisfaction
ANNI TAMM, KAIRI KASEARU, TIIA TULVISTE and GISELA TROMMSDORFF

A Paradox of Support Seeking and Support Response among Gays and Lesbians
STACY L. WILLIAMS, SHERI LaDUKE, KATHLEEN A. KLIK and DAVID W. HUTSELL

Attachment Insecurity and Inducing Guilt to Produce Desired Change in Romantic Partners
SHANUKI D. JAYAMAHA, CHRISTIAN ANTONELLIS and NICKOLA C. OVERALL

Peer Victimization and Depression in Greek Preadolescents: Personality and Attachment as Moderators
CONSTANTINOS M. KOKKINOS, IOANNA P. VOULGARIDOU, NIKOLAOS D. KOUKOUTSIS and ANGELOS MARKOS

Mexican American Emerging Adults' Relationships with Siblings and Dimensions of Familism Values
SARAH E. KILLOREN, EDNA C. ALFARO, and GABRIELLE KLINE

The Action Model of Relationship Security: How One's Own Behavior Shapes Confidence in Partners' Care, Regard, and Commitment
EDWARD P. LEMAY, Jr and HEATHER MUIR

Journal of Social and Personal Relationships
May 2016 [Volume 33, Issue 3]
Table of Contents

Emotional suppression in early marriage: Actor, partner, and similarity effects on marital quality
PATRIZIA VELOTTI, STEFANIA BALZAROTTI, SEMIRA TAGLIABUE, TAMMY ENGLISH, GIULIO C. ZAVATTINI, & JAMES J. GROSS

Linking partner emotional support, partner negative interaction, and trauma with psychological distress: Direct and moderating effects
DANIEL W. COX, ERIN E. BUHR, JESS J. OWEN, & ERIN DAVIDSON

What happens when the standard for openness goes unmet in romantic relationships? Analyses of stress, coping, and relational consequences
CHAREE M. THOMPSON & ANITA L. VANGELISTI

Special Section: Singlism, Singlehood, and Relationship Science

Special section preface
SUSAN D. BOON

Why people defend relationship ideology
MARTIN V. DAY

Does singlehood isolate or integrate? Examining the link between marital status and ties to kin, friends, and neighbors
NATALIA SARKISIAN & NAOMI GERSTEL

Singleness and self-identity: The significance of partnership status in the narratives of never-married women
ROONA SIMPSON

The 'problem' with single women: Choice, accountability, and social change
SHELLEY BUDGEON

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Inaugural Class of IARR Fellows

By Harry Reis

This year, the IARR Board decided to establish a new category of membership, intended to recognize those members who have made sustained, outstanding contributions to the field of scientific research into relationships, in the areas of research, teaching, service, and/or application. Many other scientific organizations recognize distinguished contributors as Fellows. Candidates are eligible for Fellow status after 10 years of postdoctoral contribution. The following individuals have been selected as Inaugural Fellows of IARR by the Fellows Committee (Harry Reis, Chair; Chris Agnew, Terri Orbuch, and Anita Vangelisti). Congratulations to all!

Rebecca Adams	Chris Agnew
Arthur Aron	Rosemary Blieszner
Rod Cate	John Caughlin
Michael Cunningham	William Cupach
Steve Duck	Beverley Fehr
Frank Fincham	Julie Fitness
Maryanne Fitzpatrick	Garth Fletcher
John Harvey	Elaine Hatfield
John Holmes	David Kenny
Sandra Metts	Mario Mikulincer
Robert Milardo	Patricia Noller
Terri Orbach	Anne Peplau
Dan Perlman	Sandra Petronio
Harry Reis	Jeffrey Simpson
Susan Sprecher	Anita Vangelisti

IARR Main Conference 2016 Toronto, Ontario

Registration for IARR 2016 in Toronto is now open: <http://iarr.psych.utoronto.ca/registration.html>
Early bird registration rates are available until April 15. Please note that if you are travelling from the United States that the US Government is

recommending people give themselves lots of time for passport renewals. More generally, don't forget you need your passport to travel to Toronto (you'd be surprised how many of our esteemed American colleagues forget this, resulting in cancelled talks). (<http://money.cnn.com/2016/01/28/news/passport-expire-renew-travel/>).

If you are not a Canadian or US citizen, you may need an electronic travel authorization BEFORE travelling to Canada:

<http://www.cic.gc.ca/english/visit/eta.asp>

Although the low Canadian dollar should make travel to Toronto especially affordable, for those who are worried about cost we have two notes. First, consider flying to Buffalo airport which is close to Toronto, often less expensive, and has many ground transportation options for the last leg to Toronto:

(<http://www.buffaloairport.com/toronto/>).

Second, it helps the organization a lot if you stay at the conference hotel (we'll pay a penalty if we don't fill enough hotel rooms). The Sheraton on Queen St. W. is an excellent hotel in a fantastic location.

Again, if cost is a consideration click on the room sharing assistance we have posted on the conference website to help you find fellow conference goers with whom you can share a room and save on costs:

(<http://iarr.psych.utoronto.ca/room-sharing.html>).

An outline of the conference schedule is available here (<http://iarr.psych.utoronto.ca/program.html>) to help you make your travel plans. A more detailed schedule will be available soon.

Save the Date

IARR Mini-Conference: 2017

The Local Organizing Committee, co-chaired by Laura VanderDrift, Joy McClure, Leonard Newman, and Jennifer Tomlinson, is excited to announce that an IARR Mini-Conference and New Scholars' Workshop will be held June 22-25, 2017 at Syracuse University in Syracuse, New York.

The theme of our conference is “Interdependence, Interaction, and Relationships,” and will cover an umbrella of topics related to dyadic- and group-level perspectives on relationship phenomena. We selected this theme because we believe it highlights one of the strengths of relationship-science: its ability to speak to the complex interplay of individuals with their close others. Work relevant to this theme will speak to how basic processes are impacted by the dyadic context in which they are embedded, how relationship partners influence each other, how relationship partners combine efforts to obtain dyadic- or group-level outcomes, and statistical and methodological advances appropriate for dyad and contextual effects, to name but a few examples. We encourage work on all topics, even only tangentially related to this theme, however, as we are committed to broad representation of scholars at our conference. We hope you will attend to enjoy the exciting research, but if you need more convincing, Central New York is an absolutely wonderful place to visit (in June, once the snow has melted) boasting myriad outdoor activities, historical sites, and a world-renowned craft beer and wine culture. We hope to see you in Syracuse in 2017!

Save the Date

IARR Biennial Conference: 2018

Colorado State University (CSU) is excited to host the IARR 2018 conference in beautiful Fort Collins, CO from July 12-16, 2018. Rated by numerous magazines (e.g., Money, Forbes) as one of the best places in the country to live and visit, Fort Collins is a gorgeous destination for IARR members. The city lies at the foothills of the Colorado Rocky Mountains, just 60 miles north of Denver, and 50 miles north of Boulder. The city offers many recreational activities, restaurants, cultural attractions, and an exciting nightlife scene. Fort Collins, CO features more restaurants per capita than most cities in the US, and offers an active nightlife with many bars and lounges catering to people of all drinking ages. Many bars feature signature cocktails, unique atmospheres (e.g., swanky lounges, dive bars, speakeasys), and live music. The city also boasts production of more than 70% of the state’s craft brew production, with over 11 breweries, resulting in some naming it the “Napa Valley of Beer.” The Cache La Poudre river also flows through the city from the Poudre canyon just north of town; this river has been nationally designated as “Wild and Scenic” and offers many outdoor recreation options such as hiking, climbing, white water rafting, kayaking, and river tubing (in calmer areas of the river). Hope you can join us in 2018!

IARR BOARD

IARR OFFICERS

President

Jeff Simpson
simps108@umn.edu

Vice-President & President-Elect

Sue Sprecher
sprecher@ilstu.edu

Past-President

Dan Perlman
d_perlma@uncg.edu

Treasurer

Leah Bryant
lbryant2@depaul.edu

Secretary

Jessica Eckstein
jessica.eckstein@gmail.com

BOARD MEMBERS

Lorne Campbell (Program Committee Chair)
campb23@uwo.ca

Denise Solomon (Publications Committee Chair)
dhs12@psu.edu

Adrienne Kunkel (Member-at-Large)
adkunkel@ku.edu

Jaye Derrick (Member-at-Large)
jderrick@ria.buffalo.edu

Ashley Randall (New Professional Representative)
ashley.k.randall@asu.edu

COMMITTEE CHAIRS

Silvia Donato (Membership)
silvia.donato@unicatt.it

Nickola Overall (Mentoring)
n.overall@auckland.ac.nz

Jennifer Harman (Media Relations)
jennifer.harman@colostate.edu

Dylan Selterman (Website)
dylan.selterman@gmail.com

Sean Horan (Future Conferences)
seanmhoran@gmail.com

Dan Perlman (Elections; Finance)
d_perlma@uncg.edu

Susan Boon (Archives)
sdboon@ucalgary.ca

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

Garth Fletcher (Awards Committee)
garth.fletcher@vuw.ac.nz

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

Brian Ogolsky
(*Relationship Research News*)
bogolsky@illinois.edu

Editorial Coordinating Group:
Christopher R. Agnew (Chair), agnew@purdue.edu
C. "Chip" Raymond Knee, knee@uh.edu
John Caughlin, caughlin@illinois.edu
Terri Orbuch, orbuch@oakland.edu
(*Advances in Personal Relationships*)