RELATIONSHIP RESEARCH NEWS

OFFICIAL NEWS JOURNAL OF THE INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR RELATIONSHIP RESEARCH

November 2016 VOL 15, NO. 2

PRESIDENT'S COLUMN

November 2016 Report

by Susan Sprecher
Illinois State University

Happy Fall (or Spring), depending on your hemisphere! I am excited to begin my term as your President of IARR. This organization or one of its predecessors (ISSPR and INPR) has been my professional home since I served as student helper at the first relationship conference in Madison Wisconsin (1982). I previously dodged all opportunities to be nominated for President, but finally ran out of other roles to do and now have the honor of being your President. In the U.S. Presidential election that many of us are watching very closely, candidate Hillary Clinton has stated that she has prepared her whole adult life to be President. That is sort of how I feel as I step in as President of IARR.

IARR is in good shape, thanks to the hard-working officers who have thoughtfully served the organization. I want to give a special thanks to Jeff Simpson and Dan Perlman, our most recent Presidents. A shout-out also goes to Leah Bryant (Treasurer) and Jessica Eckstein (Secretary), who are continuing in their roles and tirelessly work to keep the organization running in good standing. The Chairs and their committees (2014-2016) have done creative work (more about that below), and I am excited to see how their work will continue and be expanded upon with the new set of Chairs and committees (2016-2018). The organization is in good shape also because of the hard work of so many other key people including Editors, Associate Editors, other Board members, Conference Organizers, the Archivist, and the WebMaster (see the names listed on the final page of *RRN* and in the inside cover of the journals).

The Toronto, Canada conference was a wonderful event. Geoff MacDonald and his team (including Emily Impett and Sisi Tran) as local organizers, and Lorne Campbell as the Program Chair, provided us with a superb conference experience, with approximately 620 attendees. There were many highlights of the conference, ranging from the stimulating keynote addresses to the afternoon refreshments including smoothies! Geoff's playlist for the Saturday night dance had those on the dance floor with any stamina hopping for hours.

At the Awards Banquet that occurred Saturday night at the conference, Garth Fletcher and his Awards Committee honored several people. The award winners were:

Distinguished Career Award: John Holmes

Berscheid-Hatfield Award for Distinguished Mid-Career Achievement: Sandra Murray

Gerald R. Miller Award for Early Career Achievement: Nickola Overall

Mentoring Award: John Caughlin

Teaching Award: Jackie Fitzpatrick

Dissertation Award: Samantha Joel

Steve Duck New Scholars Award: Emily Hooker, Bonnie Le

Book Award: Jennifer Bevan

Article award: Christine Logel, Danu Anthony Stinson, Gregory Gunn, Joanne Wood, John Holmes, and Jessica Cameron

Harry Reis, chair of an Awards subcommittee, acknowledged the inaugural class of IARR Fellows. For a list, please see p. 15 of the May *Relationship Research News*. In fact, if you missed completely the opportunity to read the May issue, please go to the IARR website, and click on "Relationship Research News" in the left list, under Publications (or go to www.iarr.org/rrn)

Looking Back: Accomplishments and Transitions of 2014-2016

In addition to a superb main conference (Toronto), there were many other highlights and accomplishments from the past two years. In summer of 2015, Jen Theiss and Kathryn Greene hosted a very successful mini-conference at Rutgers University (New Jersey, USA) on the theme of "Relationships, Health, and Well-being." This included a New Scholar Workshop organized by Jen Theiss with contributions from Nickola Overall and Ashley Randall (from the Mentoring Committee). Also in the summer of 2015, Catrin Finkenauer and her colleagues at VU University (Amsterdam, The Netherlands) hosted a mini-conference on the theme of "Self-Regulation and Close Relationships," which was also very successful.

The publications of IARR have been and continue to be in good hands. Julie Fitness and her team of Associate Editors are winding down their term as Editors of *Personal Relationships*, and Deborah Kashy and her Associate Editors began processing the new submissions this past summer. Geoff MacDonald has been in his position as Editor of *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships* for over a year. Justin Lehmiller completed his term (in the fall of 2015) as Editor of *Relationship Research News*, and Brian Ogolsky and his team began their term with the publication of the May 2016 issue. Chris Agnew and the other series editors are moving the Advances series (published by Cambridge University Press) forward with more publications and books in progress and review.

The committees for 2014-2016 were also very busy. Leah Bryant and Dan Perlman (co-chairs of the Financial Committee) carefully reviewed the IARR finances, determined that the organization is in good financial standing, and adjusted membership rates and categories moving forward. Sean Horan and the Future Conferences Committee selected the site of the next mini-conference (2017 at Syracuse University, New York, USA; to be hosted by Laura VanderDrift) and the site of the next main conference (2018 at Colorado State University, Fort Collins, CO, USA; to be hosted by Jennifer Harman). Dan Perlman and his Elections Committee ran the election in the spring, which resulted in the election of Anita Barbee as President-Elect, Leanne Knobloch as Board Member-at-Large, Beverley Fehr as Publication Committee Chair, and Natalie Hengstebeck as New Professional Representative. The Publication Committee, chaired by Denise Solomon, selected the new *RRN* editor (Brian Ogolsky) and the new *PR* editor (Deborah Kashy). They also negotiated with Wiley to increase the pages of the *PR* journal. Silvia Donato and the other members of the Membership committee worked to increase the membership of the organization by reaching out to new potential members who may not have known about our organization (if you are a new member, welcome!) and by contacting prior members who had their membership lapse (welcome back!). Nickola Overall and the Mentoring Committee were also very busy. They created a mentoring program linking senior members in the field with graduate students and other early professionals. They also gathered resources for new scholars and posted these resources at the IARR website (www.iarr.org/new-scholar-resources/).

Other committees and ad-hoc task forces also were very productive in 2014-2016. The teaching committee, chaired by Kelly Campbell, continued collecting materials (syllabi, assignments) and posted them on the teaching section of the IARR website. Jennifer Harman (chair of the Media Relations Committee), with the assistance of Lucia O'Sullivan and other members, set up an IARR Twitter account and began to gather resources that will be useful for those members who would like to be more active in disseminating information to the media. The ad-hoc International Committee (chaired by Gery Karantzas) established an IARR International Award and created two online forums and one face-to-face forum at the IARR Toronto conference that allowed scholars from developing countries to showcase their work and possibly seek collaborators. In addition, two videos have been created by Gery and the International Committee that provide mentoring to younger scholars (particularly from developing countries) on two particular topics: networking at conferences and applying for post-doctoral studies. Garth Fletcher and his Awards Committee were busy last winter and spring processing the nominations for the awards (see above for award winners). An ad-hoc task force, chaired by Susan Branje, worked on creating guidelines for our journals that will align with the Transparency and Openness Promotion (TOP) Guidelines (see feature story in this issue). The journal Editors are currently discussing to what degree and how these guidelines might be implemented in our two journals.

Looking Ahead and Other Issues

The new chairs and their committee members are hard at work (see the list of new Chairs on the last page of this issue). This fall they have been identifying the goals they wish to accomplish and will begin work to meet those goals. In a future column, I will report on their progress. Other developments on the horizon, announcements, and requests that I want to highlight include:

The Chairs and I (with the help of Dylan Selterman, the webmaster) will be working to update many of the sections of the website. Stay tuned!

Based on a suggestion at the Business meeting at the Toronto conference, we will be looking into the process of providing a mechanism for senior members to donate to the organization to help fund specific initiatives, such as funding for graduate students to attend our conferences. President-elect Anita Barbee is looking into this issue, and if you have any thoughts, please email her (anita.barbee@louisville.edu).

A task force, co-chaired by Jessica Eckstein and Dan Perlman, is looking into our Management System and whether 123Signup is meeting our needs.

For your information, it was discussed at the Board meeting that it would be problematic to have the Secretary and Treasurer terms end at the same time, and it was voted to stagger the current end points of the terms. Therefore, for this time only, one year has been added to the Treasurer's term so that future terms are staggered.

If you want more information on what was discussed at the Board meeting or the Business meeting at Toronto, please go to the IARR Website, and click on *Document Archives* (on left), then *Restricted Files*, then *Historical Documents*, then *Minutes of Board Meetings*.

The journal Editors of our journals emphasized the importance of people (especially those who are Board members of the journals or active submitters to the journals) to be willing to do their share of manuscript reviewing. I want to echo their encouragement. Also, please send your best work to our journals rather than giving other organizational journals the privilege of publishing it.

The teaching committee, chaired now by Cheryl Harasymchuk, will be reaching out to the membership to seek updated teaching materials (syllabi, assignments, videos) for courses related to personal relationships. Help jumpstart the committee's work by sending them material to consider (Cheryl.harasymchuk@carleton.ca).

As many of you know, some of our members (Ben Le, Gary Lewandowski, and Tim Loving) have been maintaining an excellent website (*Science of Relationships*, at www.scienceofrelationships.com/) to disseminate scientific research on relationships to the public. I find this to be an excellent website that helps us all. Please visit it and be supportive of their efforts in any way that you can -- e.g., sending a link to an article that you would like them to consider at their site, offering to write an entry for them, and/or placing your next Amazon order through this specific link www.amazon.com/?tag=sciencofrelat-20, which will result in a small percentage of the purchase amount going to help pay for hosting the site. In addition, another IARR member, Justin Lehmiller, has a website that focuses more specifically on science of sexuality (including sex in relationships!). Please visit his great website: http://www.lehmiller.com/ or follow him on Facebook (Facebook.com/psychologyofsex) or Twitter (@JustinLehmiller) for regular updates. I find both sites to be helpful in my teaching, and I think you will as well.

Finally, we hope to see you at the next conference for IARR, which is the mini-conference at Syracuse University, June 23-25, 2017, hosted by Laura VanderDrift. See information included in this issue about how and where to submit (or go to iarr2017.com). In addition, there will be a new Scholar Workshop the day prior to the conference (June 22), organized by Ashley Randall and the Mentoring committee. I am looking forward to seeing many of you in Syracuse in June!

Concluding

At the beginning of this column, my first as President, I noted that a relationship organization has been my primary professional home since the early 1980s. Thanks to the current (IARR) and prior (ISSPR and INPR) organizations, I have developed personal relationships with many relationship scholars over the years, and my life has been enriched because of it. I am already enjoying the opportunity of becoming closer to additional members through my role as President. I am not biased of course (well maybe a little), but I think our organization hosts the best conferences, has the best opportunities for networking, and offers the best professional home (and family) for anyone doing relationship scholarship. Many of our early members have been retiring, and I hope that we can keep many of them involved and committed to IARR. More generally, I hope that, with the assistance of the officers, Chairs, other key people in the organization, and the rank and file members, we can maintain and even enhance IARR in order to make it a very attractive professional home for everyone, from new graduate students conducting their first research projects on personal relationships to the emeritus professors who were the creators of the early organizations.

Submission deadline for the next issue of RRN

April 1, 2017 (No Joke)

Submit all materials to Brian Ogolsky bogolsky@illinois.edu

INSIDE THIS ISSUE OF RELATIONSHIP RESEARCH NEWS

RELATIONSHIP RESEARCH NEWS

Editor
Brian G. Ogolsky
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

Associate Editors

Laura VanderDrift
Syracuse University

Casey Totenhagen
University of Alabama

Sylvia Niehuis
Texas Tech University

Relationship Research News is published twice a year. Contributions are very welcome and will be published as space permits. Announcements, letters to the editors, cartoons/humor, teaching tips, and other information relevant to IARR members are all appropriate. If you would like to contribute a feature article or personal commentary, please submit a brief (one paragraph) description to the editor first (please do not send manuscripts). Submit all materials to 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

And here we go again. It has been a whirlwind at IARR with another successful main conference coming and going. My kudos to Geoff MacDonald and his team for putting together an amazing event and to Lorne Campbell for the outstanding program.

In response to my call for an additional Associate Editor, I was pleased to be able to add Sylvia Niehuis from Texas Tech University to our team. She and the other AEs, Casey and Laura, have been invaluable as always.

This issue was an absolute bear to put together. At a whopping 34 pages, it is full of wonderful content. After a discussion with Kelly Campbell and Denise Solomon at the main conference, we decided to launch a new recurring column on teaching in this issue. In addition, you will find the second edition of the spotlight columns, this time featuring the work of Laura VanderDrift and Sandra Murray. Please consider volunteering yourself or nominating someone you know and respect to be spotlighted in the next issue. 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 a timely politically-themed humor column written by David Kenny. He vows to "Make IARR Great Again," in an interview that may or may not resemble some current events taking place in the current U.S. political climate. The column is "HUUUUUGE."

In her first column as New Professional Representative, Natalie Hengstebeck outlines the opportunities that are available through the Fulbright exchange—a must read for students and new professionals who are interested in studying abroad.

Next you will find the inaugural teaching column in which Kelly Campbell and Denise Solomon offer their "Top 10" teaching tips.

The feature article in this issue is a report from Susan Branje, who chaired an ad-hoc committee on publishing guidelines. Her column discusses the committee's recommendations for the IARR journals.

Sylvia Niehuis and Rebecca Oldham then review a recently released film, *Love Between the Covers*, that focuses on the romance novel industry. Casey Totenhagen reviews, *Couples Coping with Stress: A Cross-Cultural Perspective*, which is a new edited book examining dyadic coping in 14 regions across the globe. Next up, Jimmie Manning reviews *Sexual Attraction: The Psychology of Allure*, a new book that centers on the experience of sexual attraction. In the final book review, Jill Bowers discusses *The Thinking Girl's Guide to the Right Guy*, a book that brings relationship research into practice by offering suggestions for how to be happy and fulfilled in our own personal relationships.

This issue is also full of important announcements about upcoming conferences, calls for papers, and proposals for the next IARR conference hosts.

As always, we want to hear what you think. Send us an email with your suggestions for feature articles, book reviews, or any other material that you think is relevant to our readership. Now that we have completed our first year, we are starting to hit our stride, but our goal is to serve you, the reader. Let us know how we are doing.

And, as always, happy reading.

JUNIOR SPOTLIGHT

Laura VanderDrift

Syracuse University

Dr. Laura VanderDrift received her PhD in social psychology from Purdue University in 2012 under the supervision of Chris Agnew. After graduating, she accepted a position as an assistant professor in the social area of the psychology department at Syracuse University, which is the position she currently holds.

Broadly, her research interests lie in understanding interdependent social processes. Heavily influenced by Interdependence Theory, VanderDrift studies how individuals' personal characteristics (i.e., those that are not dependent upon specific relational contexts) and relational characteristics (i.e., those that pertain to interpersonal dynamics) reciprocally influence each other and combine to predict relationship outcomes, most notably dissolution processes and health outcomes.

Why do people leave their relationships? This deceptively simple question has dominated VanderDrift's work to date, beginning with her master's thesis (VanderDrift, Agnew, & Wilson, 2009). In this work, she considered how individuals move from experiencing flagging commitment to actually leaving their relationships. She developed a construct called *dissolution consideration* to encapsulate the increased salience of dissolution that people experience just prior to leaving their relationships. Subsequently, she has examined myriad processes associated with dissolution. For example, she aimed to understand the process by which need fulfillment is associated with stay-leave behavior (personal needs promote commitment, whereas relational needs are directly associated with stay-leave behavior; VanderDrift & Agnew, 2012), whether valuing the friendship component of a romance more than other aspects is associated with relationship persistence (it is; VanderDrift, Wilson, & Agnew, 2013; VanderDrift, Lehmiller, & Kelly, 2012), and how active goal pursuits derail the maintenance necessary for persistence (by refocusing attention and biasing relational information processing; VanderDrift & Agnew, 2014).

Next up with regard to stay-leave behavior, she is taking a step back to examine the underlying structure of stay-leave judgments. Classic Interdependence Theory texts have planted the idea that judgments regarding staying (and thus the predictors that strongly influence our thoughts about staying in our relationships) and judgments regarding leaving (and again, the predictors associated with these thoughts) operate relatively independently of each other. In other words, what promotes relationship stability in the positive might not necessarily promote relationship change in the negative. In collaboration with Chris Agnew, VanderDrift has conducted over a dozen experiments based on this theorizing and is excited to add her findings to the body of empirical work on stay-leave behavior soon.

It's not all breakups in VanderDrift's lab, however. She's also interested in how interdependent social processes impact health and health behavior. During graduate school, she examined the dyadic elements of condom use decisions (VanderDrift, Agnew, Harvey, & Warren, 2013). Having found the dyadic piece of this work to be particularly informative, she began work at Syracuse examining processes within couples where at least one member is HIV+. Later this year, the first of her work on this topic will appear in press – in collaboration with her colleague Peter Vanable, and graduate students Michael Ioerger and Luke Mitzel, she found that perceived partner willingness to sacrifice moderates the effectiveness of partner HIV medication adherence support.

Dr. VanderDrift is currently accepting PhD students to work with her in the social psychology program at Syracuse University. More information about Dr. VanderDrift can be found at lauravanderdrift.com or you can contact her directly: lvanderd@syr.edu. Also, she encourages everyone to visit Syracuse University this summer for the 2017 IARR Mini-Conference (theme: Interdependence, Interaction, and Relationships)! More information can be found at www.iarr2017.com.

References:

VanderDrift, L. E., Wilson, J. E., & Agnew, C. R. (2013). On the benefits of valuing being friends for non-marital romantic partners. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 30,* 115-131.

VanderDrift, L. E., Lehmiller, J. J., & Kelly, J. R. (2012). Commitment in friends with benefits relationships: Implications for relational change and safer sex practices. *Personal Relationships, 19,* 1-13.

VanderDrift, L. E. & Agnew, C. R. (2012). Need fulfillment and stay-leave behavior: On the diagnosticity of personal and relational needs. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 29,* 228-245.

VanderDrift, L. E., Agnew, C. R., & Wilson, J. E. (2009). Romantic relationship commitment and stay/leave behavior: The mediating role of dissolution consideration. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 35,* 1220-1232.

VanderDrift, L. E. & Agnew, C. R. (2014). Relational consequences of personal goal pursuits. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 106,* 927-940.

SENIOR SPOTLIGHT

Sandra Murray

University of Buffalo

Dr. Murray is a Professor of Psychology at the University at Buffalo, The State University of New York. She received her Ph.D. in Social Psychology from the University of Waterloo. She has long held interests in motivated cognition in relationships. Her scholarship has been awarded Mid-Career Distinguished Contribution Awards from the International Association of Relationships Research (2016) and the Society of Experimental Social Psychology (2012), Early Career Distinguished Contribution Awards from the American Psychological Association (2003) and the International Society of Self and Identify (2001), and best new contribution awards from the Society of Personality and Social Psychology (2007) and the International Society for the Study of Personal Relationships (1998, 2000). Her research has been supported by grants from the National Institute of Mental Health and the National Science Foundation. She is presently an Associate Editor at *Personality and Social Psychology Review* and past Associate Editor at *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* and *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*.

Dr. Murray takes an eclectic approach in her research program, drawing on the literatures on automaticity, goal pursuit, and meaning maintenance to explore how basic values to feel safe from being hurt and to perceive value in the partner dynamically influence affect, cognition, and behavior. She is most excited about exploring new research ideas developed in her forthcoming book, *Motivated Cognition in Relationships: The Pursuit of Belonging,* Murray and Holmes (in press). This book explores how basic biological and psychological drives to be safe from harm and to perceive value, meaning, and purpose in one's actions infuse relationship life. In one of her new lines of research, Dr. Murray and her collaborators at UB are examining how people can use relationships to set the world right when events threaten shared cultural understandings of how the world works.

According to the meaning maintenance model, people need the world to make sense to act purposefully and efficaciously within it (Heine, Proulx, & Vohs, 2006). The world makes sense when events unfold much as people expect, as happens when it rains on a cloudy day, syrup tops pancakes, and nasty people receive their just desserts. When events do not unfold as people expect, the world stops making sense and people are thrown into an aversive state. Consequently, violations of expectancy motivate people to restore meaning and order so they might act with purpose within the world once again.

Dr. Murray and her colleagues reasoned that people threatened by a disorderly and unpredictable world might compensate for such worldly disorder by imposing greater order and meaning on their relationship. They also reasoned that restoring order to the relationship would be a particularly pressing goal for people in more vulnerable relationships. Why would that be the case? People who are more satisfied in their relationships go about life maintaining relationships that meet their expectations in most respects. They already live in an orderly state. But, people who are less satisfied live in a comparative state of disorder. They go about life maintaining a relationship that is not necessarily the one they wanted or expected to inhabit. Consequently, when expectancy violations impose disorder on the world, people in less satisfying relationships have more psychological work to do to make sense of their ongoing involvement in the relationship.

To examine these dynamics, Dr. Murray and her collaborators crafted a series of experiments where they violated common cultural conventions, such as the conventional moral that hard work pays off (Murray, Lamarche, Gomillion, Seery, & Kondrak, 2016). In two of the experiments, expectancy-violation participants read an abridged version of Kafka's *An Imperial Message*, a story about a messenger who overcomes a series of herculean obstacles only to ultimately fail in his mission to deliver a message to the king. Control participants read a conventional narrative about a persevering tortoise triumphing over a ne'er-do-well hare. Then they measured tendencies to defensively affirm commitment, operationalized as participants' willingness to risk being closer and more committed than they perceived their partner to be. These experiments suggested that the need to restore meaning to a disorderly world does indeed insinuate itself in relationships.

Less satisfied perceivers in these experiments set their relationships right to make the world seem meaningful again. Less satisfied participants made stronger compensatory expressions of commitment in the expectancy violation than control conditions in these experiments. However, more satisfied participants did not defensively affirm commitment, presumably because they already perceived it as meaningful.

Not content to look at these dynamics only in the lab, Murray and her colleagues also tested their hypotheses about expectancy violations in couples experiencing the transition to parenthood. Less satisfied new mothers and fathers defensively affirmed commitment from pre-to-post baby when becoming a parent violated culturally conditioned expectations about the division of household labor. Less satisfied men reported relatively greater commitment over time when the post-baby division of labor violated their culturally conditioned expectation that men should do less. But, less satisfied women reported relatively greater commitment over time when the post-baby division of labor violated their culturally conditioned expectation that women should do more.

Dr. Murray is eager to see what new directions her research program takes now that her students are examining how more basic biological and psychological motivations and goals affect close relationship dynamics.

References

Murray, S., & Holmes, J. (in press). *Motivated Cognition in Relationships: The Pursuit of Belonging.* New York, NY: Psychology Press.

Heine, S. J., Proulx, T., & Vohs, K. D. (2006). The meaning maintenance model: On the coherence of social motivations. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 10,* 88-110.

Murray, S. L., Lamarche, V., Gomillion, S., Seery, M. D., & Kondrak, C. (2016). *In defense of commitment: The curative power of violated expectations in relationships*. Manuscript under revision.

HUMOR COLUMN

Make IARR Great Again!

By David A. Kenny

I am announcing here my candidacy for the presidency of our organization. I do so because our organization is a mess; the worst it has been ever! I have been successful my entire life and I think I am the only one who can take us out of this mess. I am the best and my opponents, whoever they might be, are losers. They are pathetic. We all know it.

Below is the transcript from a recent interview about my plans to make IARR great again. I was lucky enough to be interviewed by [the editor removed the name of the interviewer] who by the way is one very sexy girl. If she [the editor removed the rest of this statement].

Interviewer: I thought IARR is already great. Why don't you think IARR is great?

Me: The people I talk to are very unhappy. Real unhappy. They are getting papers and grants rejected all the time. I mean all the time. They are getting three revise-and-resubmits and then getting rejections. We can be great again. When I am president, people will get their papers published and receive massive grants. I can make our field great again.

We are being run by losers. One of them is that guy Jeff Simpson who I call Homer Simpson because he is as much of a doofus as Homer. Actually, the more I think about it, Homer Simpson could have done a better job than Jeff Simpson. Some people say that he never got a Ph.D. I do not know if it is true, but have you seen his degree from the University of Minnesota? Yeah, do you really think they have 10,000 lakes there? I don't. Anyway, I have not seen any degree, and he may have it, but it makes you suspicious, doesn't it?

Interviewer: Actually five years ago, Jeff Simpson produced a copy of his diploma. Do you not think you owe him an apology?

Me: I guess he has a degree, I suppose. I will not apologize. Homer owes me big. By my asking him to produce it, he has finally been able to end the controversy.

Interviewer: Is it not true that you did not even attend the 2016 meeting in Toronto?

Me: I love Toronto. I almost bought a beautiful condo there but the exchange rate was lousy then. It sure is great now. I first visited Toronto in 1969 and I love going there. I love walking down Yonge Street. Of course, I hate the Blue Jays and love the Red Sox. I love David Ortiz, but I do hate that beard he has. I say either grow a beard or shave. I had a beard when I graduated from college, but the chick I was dating then hated it, and so I shaved it off. Does that answer your question?

Interviewer: Not really, but let us move on. You say you are so great, but maybe you are not so eminent. Isn't it true that twice in your career, you had 10 papers rejected in a row? That does not suggest to me that you are all that impressive.

Me: That's a lie. Where did you get that lie? That rag of a newsletter, *RRN*?

Interviewer: You said it in the Fall 2010 issue of *Dialogue*, the newsletter for the Society of Personality and Social Psychology.

Me: Maybe I did and if it happened, and I am not saying it happened, it is all due to the fact that the reviewers and editors of those journals are losers and incompetents, and the system is clearly rigged. Just like the losers and incompetents that run IARR have made us no longer be great. I am the only one who can fix it. You know I am brilliant. I am the best.

Interviewer: Is it not the case that you have not held an office or ever provided any service to the organization? You have never served as an editor for any of our journals and I have information that you currently are unwilling to review papers submitted to our journals. Your opponent has spent nearly a whole career in service to the field. How can you ever seek to lead an organization, if you have never served it?

Me: Who wants to review a paper? Reviewers are losers. We all know they are losers. Don't you say to yourself all the time, "This reviewer has no clue what I am saying?" People who have been working for IARR have nothing better to do than to serve on committees and go to meetings. I am too busy, working hard trying to find co-authors to write my papers. I am writing some great papers now. The very best. You would not believe how good they are. Also in my spare time I have more important things to do, like working on my golf game.

Interviewer: Finally IARR has a female president and president-elect. Do you not think you might want to step aside and let women who make up the majority of IARR serve as president?

Me: Do not pull the woman card on me. I love the women. Ask my several wives. A woman does not need to be president, as I can make IARR great for them as well as the men. I know the women are busy being pregnant and raising kids. I can give the job my full attention.

Interviewer: Not sure how to respond to that. Moving on, you are a North American social psychologist. IARR has many other constituencies. Do you feel that you can adequately represent their views?

Me: I think I can represent Communications. After all, who is a better communicator than I am? I am the best! A huge communicator! As for Human Development and Family Relations, I was once a child and I am a member of a family, actually several of them. As for international people, when I was a kid I went to Tijuana and my parents bought me one of those Mexican hats. What do you call them? Soberios? Whatever you call them, I am Mr. International. I am loved by people from all the countries. I would be the most popular IARR president ever; I can totally guarantee that, 100 percent, absolutely. I would be brilliant!

Interviewer: I have noticed that you have a twitter account and you have posted what can only generously be described as pretty outrageous posts.

Me: I think we need a twitter journal. I would even volunteer to be the editor, even though I feel that only losers are editors. You complained about me not serving, but this would be a fantastic service I could provide. Yes, fantastic. You could publish papers on twitter. I do not know about you, but who wants to read a 30-page paper filled with all sorts of arcane details? I think 140 characters are all you need. I know that's all that I need to convey my ideas.

Interviewer: I would agree that most of what you say can be summarized in 140 characters and it would be a "fantastic" service. Moving onto something else, I checked and I have noticed that you have not paid your dues in several years.

Me: That just shows how smart I am. I would pay my dues but the money is wasted going to editors that spend all of their time rejecting papers. That said, our dues collection system is a disaster. I mean a disaster worse than those typhoons you see devastating those poor people living in Bangladesh. Who would be a better person than me to fix this rotten system? Me, the one who knows how to beat it. I have these great ideas on how we could market and brand ourselves so much better. We need to sell ourselves better. Believe me it would all be fabulous.

Interviewer: Well that concludes our interview. I can only say that you should change your campaign motto to "I am running to make IARR grate for the very first time!"

(Any resemblance to anyone currently living is fully intended! I urge everyone who's eligible to vote in any election, IARR or otherwise, to make sure that they vote, and if they have the time, to volunteer, and if they have the financial resources, to donate.)

*Note: The views expressed in this column are those of its author only.

NEW PROFESSIONAL'S COLUMN

The Fulbright Program: Opportunities for International Exchange

Natalie D. Hengstebeck

The University of North Carolina at Greensboro

"The Fulbright Program aims to bring a little more knowledge, a little more reason, and a little more compassion into world affairs and thereby to increase the chance that nations will learn at last to live in peace and friendship." – *Senator J. William Fulbright, Founder of the Fulbright Program*

In my first column as the New Professional Representative, I discuss the Fulbright Program, which is an international exchange program aimed at increasing mutual understanding between people from the United States and more than 160 countries. Fulbright provides opportunities for international exchange, both for individuals from other countries coming to the U.S. (i.e., visiting Fulbrighters) and U.S. citizens going abroad. Grants are available to support study, research, disciplinary and language teaching, and other country-specific opportunities for professional collaboration.

For students and new professionals, Fulbright may provide an opportunity to work with a scholar you admire, develop skills in a new area of research outside your PhD advisor's expertise, or build up your publication record before you go on the job market. For more experienced professionals and faculty, the program provides opportunities for research, teaching, and otherwise developing or sharing expertise.

Below, I discuss the Fulbright experiences of three IARR members, background about the program, and tips for preparing a successful application.

What inspired your Fulbright experience and what opportunities did it provide?

Harry T. Reis traveled to the Netherlands as a tenured professor in 1990.

In 1990, I spent 4 months in the Department of Social Psychiatry at Maastricht University in the Netherlands. I went because my hosts, Marten de Vries and Philippe Delespaul, had developed a method for experience sampling that involved programmable wristwatches (revolutionary at the time!) and because I wanted to try living in Europe. My time there was deeply fulfilling and tremendous fun. I learned a great deal about programmable wristwatches, of course, but also about the differences between European and American universities, about the European perspective on intimate relationships, and about the superiority of unpasteurized beer and chocolate. It's easy to summarize how my Fulbright stay in the Netherlands enhanced my career: More than any specific study or paper, the experience gave me a much broader, less Americentric view of relationships, psychology, and the academic enterprise. It also fostered enduring friendships, professional and personal, that continue to enrich my life.

Ashley K. Randall traveled to Switzerland in 2007-2008 between her MS and PhD degrees. She currently serves as the Vice President for the Arizona Chapter of the Fulbright Association.

I had a friend in graduate school at North Dakota State University who was a visiting Fulbrighter from Puerto Rico. In talking with her, I was in awe of how she went abroad to conduct research - having an experience that provided both a professional and personal gain. Having the desire to continue my research and a love for travel, I was inspired to apply for a Fulbright following my master's degree and before my PhD. Ironically enough, although I was not yet a member of IARR, IARR's directory was the very place I went to look up international scholars who were conducting research in my area of interest (stress and coping). I came across Dr. Guy Bodenmann, who was then at the University of Fribourg in Switzerland (now at the University of Zurich). I contacted him about my ideas and interest in conducting a research stay in his lab. He was very *supportive of my idea and wrote a letter of recommendation on my behalf. After three interviews (standard for Fulbright) and many months of waiting, I was awarded a Fulbright Fellowship to the University of Fribourg, Switzerland under the direction of Dr. Guy Bodenmann. This experience has been the most rewarding professionally, and our fruitful collaboration continues to this day.*

I traveled to the Netherlands in 2015-2016, or my fifth year of graduate study. An undergraduate study abroad experience in the Netherlands, Belgium, and France initially sparked my interest in the potential of policy and context to shape individual, couple, and family well-being. Pearl Dykstra's keynote speech at the 2012 IARR conference in Chicago about macro-level policies and family interactions in Europe solidified my commitment to incorporating cross-national and policy-oriented research into my own research program. With the generous support of Pearl and my doctoral committee, I prepared an application and was awarded a Nederland-America Foundation/Fulbright Grant to spend the 2015-2016 academic year in Pearl's lab in the Department of Sociology and Public Administration at the Erasmus University Rotterdam. In addition to completing several manuscripts based on earlier research, the experience made it possible for me to build relationships with experts in cross-national and policy research, train in the latest methods, and develop the foundation for my dissertation, which uses cross-national Generations and Gender Survey data. I developed a deeper appreciation for the similarities among and differences between Dutch, European, and American family research, public policy, and culture. Though the long-term career implications have yet to emerge, I am confident that the experiences and the relationships I developed during my Fulbright will continue to be beneficial personally and professionally.

What should you know about the Fulbright Program?

The Fulbright Program has opportunities for students, specialists, postdoctoral scholars, and faculty. Most programs require at least a bachelor's degree, but there is notable variation across countries and programs.

The percentage of funded applications varies *widely* across countries. For example, in 2016-2017, U.S. student study/research applications were funded at a rate of less than 5% to the United Kingdom, 31% to Brazil, and 65% to Indonesia. In addition, there is within-country variation in the success rate of applications for other programs relative to applications for study/research.

The foreign language requirement varies across countries. For example, though language study is encouraged to foster engagement with the host community, for study/research grants in the Netherlands, Dutch language proficiency is not required.

Awards vary in length by country and program, with student grants typically ranging from six to twelve months and specialist/scholar grants typically ranging from three to twelve months. If the grant length is not specified for the program on the country profile pages, you should specify the desired grant length in your application.

There are typically three stages of review including one by the Fulbright Campus Committee (at your current or former institution), the National Screening Committee (for the sending country), and the Fulbright Commission in the host country. I strongly recommend familiarizing yourself with the larger Fulbright mission and the U.S. and foreign Fulbright entities.

Application deadlines typically take place in the fall of the year preceding travel. You may only apply to one country per year.

What is involved in applying for a Fulbright award?

Finding a mentor abroad. Particularly for new professionals, the most important step in the process is to seek out a mentor who is an ideal fit for the work you want to do and who is willing to host you (e.g., write a letter of affiliation, provide office space, collaborate with you, and review your statement of grant purpose). If you do not have a potential mentor in mind, your network and the IARR Membership Directory are great places to start. Think extensively about what you hope to achieve through this grant and seek out people who are most likely to help you get there. Keep in mind that your application will need to convince multiple rounds of application reviewers in the United States and the other country that the prospective mentor, institution, and country are ideal for the work that you want to do.

Contact a Fulbright advisor. As soon as you think you might be interested in applying for a Fulbright award, contact the Fulbright advisor at your current (or former) institution. This individual, who is responsible for conducting interviews and signing off on all applications from that institution, is an invaluable resource available to help you during this process.

Connect with successful grantees. Like any (grant) application, it is beneficial to review successful applications from previous recipients. In addition to your personal network, I strongly encourage you to contact Fulbrighters in your country and/or content area of interest and ask about their experiences and whether they would share their application materials with you.

Prepare the application materials. Application materials vary based on the country and program. For example, in addition to transcripts and an online application, study/research student awards typically require a one-page personal statement, a two-page statement of grant purpose, three letters of recommendation, and a letter of affiliation from your host. Though the letter of affiliation is sometimes listed as optional, I strongly encourage you to have one.

Though the information provided in this column is not comprehensive, I hope it is a useful starting point for anyone who is interested in pursuing a Fulbright award. Program requirements and eligibility vary by program and country of citizenship. Goede reis! Bon voyage!

Many thanks to Ashley K. Randall and Harry T. Reis for contributing their insight and experiences for this column.

TEACHING COLUMN

Top Ten Teaching and Mentoring Tips

By Kelly Campbell
California State University Santa Barbara

Denise Solomon
Pennsylvania State University

Nickola C. Overall brought together a group of scholars for a symposium at the Toronto conference called "Strategies for Early Career Success." The session included talks by Jeff Simpson (Publishing Relationship Research), Andrea Meltzer (Navigating the Job Market), Emily Impett (Maximizing Post-Doctoral Opportunities), and the two of us (Teaching and Mentoring). When Brian Ogolsky approached Kelly – as the outgoing Teaching Committee Chair – to write an inaugural article for what will hopefully become a recurring RRN teaching column, she thought of her presentation with Denise. Our thanks to Brian for allowing each of us to share our top 5 tips for teaching and mentoring.

Kelly's Tips

1. **Love what you do.** In addition to the benefits I experience from having selected a profession I love, I also actively try to make my job fun, engaging, and rewarding. One strategy involves staying present, which requires deliberate thought and attention. A wonderful side effect of living fully in the moment is that my interactions are very meaningful. Another strategy is to play music regularly – in my office, during class breaks, and as the students come into and leave class. I solicit song requests from the students and play them throughout the semester. Music is

a stress reliever and mood booster. I also try to use humor as much as possible because laughing feels good and keeps the immune system strong. A final approach I'll mention is the importance of *knowing* myself and *being* myself. Being honest about who I am and being willing to show my individuality facilitates meaningful connections and keeps me happy throughout the day.

2. **Be respectful and professional.** Students sometimes report that professors look down upon them or do not treat them with respect. I try to emulate respectful communications in my teaching and one-on-one interactions. I recognize that some students have never been taught professional etiquette so I review tips in my courses and include info in my syllabi. Rules of respect (that students *and* the professor must practice) include things like being punctual, silencing cell phones, active listening, thinking before speaking, using appropriate language, speaking one person at a time, avoiding side conversations, speaking only for oneself, and using appropriate salutations and signatures in emails.

3. **Minimize the power hierarchy.** I have been fortunate to work with mentors who had very different leadership styles. I thrived with those who treated me like a collaborator or colleague and struggled with those who reminded me of their higher status. Simple things like letting students have a say in the grading process, soliciting and responding to feedback throughout the semester, and allowing students to call me by my first name (if they wish) go a long way. I find that the kind-but-firm-when-needed approach works well. As a grad student, I especially appreciated being able to meet with my mentor outside the office. Working over lunch, for example, was very different than meeting in the office; it was not only more personal, but also uniquely socialized me as a professional.

4. **Share resources.** People have different views about whether it's best to share resources with students or whether students should figure things out on their own. In my experience, sharing is better. I provide things like poster templates, sample theses/dissertations, working papers, and whatever else might help. This philosophy extends to my colleagues as well. I am happy to supply my syllabi, teaching materials, sample grant applications, etc. Along with sharing files, I also connect students with campus resources including the writing center, career center, counseling center, and tutoring, and with other professors so they can learn from people with suitable expertise.

5. **Be an ally.** I do everything possible to enhance my mentees' CVs, which includes listing them as first authors, nominating them for awards, and encouraging them to follow their passion. Each student has a distinct path. I see it as my job to help them uncover and fulfill their calling. I also make a point of reaching out and making myself available to students with minority statuses. Often times, it is difficult for students to find mentors who occupy a minority status; even when my status doesn't match their own, I let it be known that I am an ally.

Denise's Tips

1. **Be a tree.** When you agree to serve as an advisor to graduate students, find a balance between too little and too much overlap in your research interests. To be effective as a mentor, you need to work with students whose interests connect to your expertise and the central research questions you are pursuing. At the same time, you need to let students take those core questions in new directions or apply them in new ways, so that they can develop an independent identity as a scholar. By developing your advisee tree, you can stay grounded by your main program of research, while allowing the students you work with to develop their own branches on your tree.

2. **Remember it's their life.** Your mentees aren't you: They don't necessarily have the same personal and career goals, the same work habits, or the same temperament. That's okay – they get to be themselves,

while you get to be you. Anticipate and embrace those differences, by figuring out your mentees' goals, how they work best, and what motivates them. Helping them to capitalize on their own strengths will set them up for long term success achieving goals that matter to them.

3. **Engage in productive emotion regulation.** Graduate students are not productive when they are scared, overwhelmed, or uncertain; nor when they are arrogant, under-engaged, or over-confident. Avoid perpetuating anxiety and fear in the lives of graduate students. Instead, seek to de-mystify academic life and be straightforward when communicating expectations and evaluations. Help your students find a balance between self-doubt and arrogance by encouraging accurate and authentic self-assessments.

4. **Focus on what we don't know.** I ask my graduate student mentees to know what they know and know what they don't, and to focus on the latter. Students can and should embrace with confidence the expertise they have, but the most progress to be made involves mastering what they don't know yet. People waste a tremendous amount of time and energy masking their limitations. Model your own focus on what you are striving to learn, and reward those priorities in your students.

5. **Don't take it personally.** Your graduate student mentees will inadvertently insult you, frustrate you, hurt you, disregard you, characterize you as overbearing, seek to prove you wrong, and ignore your best advice. It will happen; it's not about you. Your advice comes from your understanding of the entire arc of the graduate student experience; their reactions come from the small bit of that arc that they are living in a given moment. These are very different frames of meaning, and you will not see many things the same way. Let it go. The journey is patience.

We hope our tips will help IARR's emerging scholars and add to the repertoire of more experienced mentors. After the Toronto conference, we discovered that we each started implementing each other's tips right away! We hope others find them useful.

We would like to remind our members that the Teaching Committee has assembled resources for instructors, which are posted on the IARR website. These include sample syllabi, media for teaching, and measures for close relationships constructs. The New Scholar Resources section is another great place for emerging scholars to find useful information.

FEATURE ARTICLE

Publication Guidelines for IARR

By Susan Branje
Utrecht University

The guidelines for Transparency and Openness Promotion (TOP) were published in Science in 2015. The TOP guidelines include eight transparency standards, each with three levels of increasing stringency. A detailed overview of the guidelines can be found in Figure 1. The goal of these guidelines is to promote reproducibility of research by increasing transparency of the research process and products. The idea is that journals select which of the eight transparency standards they adopt for their journal, and select a level of implementation for each standard. These features provide flexibility for adoption depending on disciplinary variation, but simultaneously establish community standards.

Figure 1

Eight Standards at Three Levels

	Level 0	Level I	Level II	Level III
Citation Standards	Journal encourages citation of data, code, and materials, or says nothing	Journal describes citation of data in guidelines to authors with clear rules and examples.	Article provides appropriate citation for data and materials used consistent with journal's author guidelines	Article is not published until providing appropriate citation for data and materials following journal's author guidelines.
Data Transparency	Journal encourages data sharing, or says nothing	Article states whether data are available, and, if so, where to access them.	Data must be posted to a trusted repository. Exceptions must be identified at article submission.	Data must be posted to a trusted repository, and reported analyses will be reproduced independently prior to publication.
Analytic Methods (Code) Transparency	Journal encourages code sharing, or says nothing	Article states whether code is available, and, if so, where to access it.	Code must be posted to a trusted repository. Exceptions must be identified at article submission.	Code must be posted to a trusted repository, and reported analyses will be reproduced independently prior to publication.
Research Materials Transparency	Journal encourages materials sharing, or says nothing	Article states whether materials are available, and, if so, where to access them.	Materials must be posted to a trusted repository. Exceptions must be identified at article submission.	Materials must be posted to a trusted repository, and reported analyses will be reproduced independently prior to publication.
Design and Analysis Transparency	Journal encourages design and analysis transparency, or says nothing	Journal articulates design transparency standards	Journal requires adherence to design transparency standards for review and publication	Journal requires and enforces adherence to design transparency standards for review and publication
Study Preregistration	Journal says nothing	Journal encourages preregistration of studies and provides link in article to preregistration if it exists	Journal encourages preregistration of studies and provides link in article and certification of meeting preregistration badge requirements	Journal requires preregistration of studies and provides link and badge in article to meeting requirements.
Analysis Plan Preregistration	Journal says nothing	Journal encourages preanalysis plans and provides link in article to registered analysis plan if it exists	Journal encourages preanalysis plans and provides link in article and certification of meeting registered analysis plan badge requirements	Journal requires preregistration of studies with analysis plans and provides link and badge in article to meeting requirements.
Replication	Journal discourages submission of replication studies, or says nothing	Journal encourages submission of replication studies	Journal encourages submission of replication studies and conducts results blind review	Journal uses Registered Reports as a submission option for replication studies with peer review prior to observing the study outcomes.

Retrieved from https://cos.io/top/#summary

As signatories of the TOP Guidelines, JSPR and PR have expressed their support of the principles of openness, transparency, and reproducibility, expressed interest in the guidelines, and committed to conducting a review of the standards and levels for potential adoption. Last year, an IARR task force committee reviewed our journal policies and formulated recommendations regarding how PR and JSPR might operate in the future in light of the eight transparency standards of the TOP guidelines. The task force committee consisted of Geoff MacDonald, Lorne Campbell, Jaye Derrick, Julie Fitness, Mario Mikulincer, and Susan Branje.

Recommendation for the TOP guidelines

Overall, the committee agreed that researchers should provide enough information so that others can replicate their methods once published. The committee agreed that PR and JSPR should adopt Level 1 for each of the 8 standards. This means that the journals should ask authors to report whether or not they conform to the standard, and should direct authors to potentially helpful resources. Adopting Level 1 requirements does not insist that authors adhere to the guidelines in order to publish in the journals. Rather, authors are asked to state whether they do and if so, to provide links to the relevant information. We generally regarded Level 3 as overly restrictive, but perhaps Level 2 could be used when researchers are more comfortable with implementing the standards. This recommendation was based on a number of thoughts and concerns:

Transparency and openness about data, methods, codes, and syntax helps science to go forward faster and should therefore be encouraged. Recognition of other types of output in addition to journal publications would be an important impetus to transparency of research.

For each of the standards, the same level should apply to all types of research we publish in our journals. Currently it is unclear how some of the standards should be applied to specific types of studies such as qualitative studies or long-term longitudinal studies.

Although the guidelines are modular so that each journal can select the components that are most relevant for the types of research it publishes, the TOP guidelines have different levels of "excellence" attached to different practices, suggesting that higher levels correspond to better quality research. These conclusions about excellence are problematic, as it might suggest that some types of studies not completely adhering to the strictest levels are of inferior quality.

It is not clear whether all guidelines will actually lead to more replicable research. Some of the guidelines are overly restrictive and seem equivalent to paranoia, especially the Level 3 requirements regarding replication and rerunning analyses by editors and reviewers. The goal of the guidelines should be transparency and replicability in general, not control of individual studies to capture fraudulent researchers.

Considerations regarding each of the eight standards

1. Citation Standards of data, code, and materials
Although JSPR and PR encourage citation of data, code and materials in line with APA guidelines, clearer guidelines on how to cite these sources could be provided. When datasets are registered and have a persistent Digital Object Identifier (DOI) or are published in open data journals with a PID (permanent URL), these datasets could be cited.

2, 3 and 4. Transparency of Data, Analytic Methods (Code), and Research Materials
For standards 2-4, requiring Level 1 and in time Level 2 are thought to be good practice. Requiring people to make data, codes, and materials of publications available on online platforms, such as the Open Science Framework (OSF; opensciencetframework.org) or Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research (ICPSR), allows replication of findings as well as reanalyzing data in meta-analyses or with different methods.
There are a number of limitations to making data available, however:

Data protection and security is an increasing concern. Personal data that are identifiable and can be traced to individual cases cannot be made public. Simply requiring authors to submit or publish their data without any form of encryption should be discouraged.

For some types of data (observational, qualitative, transcripts, physiological, large-scale longitudinal), the amount of raw data is very large. It should be clear how much of the data should be made transparent. Many decisions regarding data preparation take place going from the raw data to the data used for analyses.

Making data publically available for transparency should be distinguished from sharing data for use.

We need to determine which code (i.e., statistics package) researchers should make available and in what format, as some programs (e.g., Excel) do not have easy code-sharing methods, and over time, older codes potentially cannot be read anymore or will result in slightly different findings in newer program versions.

The level 3 requirement for independent reanalyzing of data before publication would be overly burdensome for the editorial team. Also, it should be clear whether this includes checking of data preparation and analytical decisions.

5. Design and Analysis Transparency
As our journals publish many different designs, we need to provide a comprehensive set of detailed guidelines that will accurately cover all possible types of studies. The equator network suggests some standards, yet some of the methods commonly used in relationships research are not well-represented. Moreover, some of the guidelines in the equator network are less detailed than the APA guidelines used by researchers publishing in PR and JSPR.

6. Preregistration of studies
The committee advises Level 1, encouraging preregistrations, as a good start. For (longitudinal) studies where secondary data analysis on existing data is common, preregistration of hypotheses and analysis plans seems more feasible than preregistration of studies. The Level 2 and 3 requirement that editors check that everything was preregistered appropriately seems overcontrolling.

7. Preregistration of analysis plans
For particular studies (e.g., experiments),

preregistration of analysis plans is more inclusive than preregistration of studies. Preregistration of (detailed) analysis plans is more difficult for longitudinal or publically available nationally representative studies where secondary data analysis is common or many different analytical decisions have to be made. In these cases, registering which steps were taken during the analyses and how and why subsequent analyses changed from the plan is recommended. It is not clear how one can ensure preregistration of analysis plans before the actual start of the analyses.

8. Replication

Replication studies are very important for addressing the bias toward publishing statistically significant findings. The current system of publishing journal articles does not promote replications. Therefore, we need to consider alternative ways to publish replications, for example, by creating online areas where one can add replication data, code, and results to primary papers. In the two-part review, there should be room to reject a paper if the initial review was positive, but concerns arise on submission of the full paper.

BOOK/FILM REVIEWS

A Review of Love Between the Covers

by C. Rebecca Oldham and Sylvia Niehuis
Texas Tech University

"This is a story about pride. And also a story about prejudice" opens the National Endowment for the Humanities-funded documentary *Love Between the Covers* by producer, writer, and director Laurie Kahn. The documentary, advised by such esteemed social scientists as Stephanie Coontz and Eli Finkel, is about the multimillion-dollar romance-novel industry. According to the documentary, "Last year, 75 million Americans read at least one romance novel. Many of them read lots more." The documentary contains numerous interviews with romance fiction authors and readers, who discuss how romance novels and their writers and readers are often negatively perceived ("You read that?!" "I was a literary snob." "I didn't read romance novels and I made fun of women, who did."). Speakers in the film also express great pride about the extensive and supportive community the authors and their readers have built, and how the genre has helped many female authors financially and personally.

Despite misconceptions some of us may have, the readers and writers featured in the documentary argue that there is great diversity with regard to authors' social class, occupation, age, education, sexual orientation, and race. Several of the most successful romance-novel authors either still are or were professional women (e.g., professors, geneticists, astrophysicists, lawyers, doctors). There is one area, however, in which there is hardly any diversity: gender. In this field, authors seem to be predominantly women writing for women. So, why is romance dismissed? Deborah Chappel Traylor from Arkansas State University seems to think that those disliking romance unfairly claim that it is formulaic: "We don't see Ernest Hemingway as formulaic, but every single one of his novels ends exactly the same way. So why does one get coded as realistic, and the other gets coded as, you know, hopelessly optimistic?" Sarah Frantz Lyons, editor for Riptide Publishing, takes on a decidedly feminist perspective, arguing that people sneer at the romance genre, "because it's written by women, it's written for women, and it's written about women."

Other romance authors feel that, contrary to many people's conceptions, romance novels are pro-women, whereas most literary works of great renown are toxic to women. For instance, Sarah Wendell, romance blogger, argues that romance novels are, "the one place where you will consistently find women's sexuality treated fairly and positively. Everyone is going to experience some sort of sexual exploration or satisfaction; the woman will always win and everyone will be happy in the end." Other documentary interviewees describe the transgressive act of putting women's desires (sexual and otherwise) in the center of romance narratives in ways that do not trivialize those needs or portray women as greedy. Readers and authors in the documentary credit the genre as a source of their own entitlement to happy endings and feelings of empowerment. Moreover, authors such as Beverly Jenkins write and read romance novels wherein women are happy and self-sufficient with or without their male partners. In contrast, many other works of fiction are, "… toxic stories, no matter what great literature they are, they are toxic to women. If you are free sexually you are going to die horribly or end up with a scarlet letter on your chest, celibate for the rest of your life, because boy, did you screw up. Then you get to the romance fiction and it's not there. You get rewarded for going after what you want, and you can have sex without dying horribly," contends Jennifer Crusie, romance-novel author.

In her documentary, Laurie Kahn consciously explores the diversity of characters and subgenres represented in romance novels. She characterizes the romance genre/industry as one that is accessible – almost grassroots – so that those persons who do not see themselves represented in romance novels can begin writing the stories they wish to read. Kahn features women of color and lesbians, in particular, but also mentions how women of size and various religious backgrounds are represented in romance novels. In fact, she makes the point that romance offers subgenres of almost every type – Amish, BDSM, mystery, sci-fi, historical, and the list goes on. What makes this level of diversity possible is, in part, the intimate and supportive community of romance-novel writers and fans. Joanna Gregson from Pacific Lutheran University describes the collaborative community as one in which, "It's not us, the writers, and them, the readers. We ARE them." Social media, message boards, and blogs keep writers and their fans intimately connected. Some of those fans become aspiring writers and fill gaps of representation in the genre. The Romance Writers of American National Convention is contrasted to conventions of other genres with its emphasis on teaching panels rather than on book-signings and interviews. At this conference, aspiring writers have opportunities to create collaborative relationships, acquire experienced mentors, and receive feedback on their work. A "pay it forward" attitude exists to help teach and nurture aspiring romance-novel writers, allowing women of all kinds to add to the diversity in content and characters in this genre.

Love Between the Covers displays romance writers' creative processes and describes the world of publishing a romance novel. Publishers and editors must package each book in a marketable way (e.g., content editing, book cover) by a certain deadline. The pressure to publish and conform to the market has increased. Some find the publication process so stressful that they have begun self-publishing or publishing online, even though this method is less lucrative and less effective for establishing a career.

Possible Pedagogical Applications

There are different possible ways in which *Love Between the Covers* could be used in teaching close-relationship courses in social-science departments. How an instructor frames the film would likely depend on the specific discipline of a course. For example, psychology courses could focus on individual-level behaviors and attitudes related to romance novels; sociology courses could probe social stratification of romance-novel production and readership by gender, race-ethnicity, sexual-orientation, etc.; communications courses could examine marketing and distribution of such novels; and women's/gender-studies courses could scrutinize gender-linked participation and portrayals in the industry. Kahn describes the romance-novel industry as one that challenges stereotypes and formulaic gender depictions seen in other types of literature. The aggressive and passive sexual roles attributed, respectively, to men and women throughout much of popular culture are not necessarily ones that define the relationships in romance novels. The documentary touts the subversive nature of the female-dominated romance-novel industry, which far from reinforcing passive stereotypes about women, places their desires, motivations, and abilities at the center of their work. Instructors of close-relationship courses, therefore, could use the film as a springboard for critical discussion of traditional gender stereotypes of sexual behavior and enjoyment.

However, the documentary does not highlight existing controversies about whether romance novels are "feminist," with the exception of one comment by author Jayne Ann Krentz, who raises the questions "Why do we still write it [referring to romance]? Why are we still dealing with archetypes that go back a thousand years?" Whereas many interviewees argue that the sex-positive themes of romance novels are beneficial to women, we were not convinced that the genre does not struggle with other sexist tropes. Although the documentary touches on feminist issues related to diverse representations in romance novels, we believe there is likely still room for improvement. It is clear from *Love between the Covers* that capitalist mechanisms of marketing are still at play when editing and packaging mainstream romance novels for sale (which is described as the way to develop a serious career). To what extent do these forces constrain the diversity represented in these novels to make them palatable to the masses? For example, although larger women were briefly mentioned in the documentary, covers of romance novels still portray men and women who fit hegemonic conventions of attractiveness and the thin-ideal body type. Although black women were featured in the documentary, do other racial minorities (e.g., Asian American, Native American) enjoy the same visibility? Furthermore, several traditionally underrepresented groups were also not discussed in the documentary: people with disabilities, gay men (and other sexualities, such as asexuality), transgender people, older people, etc. One wonders which kinds of diversity are mainstream in the romance-novel industry and which ones remain on the fringe. These questions have broader implications for whether the process of marketing romance novels constrains the scope of what the industry could theoretically represent and how it could benefit all types of women (and men) through challenging hegemonic representations.

Another gender-related angle that could be explored in the classroom is the gender skew in the romance-novel field. The documentary explicitly notes that the industry is dominated by female writers and readers, but does not speculate as to why this may be. Why are there not more men who are readers and writers in this genre? Furthermore, considering the filmmakers' concern for diversity, why did no one seem troubled by the absence of men in the industry? Are men uninterested in participating or are there barriers excluding them from full participation (from within or outside of the industry itself)? Though perhaps somewhat tangential to the scope of the film, the industry's gender skew could be addressed in the classroom. Different theoretical perspectives (e.g., social or sociobiological theories) may be used to try to explain why the romance-novel industry is so woman-dominated.

In the end, though, it should be noted that the film focuses primarily on the operation of the romance-novel industry and not as prominently on theoretical-conceptual themes that would fit within the social-science classroom. Extra creativity and effort would be required on the part of instructors, therefore, to gain the maximum pedagogical benefit (e.g., in students' critical-thinking) from *Love Between the Covers.*

Kahn, L. (Producer/Director). (2016). *Love between the covers* (Motion picture). USA: Blueberry Hill Productions. For more information go to: http://www.lovebetweenthecovers.com/

A Review of Couples Coping with Stress: A Cross-Cultural Perspective

By Casey Totenhagen
University of Alabama

The book *Couples Coping with Stress: A Cross-Cultural Perspective,* edited by Mariana F. Falconier, Ashley K. Randall, and Guy Bodenmann (2016), provides an in-depth study of dyadic coping (DC) as understood through a systemic transactional model (STM) perspective across different cultural contexts. This book is unique in that it provides an opportunity for an in-depth understanding of a specific area. All topics are explored through an STM framework and focus on the concept of DC within this framework. Although the authors suggest that the book could be used in undergraduate or graduate courses on stress and/or relationships, I think the book may be a bit advanced for this purpose--particularly for undergraduate students. Students conducting research or study in this area would certainly benefit from this book, but I believe that it will appeal most to researchers and clinicians who do work in the area of stress and coping in interpersonal relationships as well as those wishing to more explicitly understand and apply cultural perspectives in their research or practice.

In the first three chapters, the authors provide an overall summary and orientation to the reader on the STM framework, the concept and measurement of DC, and culture. Whereas historically, stress and coping research has focused on individual appraisals and coping strategies, the STM elevates these ideas to a systemic level. Interpersonal relationship researchers will appreciate the foundational ideas behind the STM framework and DC that not only does stress impact relationships, but stress and our responses to stress are inherently dyadic *processes*. The authors excel at deconstructing a complex model to provide a clear and concise description of the main concepts and tenets. The STM, which is built on assumptions of interdependence of partners, acknowledges that although some stressors are shared by partners, other stressors may affect one partner primarily yet cross over to affect the other partner as well as the relationship (i.e., external stress). As such, the appraisal process by each partner individually, as well as by both partners together, is quite complex and can elicit an even more complex array of dyadic coping strategies. The figures provided throughout Chapter 1 help to clarify these processes and outline the different forms and functions of positive and negative dyadic coping strategies that may be used.

The authors acknowledge that originally, the STM did not explicitly consider culture. However, the model (as well as measures, such as the Dyadic Coping Inventory) has been adopted widely by researchers across the globe. Thus, questions of culture become relevant and are discussed more explicitly in Chapter 2. The authors are clear that in the book, they focus on large ethnic groups who are associated with a particular nation. They also acknowledge, however, that there is a great deal of within-group variability which is lost because some individuals may belong to multiple cultural groups. In describing the challenges of fully describing and understanding a culture, I was pleased to see discussions about the dynamic and fluid nature of cultures and the risk of perpetuating stereotypes.

The third chapter discusses the *measurement* of dyadic coping across cultures. The authors briefly mention other dyadic coping instruments before launching into an in-depth discussion of the Dyadic Coping Inventory (DCI). The authors highlight the DCI “given the extensive implementation of the DCI for measuring DC in scholarly research,” (p. 37). While certainly the DCI has been implemented in numerous studies across many countries, a brief discussion of the pros and cons of other instruments would have been appreciated. In focusing on the DCI specifically, however, the authors are able to illustrate the steps in adapting a measure with cultural competence beyond just translating the words into a different language.

Across the three introductory chapters, the authors are careful to acknowledge the existence of other perspectives on topics such as stress, dyadic coping, and culture. These acknowledgments are brief and do not provide a true summary or comparison of these perspectives to the STM and DC perspectives centrally used in the book. It is important to note, however, that where the authors have sacrificed some nuance and detail, they have gained clarity and continuity. Readers interested in understanding related perspectives are directed to other resources.

Following the introductory chapters, a chapter summarizing research on DC from an STM perspective in each of 14 regions representing different cultures is provided (Chapters 4-17). Specifically, they examine American, Swiss, Portuguese, German, Italian, Greek, Hungarian, Romanian, Pakistani, Chinese, Japanese, African, Australian couples, and Latino couples in the United States. Each chapter provides a review of couple relationships, stress, and dyadic coping in that culture. Further, implications for both research and practice are provided. Cultural nuances and research topics are discussed as appropriate. Taken together, these chapters provide the reader with a great deal of information. However, the consistent format of each chapter makes comparisons much easier. Whereas these chapters provide comprehensive detail on an STM and culturally relevant perspective on the research on stress and coping in each of these cultures, the authors dedicate the last section of the book (Chapter 18 and the Conclusion) to synthesizing this information into tangible “take home” messages.

Chapter 18 provides a “blueprint” for synthesizing this information into directions for future research and practice when including the cultural context in dyadic coping. The authors delineate four specific dimensions of culture that should be incorporated into research and clinical practice on stress and dyadic coping: 1) family boundaries, 2) gender roles, 3) personal control, and 4) interdependence. While acknowledging some of the challenges of describing cultural context of a group of people (e.g., substantial diversity exists within a culture, many individuals identify with more than one culture, and two dyad members may come from different cultural contexts), the authors describe how these four dimensions of culture can be used to frame such important aspects of stress and coping as what is considered a stressor and what appropriate coping might look like.

I found the conclusion of this text to be particularly critical. Because the book focuses on a single theoretical perspective as implemented across multiple cultures, the amount of depth and detail in this text is incredible. This final section of the book briefly outlines some of the similarities and differences that have been found in the dyadic coping research across the cultures presented in this book. Further, a table is provided that very succinctly and clearly summarizes the literature for each culture presented with respect to dyadic coping, describing the dominant value orientations (e.g., the four dimensions of culture reviewed in Chapter 18) as well as programs designed for that population based on the STM framework. This conclusion very nicely sums up the comprehensive information presented in this book in a package that can be used by both researchers and clinicians. Overall, I believe the authors and editors of this book have tackled a unique challenge: providing an extensive and comprehensive review of the stress and coping research from an STM perspective as understood across cultures, and I believe that they have done so with focus and clarity.

Falconier, M., Randall, A., & Bodenmann, G. (2016). *Couples coping with stress: A cross-cultural perspective.* New York, NY: Routledge.
ISBN 978-1138906655.
350 pages. Paperback, 47.03 USD (Amazon).

A Review of Sexual Attraction: The Psychology of Allure

By Jimmie Manning
Northern Illinois University

Relationship studies tend to be empirical endeavors. Our organization is not called the International Association for Relationship *Studies*, but rather uses the more-specific *Research* in its name. This nomenclature certainly matches relationship journals, where quantitative and qualitative data-driven empirical studies are the norm. Beyond those outlets, it is rare to find explorations of relationships in the humanities. Philosophy, cultural studies, rhetorical or literary criticism, and other humanities-centered fields might study social relationships or identity frequently, but studies focusing directly at relationships are much rarer.

Studies of sexuality are more common across empirical and humanistic domains, but even then they seldom involve relationships – even when being examined through an empirical lens. As Diamond (in press) notes in a chapter based, in part, on keynote addresses she delivered both for IARR and the Society for the Scientific Study Sexuality, sex research fails to examine relationships and relationship research fails to examine sex.

Considering these points, James Giles's *Sexual Attraction: The Psychology of Allure* makes a unique, interesting, and much-needed journey into blending an existing body of social scientific research with humanistic ways of knowing that includes experiential, non-empirical qualitative methods as well as original philosophic inquiry and excerpts from film, literature, and music. The resulting volume provides many good considerations for those who do empirical sexuality and relationship research as well as insights into ideas that would be difficult—if not impossible—to explore through traditional research methods.

As that description suggests, this book will not be for everyone. Those who are skeptical or dismissive of psychoanalytic approaches (e.g., Freud) might especially have a hard time embracing what the text has to offer. Those who do keep an open-mind about the text's unique approach will be rewarded with both many new ideas about sexual attraction and an excellent overview of existing literature.

For me, the learning began in the preface. There, Giles offers a helpful explanation of the differences between the terms *sexual desire* and *sexual attraction*. Whereas sexual desire deals more with wishes, needs, or drives for sexual activity, sexual attraction involves allure, or being drawn to another person. These concepts, as well as other important terms such as *interpersonal attraction*, are thoroughly explained in the first chapter. It is evident that Giles has carefully determined how different terms or concepts that might be used to discuss similar ideas have distinct, often important differences.

Even though his care to define and describe terms is evident, at times there is still a sense of mystery that remains. The clearest example of this is the use of allure both in the sense that it is what someone has (e.g., "She had an allure that made her irresistible") as well as something that describes a person's being drawn to another and imagining erotic interaction. Ontologically, that sets allure up to be a somewhat circular concept. This is most evident when Giles writes, "the allure that she emanates toward me is simply her sexually attractive physical appearance operating on me" (p. 33). This idea of "I am sexually attracted to that person because that person is sexually attractive" needs more clarification to eliminate this sense of circular reasoning.

After the book sets up the key concepts in its first 50 pages, the remainder of the book moves through a set of potential stages for sexual relational development, beginning with the chapter "Exchanging Glances" and ending with the chapter "It Turned Out So Right." Within that progression, recurring questions about sexual allure in cross-sex heterosexual friendships are asked. As one example, the question of whether a man and woman can ever be just friends is speculated on in-depth, complete with references to *When Harry Met Sally*.

Many original ideas are offered about understudied areas of sexuality, including a fantastic discussion of sexual dreams. The book also pulls together many different areas of research popular with IARR members into an intriguing conversation. Those areas include cross-sex friendships, friends with benefits relationships, or flirting. Those who study privacy management, uncertainty in relationships, and, obviously, romantic attraction will also likely be interested.

Critical scholars, especially those who use queer theoretical paradigms, are almost certain to find themselves frustrated with the often hetero-assumptive language used in the book. In the author's defense, he does explain in the preface that focusing on heterosexual sexual attraction is intentional, as non-heterosexual sexual attraction is different and deserves its own book. I support this decision, as it is evident from the sections where he does discuss or analyze sexual and gender identities that the author is ill-equipped.

On a more-minor level, the term *homosexual*, which has been abandoned by many researchers because of its pathologizing history (Elia, 2003), is used instead of *gay* or *lesbian*. Most troubling is a discussion of the characters Dil and Fergus from the film *The Crying Game*. Giles asserts the trans* character Dil is "not a woman but is in fact just a man dressed as a woman" (p. 182), reifying the gender binary, ignoring any distinction between gender and biologically-assigned sex, and perpetuating the idea that trans* people are not legitimately their gender. He also speculates about the possibility that Fergus "turned bisexual" (p. 182). At best, this statement grossly oversimplifies sexual fluidity; but, more likely, it appears to indicate a misunderstanding of bisexuality.

These word choices were undoubtedly made with no ill intent by the author. In fact, I appreciate very much his interest in exploring non-heteronormative matters of gender and sexuality. These instances do, however, underscore the importance of understanding sexual and gender identities when writing about them (or seeking consultation or review from someone who has that expertise).That being stated, the book is almost completely free of specialized language or jargon. Although it might not be the best fit for an undergraduate or graduate course, given its lack of citations and the gender/sexuality issues listed in this review, it would make an excellent book for an academic reading group. I suspect the participants would enjoy discussing Giles' ideas, and they might be inspired by how they approach their own work after experiencing his interesting, creative, and unabashedly exploratory approach.

References

Diamond, L. M. (in press). Where's the sex in relationship research? In R.S. Stewart (Ed.), *Let's talk about sex: Multidisciplinary discussions*. Sydney, Nova Scotia: Cape Breton University.

Elia, J.P., 2003. Queering relationships: Toward a paradigmatic shift. *Journal of Homosexuality, 45*, 61-86.

Giles, J. (2015). *Sexual attraction: The psychology of allure*. Santa Barbara, CA: ABC-CLIO.
ISBN 1440830010
257 Pages. Hardback, 36.96 USD (Amazon).

A Review of The Thinking Girl's Guide to the Right Guy

By Jill R. Bowers
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

The Thinking Girl's Guide to the Right Guy eloquently depicts the interplay between patterns of thought, feelings, and behaviors in relationships while providing an outline for helping young women find and maintain healthy relationships. The book contains evidence-based information on relationships, yet is written in a manner that is engaging and understandable to the lay person.

The book appears to be written primarily for heterosexual women and caters to emerging or young adults. The format of the book follows interviews from seven women in their early 20s to mid-30s that highlight their stories through detailed descriptions of their conversations. The stories of these women and the ways in which the authors intertwined them into the chapters produced a feeling of authenticity as the women's narratives were relatable and a creative way to engage readers with research-based information.

Most contemporary resources for young women focus on "how to get a partner to like you" rather than how to understand your own needs in the context of a relationship. This book, however, centers on what one actually wants out of relationships, including how to know what you want, like yourself, treat a partner you like, know if he likes you, and decide when and how to leave unhealthy relationships. In many of the chapters in this book, the authors do an excellent job providing concrete examples of how young women can do these things and think about the personal qualities they bring to the table in relationships. For example, the authors highlight take-home messages, key facts and statistics, stories from real women, questions to ask oneself, personal inventories, and checklists of skills or traits the reader or her potential partner may possess.

Perhaps, my favorite thing about the book was the focus on the need and importance of being self-aware. The authors highlight three main conditions for a healthy relationship, and the first one is knowing and liking oneself; they suggest that if women want to find and maintain a healthy relationship, a shift in thinking that begins with being self-aware, or knowing and liking one's authentic self, is often required. Based on the fact that this book is geared toward a younger, largely less experienced audience, I believe this could be the focus of the whole book as the extent to which one knows or likes herself likely plays a major role in the other key conditions highlighted by the authors: "I know and like him" and "he knows and likes me." A young woman who is self-aware and likes herself is likely going to attract or be attracted to a partner who is at a similar level of self-awareness, and she will not be attracted to someone for the wrong reasons (e.g., because he needs to be saved and can make her feel better in that regard), who is not attracted to her, or who does not appreciate her for who she is. In this book, readers will learn about the ways in which self-awareness facilitates honesty—with oneself and a partner, allowing one to have personal power in relationships rather than the temporary, unauthentic power one may obtain when looking for the wrong things, playing games, or engaging in unhealthy communicative patterns.

Based on the focus on knowing oneself and "guide to thinking," I had hoped there would be more of a discussion about how to navigate singleness. Researchers have found that many young adults explore and experiment in relationships, and this is a normal part of development for this age. Yet, young women often learn about themselves and what they want while in relationships, rather than intentionally being on their own to explore what they want and practicing the skills (e.g., with friends, family, or strangers) that they could bring to a healthy relationship. Is this because it is natural to desire relational intimacy or because they have been socialized that this is the path they need to take? Too often, programs, books, or resources for young adults have this future orientation, indicating that one needs to be in a relationship of some kind.

My perception of the organization of the book was that it was slightly difficult to follow. For example, the first half of the book was largely focused on relationship initiation and the latter half, on advanced stages of relationships or knowing when to end a relationship. That would seem like a natural progression, yet the authors focus on various forms of relationships (e.g., dating, hook-ups, and serial monogamy). So, it might have been useful to have the chapters outlined by type of relationships because the progression and individual needs in relationships may differ drastically based on the type of relationship. The focus on relational skills was also admirable as research has shown that skill-building techniques are most effective across program development efforts. At the same time, the skills discussed (e.g., conflict resolution and emotional regulation) were embedded within the chapters and could be difficult for some to recognize as a skill. Based on the likelihood of the young adult audience, I believe it would be important to dedicate a chapter to skills and the ways in which they are played out in relationship decisions (e.g., the key conditions mentioned), or the root causes of unhealthy behaviors (e.g., ego or fears that cause one to act or react in a passive aggressive manner).

Despite the limitations, I believe this book has a lot of solid information that could serve as a great resource for psychologists, counselors, and other professionals who are looking to work with older youth or young adults to help them navigate healthy relationships. I could envision this book being adapted into a healthy relationships curriculum as it includes resources such as websites and video hyperlinks in addition to the stories, statistics, and empirical research. I believe the authors of this book did an excellent job bridging research-based information with narratives to help young women.

Davila, J., & Lashman, K. (2016). *The thinking girl's guide to the right guy: How knowing yourself can help you navigate dating, hookups, and love.* New York: NY: Guilford.
ISBN: 978-1462516957
322 pages. Paperback, 12.16 USD (Amazon).

JOURNALS UPDATE

Tentative Contents of Upcoming Journals

Personal Relationships
September 2016 [Volume 23, Issue 3]
Table of Contents

Journal of Social and Personal Relationships
September 2016 [Volume 33, Issue 6]
Table of Contents

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Call for Papers

IARR Mini-Conference
Syracuse, NY; June 23-25, 2017

On behalf of the International Association for Relationship Research (IARR), we are excited to announce that we are now accepting proposals for presentations for the 2017 mini-conference to be held in Syracuse, NY from June 23-25, 2017. The mini-conference theme is "Interdependence, Interaction, and Relationships," and we welcome submissions on all topics related to relationship science. In addition to the conference, we will also be having a New Scholars Workshop held on June 22. Please see below for more information.

We will accept abstracts for: (a) individual oral presentations, (b) symposia on particular topics (comprising 3-4 individual presenters), and (c) poster presentations. Individual abstracts should be no longer than 250 words.

Submissions will be received until March 10, 2017, and acceptance notifications will be emailed in early April 2017. For more details on the conference and submission process, please see our website: iarr2017.com. Questions can be directed to the local area chair, Laura VanderDrift, at iarr2017@syr.edu.

Call for Papers
IARR New Scholar Workshop
Syracuse, NY; June 21-22, 2017

The New Scholars Workshop is designed for graduate students and early career professionals in the field. This workshop will take place on Thursday, June 22, 2017, with a welcome reception for New Scholar participants on the evening of Wednesday, June 21, 2017.

The workshop will include interactive panel discussions by senior scholars in the field about such topics as: navigating the job market (academic and industry jobs), being successful in Year 1, teaching close relationships related courses, obtaining grants, publishing, and making the most out of networking opportunities. Discussions will include conversations for those who wish to pursue industry and academic positions.

Participants in the New Scholar Workshop are also invited to present their research in poster-format at the mini-conference welcome reception during the evening of June 22. If you would like to have your work featured during this reception, please refer to the IARR mini-conference website at iarr2017.com for instructions. Please note, there is no thematic requirement for this poster session – all work is welcome!

Registration for the New Scholars Workshop is available when you register for the Mini-Conference. The cost is $75, which includes the New Scholars welcome reception on the 21st, as well as breakfast, lunch, and refreshment breaks during the pre-conference on the 22nd.

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!

Relevate: Transforming the "Impact factor"

"Relevate" is a word starting to emerge at research conferences, in classrooms, and on social media; it's a verb meaning to *elevate your relationship*, and it's also a name for the non-profit interdisciplinary team created by Dr. Amber Vennum at Kansas State University. The Relevate team consists of relationship scholars and educators, marriage and family therapists, software engineers, marketing specialists, and young adults who are passionate about improving the health of individuals and relationships everywhere. Over the past 2.5 years this growing team has trekked toward the creation of a smartphone app and website meant to fill the chasm between the state of relationship research and the research-based relationship knowledge accessible to the public. As noted by O'Sullivan, Muise, and Lehmiller in the November 2015 IARR Newsletter, we are often talking to ourselves in the research community due to our current scholarship structure. This has three important consequences – relationship-based professional organizations and relationship scholars have few avenues for widely promoting their knowledge; the public struggles to find understandable research-based relationship information on which to base their personal relationship decisions; and the work of relationship scholars is not sufficiently influencing the priorities of policy makers and funding organizations.

The Relevate team is joining IARR efforts to promote public scholarship on romantic relationships by creating an easily searchable mobile-friendly platform, called MyRelevate, for scholars to consolidate and share their public scholarship (blogs, articles, infographics, short videos, and media interviews). Public users will be able to create personal accounts for tracking their own relationship goals and milestones, following their favorite relationship scholars, and saving and sharing their favorite content (i.e., public scholarship uploaded or linked to by scholars). Through adaptive technology, public users can receive newsfeeds of content personally tailored to the information they enter about their current relationship experiences. Scholars will receive metrics on the reach of their content (i.e., their public "impact"). The vision of MyRelevate is driven by the ongoing input of the scholars and public users who see the need for increased access to relationship research.

How you can get involved:

1. Follow us on social media and spread (share) the news: YouTube, Facebook, Pinterest, and Twitter.
2. Interested in being a Contributor? Send us (avennum@ksu.edu) your public scholarship (press releases about your work, a link to your blog, short videos, PDFs written for lay audiences, etc.) and we will share them on our social media sites for now and to MyRelevate as development progresses. Not sure how to transform your academic scholarship into public scholarship? We will have step-by-step tutorials available soon!
3. Sign up at the link below to become a Beta tester for our Contributor interface and shape MyRelevate: https://kstate.qualtrics.com/SE/?SID=SV_0qY3QmVOUSgrXWl
4. Email avennum@ksu.edu to share your ideas.
5. Keep doing what you are doing. The work you do makes this possible!

Call for Proposals to Host 2019 IARR Mini-Conferences

The Future Conferences Committee (FCC) of the International Association for Relationship Research (IARR) invites letters of intent to host a regional or thematic mini-conference to be held in 2019.

The deadline for a letter of intent is February 15, 2017.

The letters of intent will be screened by the FCC, followed by invitation to those selected to submit a full proposal with more detail. The FCC and the IARR Board will review the full proposals and make a final decision about mini-conferences. There can be more than one mini-conference selected for 2019, in different geographical areas.

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

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

Requirements for the Letter of Intent

A letter of intent to host a 2019 mini-conference (due February 15, 2017) should contain the following information (please send to Terri Orbuch, Chair of Future Conferences Committee, orbuch@oakland.edu):

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

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

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

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

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

6. *State why your location is ideal for the 2019 IARR mini-conference.* Provide a brief justification for the committee as to why your location would be ideal by noting any additional information not covered above. Please note that while the committee will consider the attraction of the location, there are many other factors that make an ideal location for a mini-conference, including: having dedicated IARR members on-site or nearby who are willing to organize the conference, venue (conference space), having experienced university conference organizers, partnering with a university, ease of travel into the site, interesting conference theme, and potential sponsorship.

If you are selected to write a longer proposal (due May 15, 2017), additional information to be requested in the proposal may include, but is not limited to:

Additional Requirements for Full Proposal (due May 15, 2017)

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

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

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

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

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

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

8. *Hospitality*. Describe plans for lunches, dinners, and coffee breaks. Will the New Scholar Workshop be a part of this mini-conference?

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

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

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

12. *Projected budget.* Complete and attach the *Mini- Conference Budget Form* available on the IARR website (www.iarr.org) or from Terri Orbuch (orbuch@oakland.edu). Estimate revenue (from registration fees, co-sponsors, etc.) and costs (for venue, meals, equipment rentals, conference program, speaker honorariums, etc.). Provide both overall and itemized estimates of revenues and costs.

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

Please send your letter of intent via an email attachment by February 15, 2017 to Terri Orbuch, Chair of the Future Conferences Committee (orbuch@oakland.edu). Please also direct any questions to her.

Call for Proposals to Host 2020 IARR Main Conference

The Future Conferences Committee (FCC) of the International Association for Relationship Research (IARR) invites letters of intent to host the 2020 main conference.

The deadline for a letter of intent is March 15, 2017.

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

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

FCC is especially interested in submissions for a non-North American location. However, we welcome submissions from anywhere. Conference attendance has ranged from 300 to 650, with the higher attendance in recent conferences and in North American sites.

Requirements for the Letter of Intent

A letter of intent to host the 2020 IARR conference (due by March 15, 2017) should contain the following information: (please send to Terri Orbuch, Chair of Future Conferences Committee, orbuch@oakland.edu):

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

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

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

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

4. *State why your location would be ideal for the 2020 IARR conference.* Provide a brief justification for the committee as to why your location would be ideal by noting any additional information not covered above. Please note that while the committee will consider the attraction of the location, there are many other factors that make an ideal location that you could highlight about your location, including: having dedicated IARR members on-site, the venue (conference space), having experienced university conference organizers, partnering with a university, and ease of travel into the site.

If you are selected to write a longer proposal (due June 15, 2017), additional information to be requested in the proposal may include, but is not limited to:

<u>Additional Requirements for Full Proposal (due June 15, 2017)</u>

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

12. *Projected budget.* Complete and attach the *Main Conference Budget Form* available on the IARR website (www.iarr.org) or from Terri Orbuch (orbuch@oakland.edu). Estimate revenue (from registration fees, co-sponsors, etc.) and costs (for venue, meals, equipment rentals, conference program, speaker honorariums, etc.). Provide both overall and itemized estimates of revenues and costs.

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

Please send your letter of intent via an email attachment by March 15, 2017 to Terri Orbuch, Chair of the Future Conferences Committee (orbuch@orbuch.edu). Please also direct any questions to her.

Conference Announcement

IARR members may be interested in presenting or attending the International Conference on Shared Parenting (ICSP) which will be held in Boston, MA, from May 29th through 31st (memorial weekend), 2017. The conference is being jointly co-sponsored by the National Parent's Organization and the International Council on Shared Parenting, and the scientific committee chair is IARR member Jennifer J. Harman (Colorado State University). A call for papers has been released, for papers related to the theme "Shared parenting research: A watershed in understanding children's best interests?" If you have research related to shared/joint/disjointed parenting and child outcomes, you are encouraged to submit! For more information, please visit: http://npo-icsp-2017.twohomes.org/Boston2017_Call-for-Papers

IARR BOARD

IARR OFFICERS

President
Susan Sprecher
sprecher@ilstu.edu

President-Elect
Anita Barbee
Anita.barbee@louisville.edu

Past-President
Jeff Simpson
simps108@umn.edu

Treasurer
Leah Bryant
lbryant2@depaul.edu

Secretary
Jessica Eckstein
IARR.Secretary@gmail.com

BOARD MEMBERS

Beverley Fehr (Publications Committee Chair)
b.fehr@uwinnipeg.ca

Susan Branje (Member-at-Large)
s.branje@uu.nl

Leanne Knobloch (Member-at-Large)
knobl@illinois.edu

Natalie Hengstebeck (New Professional Representative)
ndhengst@uncg.edu

COMMITTEE CHAIRS

Anita Vangelisti (Awards)
vangelisti@austin.utexas.edu

Jeff Simpson (Elections)
simps108@umn.edu

Leah Bryant (Finance)
lbryant2@depaul.edu
Dan Perlman (Finance)
d_perlma@uncg.edu

Terri Orbuch (Future Conferences Committee)
orbuch@oakland.edu

Rozzana Sanchez Aragon (International)
rozzara@unam.mx

Lucia O'Sullivan (Media)
osulliv@unb.ca

Madoka Kumashiro (Membership)
m.kumashiro@gold.ac.uk

Beverley Fehr (Publications)
b.fehr@uwinnipeg.ca

Ashley Randall (Mentoring)
ashley.k.randall@asu.edu

Cheryl Harasymchuk (Teaching)
cheryl.harashymchuk@carleton.ca

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

Susan Boon (Archives)
sdboon@ucalgary.ca

EDITORS

Journal of Social and Personal Relationships:
Geoff MacDonald
gmacdonald@psych.utoronto.ca

Personal Relationships:
Masthead Editor: Julie Fitness
julie.fitness@mq.edu.au
Incoming Editor: Deborah Kashy
kashyd@msu.edu

Relationship Research News:
Brian Ogolsky
bogolsky@illinois.edu

Lead Editor for *Advances in Personal Relationships*:
Christopher R. Agnew (Chair)
agnew@purdue.edu