RELATIONSHIP RESEARCH NEWS

OFFICIAL NEWS JOURNAL OF THE INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR RELATIONSHIP RESEARCH

PRESIDENT'S COLUMN

May 2017 Report

by Susan Sprecher
Illinois State University

Greetings from your President, writing her second Presidential column during Western Hemisphere Spring!

If I had been President of IARR not too many years ago, my second RRN Presidential column would have also been my last and I would already be feeling a bit like a lame duck. Presidency terms were only one year, up until recently. However, with biennial conferences, it made sense to convert to two-year terms, and a prior Board in its wisdom made that change to our by-laws. The two-year term gives Presidents (and their selected Chairs) the time to learn the role and then time to advance agenda to help the organization. Dan Perlman and Jeff Simpson, in that order, were the first two Presidents to have two-year terms. I am excited to be the President of IARR for another approximately 15 months, and especially to continue to work with the great people in our organization to advance the interests of the organization.

Speaking of great people, a shout out of thanks goes again to Geoff MacDonald, Lorne Campbell, and the others who organized the Toronto conference last summer. Not only did they host a great (biennial) conference – as we acknowledged in the last issue of *RRN* -- but after all of the bills were paid and the dust settled, they determined that a profit had been generated. This profit went into the IARR general fund to be used in the future for good causes (such as helping students attend the next biennial conference).

2017 is an "odd number year" which means we do not have our regular main conference, but we do have a themed mini-conference and a new scholar workshop. Syracuse University will be the host to a mini-conference, June 23-25, with the theme of "Interdependence, Interaction, and Relationships." There is a great line-up of keynote speakers and a program that is currently being developed based on the many submissions received (see an article in this issue on updates about the conference, by Laura VanderDrift, the main host of the conference). For Thursday, June 22, the day before the mini-conference, Laura VanderDrift, Ashley Randall, and others are also organizing a New Scholar Workshop, which includes a great line-up of mentors for new scholars in the relationship field. I hope that you can attend one or both of these events, and please encourage your students and colleagues to as well.

Furthermore, it is not too early to begin to think about your submission and travel plans for the next biennial (main) conference, which will be July 12-16 in exciting Fort Collins, Colorado (Colorado State University), hosted by Jennifer Harmon, with Lisa Neff as Program Chair. Consider planning your summer vacation around this beautiful area of the U.S., which is at the foothills of the Colorado Rocky Mountains.

Late last year, the committee chairs and their members submitted goals for what they hoped to accomplish during their terms, and they have been busy making progress on those goals.

Some highlights of the work that occurred in the past six months include:

Following up from the work of the task force, Geoff McDonald (Editor of *JSPR*), with the assistance of others including Deborah Kashy (Editor of *PR*), drafted language to be included in the two society journals concerning the issue of guidelines for

transparency and Openness Promotion (TOP). This draft is now under consideration by the Publication Committee and later will be considered by the Board, before being implemented in the two journals.

The Board is in the process of approving a renewal contract with Sage (for *JSPR*), which involves a URL link for members to access JSPR on our website. This is a link for members only, and you should have received the login information in an email on March 27 from Jessica Eckstein, the secretary of IARR. The message had the subject, "IARR Member JSPR Login Info for 2017." If you cannot find that message, contact Jessica at IARR.Secretary@gmail.com for the login information. Please retain the login information in a place easy to retrieve.

Terri Orbuch and the members of the Future Conference Committee have been busy recruiting possible sites for the 2019 mini-conference and the 2020 main, biennial conference. Letters of intent from prospective conference organizers were due to the committee on Feb. 15th (for mini-conference) and March 15th (for main conference), and then final proposals will be due May 15th and June 15th, respectively. IARR has always prided itself on hosting excellent conferences that promote collaboration among scholars, warm interactions, and the development of new professionals. We have depended on the good will of members to lend their organizational skills to the planning of a conference. Please consider being an organizer (at your university or city) for a future conference, such as 2021 or 2022. I can vouch for the fact that it is very exciting to have the warm and fun people in the relationships field descend on your home turf. Start scheming now with some local colleagues about the possibility of hosting a future conference. If you have any questions about the process, contact Terri Orbuch, the current chair of FCC, at orbuch@oakland.edu, or contact me (sprecher@ilstu.edu).

Various people are helping to make the IARR website (IARR.org) more vibrant and useful. Foremost among these people is Dylan Selterman, our webmaster, who is in the central role of making changes and maintaining the website. Susan Boon, our archivist, has worked tirelessly to update

archival material (past conference programs, etc.) on our websites. Stan Treger has recently begun assisting Susan in this endeavor and has also been updating the page of our website that has links to members' homepages. If your academic webpage is not listed on the page (http://www.iarr.org/members/), please send the link to Stan and request that he add it (streger@syr.edu).

Another committee that will soon be hard at work on the website is the teaching committee. Chaired by Cheryl Harasymchuk (see her article later in this issue), the committee is requesting recent assignments, measures, syllabi, and media used in close relationship courses. They want to update the teaching resources on our website. I encourage you to send your teaching materials to Cheryl (cheryl.harasymchuk@carleton.ca), so they can include them on the website.

Anita Vangelisti, chair of the Awards Committee (with the help of Dylan Selterman), has created a section of the website that lists the awards given by IARR. Interested in self-nominating or other-nominating for our next round of awards? Go to http://www.iarr.org/awards/ and gander at the list of awards.

Ashley Randall and the mentoring committee will be rolling out another version of the mentoring program this summer. Stay tuned for more information, and sign up to mentor or be mentored!

Jeffrey Simpson and the Elections committee have been seeking nominations for the one elected position that will take place in May. Look for an email and vote!

The Media committee, in consultation with other committees (International, Membership), is in the process of exploring the possibility of videotaping or interviewing members to showcase their hard work. These committees are also looking into other initiatives that can increase communication among members and spread the word about the organization to others.

The future of our organization depends on our success at having current members renew and new members join. Those of you who have been in the organization for a while know what a great

organization this is for anyone who is serious about relationship research and even for those who only dabble in it. Help spread the word! Send your students and new collaborators to the membership page of the IARR website. Encourage them to attend our next conferences. We have an updated membership brochure (thanks to several people and especially Stan Treger) that highlights the benefits of membership in IARR. If you would like to request a copy of this brochure to send to colleagues and students, please write me (sprecher@ilstu.edu).

In closing, thanks to all who are working to help make this organization special. If you want to contact any committee chairs or board members, please see the list at the end of this issue. Thank you to Brian Ogolsky who has worked so diligently to

organize the contributions and news from many sectors of the organization to appear in this issue and others issues of *RRN*. THANK YOU TO ALL -- from those who have just recently become members of IARR for the first time, to those who have been life-long members and even retired but still involved, and in the middle, the mid-career folks. Thank you for making IARR your major professional home and for your past, current, and future contributions to the society.

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

<u>October 1, 2017</u>

**Submit all materials
to Brian Ogolsky**

bogolsky@illinois.edu

INSIDE THIS ISSUE OF RELATIONSHIP RESEARCH NEWS

FROM THE EDITOR'S DESK

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

Welcome to another exciting issue of RRN. As we pulled together the content for this issue, the editorial team began brainstorming ways to make RRN more user-friendly and accessible to members. One idea we came up with was to update the look, feel, and accessibility of the content. Specifically, we thought that it might be helpful to give the newsletter a considerable makeover and to archive past issues by content. We would like your input first, however. Please take a moment to share your thoughts with us in the following survey.

You can access this survey by clicking here.

We will leave the survey open until June 1, but please try to complete it as soon as possible. I will compile and summarize the results for the board meeting at the Syracuse conference in June. We appreciate your participation in this process and hope that it will make our publication more useful to the membership. Now for the good stuff.

In this issue you will find our third edition of the spotlight columns featuring the work of IARR award winners past and present, Samantha Joel and Leanne Knobloch. As always, please consider nominating someone you respect to be spotlighted in the next issue.

New Professional Representative, Natalie Hengstebeck interviewed two IARR members who currently work at Facebook for the first edition of her column about careers outside the academy. Also, note that one of the contributors, Liz, will be part of a panel discussion at the upcoming mini-conference in Syracuse.

Next, Cheryl Harasymchuk encourages us to explore the teaching resources that can be found on the IARR website.

The feature article in this issue is a "how-to" about the web site ResearchGate, arranged by Lucia O'Sullivan, chair of the media relations committee. This article is a must for those who have never used the site and a good reminder of best practices for those who have.

Don't skip over those announcements because Laura VanderDrift unveils the list of outstanding keynote addresses for the mini-conference in June. For those new professionals and students out there, be sure to check out the list of topics and panelists for the New Professionals workshop. As a past participant and current panelist I strongly recommend it! This workshop represents what makes IARR great---the connection between its members.

Send us an email with your suggestions for feature articles, book reviews, or any other material that you think is relevant to our readership.

I hope to see you all in Syracuse for what looks like another awesome conference. Happy reading!

JUNIOR SPOTLIGHT

Samantha Joel

University of Utah

At the foundation of every romantic relationship are two (or more) people who made a series of choices to begin, advance, maintain, and sometimes dissolve that particular relationship. Samantha Joel has long been fascinated by how people make the choices that grow or break apart their relationships. What are the processes through which people choose to pursue a new romantic interest, move in with a dating partner, or end a struggling relationship? Because people have such a high degree of control over the choices they make, Joel believes that relationship decisions are a promising avenue for helping people to

improve their own relationship outcomes, which have a profound impact on both physical and mental health. Research on relationship decisions uncovers tools to help people invest in relationships that are right for them, and reject those that are not right.

Joel's theoretical framework argues that close relationships are a judgment and decision-making (JDM) domain, meaning that relationship decisions share important similarities with other kinds of life decisions (e.g., Joel, MacDonald, & Plaks, 2013). Researchers can thus harness JDM principles and research techniques to better understand the mechanisms that guide close relationship decisions. To date, much of Joel's research has focused on the factors that influence decisions to advance and maintain relationships even when those relationships are unsatisfying. For example, Joel has found that prosociality is one potential reason why low-quality relationships start and persist. Even when people lack self-interested reasons to advance or maintain a relationship, they may nevertheless choose to do so for the sake of the partner. People will agree to go on dates with potential partners who they perceive to be unattractive, or who have traits that they do not want, in part to avoid hurting the potential partner's feelings (Joel, Teper, & MacDonald, 2014). Furthermore, a romantic partner's relationship investments promote an individual's commitment to the relationship over time, even for individuals who are relatively unsatisfied with their relationships (Joel, Gordon, Impett, MacDonald, & Keltner, 2013).

Joel's research not only uses JDM principles to uncover new insight about relationships, but also uses the relationship context to uncover new insight about JDM principles. Relationships offer a deeply emotional and evolutionarily relevant context for testing the boundaries of general decision principles, typically uncovered in economic or organizational contexts. One such principle is numerical anchoring: the tendency for people to use any available numbers, even irrelevant numbers, to inform their judgments. By examining anchoring in the context of romantic relationships, Joel and her colleagues found that this phenomenon—previously assumed to be universal—does not extend to situations in which the anchors are deeply threatening to the self. For example, anchors suggesting that a romantic breakup is imminent were ignored when making judgments

about the likelihood of one's relationship lasting (Joel, Spielmann, & MacDonald, in press).

Currently, Joel and her collaborators are examining the downstream consequences that different decision strategies may have for relationship quality and well-being. For example, what positive or negative outcomes might result from making relationship decisions for the sake of the partner, both for the self and for the partner? Joel is particularly interested in using novel statistical tools such as machine learning to try to predict relationship outcomes with improved levels of accuracy.

Joel received her PhD from the University of Toronto in 2015 under the mentorship of Geoff MacDonald, after which she completed a one-year post-doc with Paul Eastwick at the University of Texas at Austin. Now, as a newly-minted Assistant Professor, Joel is thrilled to be building a long-term research program in the Psychology Department at the University of Utah. You can learn more about the Relationship Decisions Lab at www.relationshipdecisions.org. Joel is currently accepting graduate students: you can learn more about the U of U's Social Psychology PhD program at https://psych.utah.edu/graduate/.

References

Joel, S., Gordon, A. M., Impett, E. A., MacDonald, G., & Keltner, D. (2013). The things you do for me: Perceptions of a romantic partner's investments promote gratitude and commitment. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 39,* 1333-1345.

Joel, S., MacDonald, G., & Plaks, J. E. (2013). Romantic relationships conceptualized as a judgment and decision-making domain. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 22,* 461-465.

Joel, S., Spielmann, S. S., & MacDonald, G. (in press). Motivated use of numerical anchors for judgments relevant to the self. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin.*

Joel, S., Teper, R., & MacDonald, G. (2014). People overestimate their willingness to reject potential romantic partners by overlooking their concern for others. *Psychological Science, 25,* 2233-2240.

SENSOR SPOTLIGHT

SENIOR SPOTLIGHT

Leanne Knobloch

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

How do relationships change over time? What is the role of interpersonal communication during relationship development? Why do some relationships thrive and others falter during times of transition? How can people communicate effectively when relationships are in flux?

Leanne Knobloch has been fascinated by these questions for more than 20 years, first as an undergraduate student in the Department of Communication and Media Studies at St. Norbert College in Wisconsin (B.A., 1996), then as a graduate student in the Department of Communication Arts at the University of Wisconsin – Madison (M.A., 1998; Ph.D., 2001), and now as a faculty member in the Department of Communication at the University of Illinois (2002-present).

She credits her academic career to good mentoring. "I was lucky enough to be trained by outstanding scientists who are actively involved in their scholarly disciplines as well as the interdisciplinary efforts of IARR," she said. "At the top of the list is my dissertation advisor, Denise Solomon, and members of my doctoral committee, Jim Dillard, Mary Anne Fitzpatrick, and Linda Roberts. Their mentoring opened so many doors for me – including doors that I didn't know existed before they invited me to work alongside them."

Knobloch's research focuses on how people communicate during times of transition within romantic relationships. Much of her work has been guided by *relational turbulence theory* (Solomon, Knobloch, Theiss, & McLaren, 2016), a recent update and extension of the *relational turbulence model* (Solomon & Knobloch, 2001, 2004).

Relational turbulence theory offers an explanation for people's cognitions, emotions, and communication behaviors when the circumstances of their relationship change. It proposes that changes in a relationship generate relational uncertainty and disrupt interdependence between partners, which in turn, crystalize into an overarching perception of the relationship as turbulent that makes relating difficult.

For much of the past decade, Knobloch has investigated relational turbulence processes among military couples navigating the cycle of deployment. She is working on a grant project funded by the U.S. Military Operational Medicine Research Program to follow 500 returning service members and at-home partners across the transition from deployment to reunion. Her co-investigator on the project is her twin sister, Dr. Lynne Knobloch-Fedders, a clinical psychologist at the Family Institute at Northwestern University who will be joining Marquette University in the fall as a faculty member in the Department of Counselor Education and Counseling Psychology.

The goal of their project is to identify how people's mental health symptoms and experience of relational turbulence predict their well-being during the post-deployment transition. "Reintegration after deployment is an exciting time for military couples, but it can be challenging for partners to adjust to living together again after months apart," Knobloch explained. "We are working to understand how the transition unfolds to help returning service members and at-home partners communicate more effectively upon reunion."

Knobloch has taken her research outside her lab by volunteering on behalf of nonprofit organizations supporting military families. She has led webinars for military family life professionals sponsored by the eXtension Military Families Learning Network in collaboration with the U.S. Department of Defense Office of Family Readiness Policy. At present, she is a member of the Science Advisory Board of the Military Child Education Coalition, which works to enhance the educational achievement of military children in the midst of family separations. She also serves as a pro bono research consultant for the Comfort Crew for Military Kids, which offers resources to military children facing challenging situations, and REBOOT Combat

Recovery, which helps military families heal after trauma.

Knobloch has been involved in IARR governance as well. She has served as a member of the awards committee, a panelist at new scholars workshops, a member of the nominating committee, the chair of the future conferences committee, and an associate editor for the *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*. She is currently a member-at-large of the IARR board of directors.

Knobloch's work has been honored by the Gerald R. Miller Award for Early Career Achievement from IARR (2008), the Article Award from IARR (2012), the Golden Anniversary Monograph Award from the National Communication Association (2012), and the University Scholar Award from the University of Illinois (2015), which recognizes outstanding teacher-scholars from across the university system.

What advice does she have for emerging relationship scientists? "Surround yourself with good mentors. Learn from the best," she recommends. "Then, don't forget to pay it forward when it's your turn to work with the next generation of scholars."

Leanne K. Knobloch is Professor and Director of Graduate Study in the Department of Communication at the University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign. She can be reached via email at: knobl@illinois.edu

References

Knobloch, L. K., Ebata, A. T., McGlaughlin, P. C., & Ogolsky, B. (2013). Depressive symptoms, relational turbulence, and the reintegration difficulty of military couples following wartime deployment. *Health Communication, 28,* 754-766. doi:10.1080/10410236.2013.800440

Knobloch, L. K., McAninch, K. G., Abendschein, B., Ebata, A. T., & McGlaughlin, P. C. (2016). Relational turbulence among military couples after reunion following deployment. *Personal Relationships, 23,* 742-758. doi:10.1111/pere.12148

Solomon, D. H., Knobloch, L. K., Theiss, J. A., & McLaren, R. M. (2016). Relational turbulence theory: Explaining variation in subjective experiences and communication within romantic relationships. *Human Communication Research, 42,* 507-532. doi:10.1111/hcre.12091

Solomon, D. H., & Knobloch, L. K. (2001). Relationship uncertainty, partner interference, and intimacy within dating relationships. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 18,* 804-820. doi:10.1177/0265407501186004

Solomon, D. H., & Knobloch, L. K. (2004). A model of relational turbulence: The role of intimacy, relational uncertainty, and interference from partners in appraisals of irritations. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 21,* 795-816. doi:10.1177/0265407504047838

NEW PROFESSIONAL'S COLUMN

Careers Beyond the Ivory Tower, Part One: Facebook

By Natalie D. Hengstebeck
The University of North Carolina at Greensboro
Liz Keneski & Tim Loving
Facebook

This is the first article in a series about careers outside academia. The focus of this column is careers at Facebook, the current employer for several IARR members, including Liz Keneski and Tim Loving.

Liz Keneski (LK), Mixed-Methods User Experience Researcher. Liz earned her Ph.D. in Human Development and Family Sciences at The University

of Texas at Austin in 2016, directed by Tim Loving and Lisa Neff and also in collaboration with Paul Eastwick. She has worked at Facebook since February 2016.

Tim Loving (TL), Quantitative User Experience Researcher. Tim earned his Ph.D. in social psychology at Purdue University in 2001. Previously an Associate Professor of Human Development and Family Sciences at The University of Texas at Austin, he has worked at Facebook since February 2016.

NH: What sparked your interest in working at Facebook? How did you learn about your current position?

LK: During the end of my 3rd year of grad school, I began to question if the ins and outs of an academic job and life were for me. I LOVED conducting research, really enjoyed teaching, and did not mind writing. But I was less enthusiastic about chasing grants, university politics, and the length of the peer-reviewed publication process for my work to get out there. I decided I needed to fully explore all of my career options in order to make the best choice for me. So, I decided that I would spend the next year teaching my own course, conducting applied research at a local nonprofit, and doing a research internship in industry. A colleague had completed an internship at Google (the first of anyone I knew well from academia to do this!) and it made me curious as to what companies might have similar experiences for people with psychology backgrounds. Thus, I interviewed and was selected for an internship at Facebook - a great fit for me theoretically as well as methodologically, which I completed over the summer after my fourth year. I fell in love with the research and the ins and outs of my research role there and accepted a full-time offer during my final year of graduate school.

TL: I had been at The University of Texas at Austin for nearly 13 years, and I was planning (or hoping) to go up for full professor in the next few years. Two former graduate students (including Liz) had interned in industry and both recently accepted full-time positions at Facebook. Because some of our current students were interested in industry careers, I was eager to learn more about the application process for careers outside of academia so I could

better advise future students interested in a similar career path. So, when one former student somewhat jokingly referred me for a position at Facebook, I initially went through the process with that goal in mind. Though I was not planning to leave academia at the time, I spoke with the recruiter, interviewed with various people in the company, and flew out for an interview at the Facebook campus. Then, Facebook made an offer, and I faced the possibility of a major career shift that would offer not only a fresh start, but would also make it financially possible for my wife to stay home longer with our newborn. Couple those benefits with the incredible intellectual energy and enthusiasm I experienced during my interview and when talking to other researchers at Facebook, it was hard not to be excited about the shift. I took the position.

NH: How did your educational and work experiences lead to your current position at Facebook?

LK: Completing an internship was probably the primary experience that led me to my current position. But other things I did in graduate school certainly also factored in, including conducting some applied research, gaining experience in a variety of research methods, getting a variety of statistical techniques under my belt (i.e., completing a Portfolio in Applied Statistical Modeling), gaining experience giving presentations (e.g., at IARR, at SPSP), getting published, writing for non-academic audiences (e.g., for Science of Relationships), and holding leadership roles (e.g., Graduate Student President of SPSP).

TL: Though I did not start talking to Facebook with the intention of leaving my faculty position, I have participated in several side projects that laid the foundation for a career outside of academia, including my work on the [Science of Relationships](#) and a prior [mobile app development project](#) with Gary Lewandowski and Benjamin Le (both IARR members). I got into these projects because of a scientific responsibility to get our research out to the public and to supplement stagnant faculty salaries. From these projects, I developed valuable experience in user interface research and meaningfully translating research findings to non-academic stakeholders that was attractive to Facebook.

NH: From the perspective of a close relationships scholar, what is unique about working for Facebook relative to other industry positions?

LK: Although I knew that many companies employed people to do research and analytics, it was important to me that my work remain connected to my theoretical interests. I knew that I would not personally be fulfilled working in any industry job (e.g., doing analyses about Human Resource-related metrics) -- I wanted to directly apply my theoretical and methodological expertise. At Facebook, I get to study close relationships in one sense or another all the time because I work for a company that revolves around social connections.

TL: As Liz said, Facebook is inherently about relationships. Though I no longer study the physiological responses of people in the midst of relationship transitions, Facebook provides opportunities to study people's "relationship" with the interface. As an early adopter, I was interested in how the platform could be improved and truly testing how basic theory can be turned into an incredible applied tool. However, because people generally cannot talk about current projects at Facebook, I had to take an enormous leap of faith about the kind of work that I would be doing were I to accept the position.

NH: What are the specific responsibilities of your position? How do they compare to responsibilities you held in academia?

LK: To design, execute, and report results from studies that contribute to helping my team achieve their goals, both in the short-term and long-term; to use research findings to help inform product roadmapping as well as team goals and strategies; to learn skills from fellow researchers; to train and teach fellow researchers; to mentor more junior researchers; to interview potential new researchers. Most responsibilities are similar to academia: determining what the important research questions are, designing and executing studies to address them, and reporting my findings and implications. A significant difference from academia is that I am only rarely involved in publishing results in peer-reviewed journals; instead, I often present results via presentations, slide decks, short reports, videos, etc. Another very significant difference is the pace at

which research is conducted - it is not terribly uncommon for me to conceive a study on Monday, plan it on Tuesday, run it on Wednesday, analyze results on Thursday, report findings on Friday, and then to see impact of my work the following week. This in contrast to a relationships chapter (co-authored with several other IARR members) forthcoming this year that was conceived when I was an undergraduate ten years ago is, obviously, a huge change for me.

TL: I have two "pots" of work. The first includes day-to-day problem-solving projects in which an engineer may ask me to help understand why something is happening. The second pot is big-picture projects. I cannot talk about our current projects, but a great example of our work is a communications researcher who is interested in how people show how they feel about things. For example, from academic research, we know that the best quality social support is support that matches people's needs. Although I did not work directly on this project, an exemplar research question for us might be: if we are going to do something different than a thumbs up for people to react to posts, what would that be and how should it look? As you may know, the solution was Facebook Reactions, i.e., Like, Love, Haha, Wow, Sad, and Angry buttons. This Wired article does a great job describing how user experience research led to the redesigned "Like" button.

NH: What specific skills or personal qualities have you found to be most important for success at Facebook? Do you have any advice for early career professionals who are interested in pursuing a career at Facebook?

LK: Communication and presentation skills, experience in applied work, flexible and innovative mindset, ability to work quickly, ability to work well in teams, and experience with quantitative and qualitative methods. And honestly, being a pleasant person to work with - poor or harsh communication and interpersonal skills don't fly in industry.

TL: Making science accessible to other people, survey analysis skills, teaching and mentoring experience, and managing productivity and perfectionism in a fast-paced environment. In addition, researchers need to develop a product

focus, which sometimes means looking beyond what is interesting to instead ask how you can improve understanding or functioning of something.

Close relationships scholars have some really incredible tools in their toolkit, particularly the statistical tools needed to analyze longitudinal data with complex interdependencies. Though I do not spend as much time using theories of relationship science, the skills developed in my academic career fit well with the work I do at Facebook.

For graduate students interested in Facebook, I suggest that you truly learn methods -- both quantitative and qualitative (lab, field, and stats) --- study them as much as you do your content or topical area. I really can't underscore that enough. And take all opportunities to sharpen your presentation skills, including in front of large audiences and with "high-stakes." Try to do some non-academic writing (e.g., for Science of Relationships -- I have it on good authority they are always looking for new contributors). And look for opportunities to get out of the ivory tower a bit -- even if it is just doing one applied project with a local non-profit. It will not set your career back. Rather, it'll either open up new career options you may not know about or it will help squash any nagging doubts you have about the potentially greener grass on the other side of academia.

NH: How would you describe a typical day in your current position? What is the one thing you spend the most time on?

TL: I do not have a typical day. Some days I spend a lot of time meeting with team members and stakeholders, other days are spent analyzing data and writing reports, and some days catching up on all of the work that other people on the team are doing.

LK: A typical day involves one or more of the following: study planning, study execution, analyses, and writing up or presenting results. Plus several meetings with collaborators (fellow researchers, data scientists) as well as stakeholders (designers, product managers, engineers, company leaders).

The one thing I spend the most time on is probably planning studies, whether that be writing, editing and programming a survey, developing the recruitment

criteria for a diary study, or writing a script for a lab study.

I agree with Tim as well, though, that there isn't really a "typical" day. Things are always different and that's part of what makes my job stimulating and fun!

NH: What is the workplace culture like? How does it compare to your experiences in academia?

LK: The culture at Facebook is positive, open, fast-paced, and a freaking blast. By positive, I mean there is an air of "we can make a difference!" by making the world more open and connected (Facebook's mission). By open, I mean both honest (feedback is not coated in a written review once a year, but given regularly and in person) and transparent (the CEO does a weekly ask-anything Q and A for the entire company). By fast-paced, I mean FASSSSST. This is probably the biggest difference between the cultures of academia and industry. I regularly have weekly turn-arounds between designing a study and reporting results. Meetings are generally only 30 minutes long unless there is a very compelling reason to make them an hour. And last, it is really fun - meetings are serious and efficient, but held in rooms with names such as "Chewing Gum with Your Mouth Open." People work incredibly hard, but then we have team off-sites where we go to the beach together. And it never hurts anybody to have ping pong tables around.

TL: Liz does a great job highlighting a lot of the characteristics of the Facebook culture. The one thing I would add is that it has taken some time learning to respect deadlines. In academia, I once submitted a chapter 18 months late because of my never-ending academic to-do list, which you could never do in industry. In addition, my new position is not a lifestyle or an identity - I leave my work at work.

NH: What does career progression look like at Facebook?

LK: There are two primary career paths for a researcher at Facebook - becoming a better and better (higher level) researcher or becoming a research manager. The former means you advance to higher levels (promotions, raises) by advancing your

skills and impact as a researcher; you might be called a "Research Lead." The latter involves managing and mentoring researchers on a given team or set of teams. At Facebook, these career trajectories are parallel so you don't have to become a manager to move up; if you're not interested in managing, but always want to do research, you keep doing research and can move up at the same "level" as managers do. There are also Directors of Research who manage several Research Managers and coordinate with company leaders. A less common, but possible, career trajectory is moving to a different role if your interests and/or skills evolve (e.g., becoming a data scientist as you gain coding experience, becoming a product manager if you want to lead product development).

Aside from "progression," there are also opportunities to work on different teams (e.g., News Feed, Messenger) as your interests change.

TL: What Liz said.

NH: What is the most difficult or frustrating part about your job? And the most satisfying?

LK: The most satisfying aspects of my job include finding interesting results (duh… I'm a scientist!), seeing the impact of my research in action, being involved in decision-making and high-level strategy, learning new research skills, and teaching/mentoring other researchers.
The most frustrating parts of my job are accommodating everyone's stake in a given research study. For example, designers may be interested in learning one thing whereas I know Product Managers will need to know something else to better inform their work. This is a tough balancing act.

TL: A satisfying part of this job is the ability to turn off work at the end of the day and enjoy guilt-free nights and weekends. There's also something really remarkable about having the resources available to answer fascinating questions quickly and then either move on or build from there as needed. It's never boring. On the difficult side, it's taking time to get used to the fact that so much work is being done in parallel, and it's easy to feel like you're never up to speed with everything going on. Eventually, you come to accept that, but I'm still used to having a solid grasp of the big picture.

NH: Looking back on your experience, what do you wish you had known before you applied or started working at Facebook?

LK: Two things before applying: (a) that this job existed and (b) that this job is HARD to get. Our interview process is extremely rigorous with a very small apply-to-hire success rate for researchers.
Four things before I started working here: (a) how fulfilled I would be conducting research in industry, (b) how much my "soft skills" would come into play (e.g., communication, collaboration, innovation, and ability to work fast), (c) how palpable a positive company culture can be, and (d) [being honest] the salary, benefits, professional and personal development opportunities, and potential for work-life balance.

NH: What other suggestions do you have for individuals interested in careers at Facebook and, more generally, careers outside of academia?

LK: I would advise people not to think of jobs in industry as a "backup" option. This is a fairly different career path with fairly different day-to-day tasks and a somewhat different emphasis in experience and skills required. You should really want to do this type of work in this type of setting if you apply for this type of job, and you should prepare for it as much as you would for an academic job.
Reach out and ask us questions!

For more information about working at Facebook, visit the [Facebook careers page](#).

TEACHING COLUMN

By Cheryl Harasymchuk
Carleton University

Part of my job is sharing my knowledge and

enthusiasm about relationship science with students in the classroom. Four years ago, I was given the opportunity to switch things up and teach a small, (i.e., 25 students) first-year course on close relationships (a welcome break from teaching my long-standing social psychology course that had over 300 students). I was excited by the possibility of making my mark at my university (no one had taught a course like this before in my Department) but I was daunted by the choices. I was used to sharing relationship science in either a very narrow way (e.g., sharing my research with graduate students) or a very broad way (e.g., covering the highlights of relationship science in a couple of weeks during my social psychology course). I now had to find a middle ground and decide what needed further elaboration (e.g., methods associated with tracking couples over time) and what needed to be cut (i.e., an analysis of statistics). Additionally, given that this course was for first-year students, I needed to choose material that would suit a) their level of psychological and methodological knowledge and b) the class size (e.g., I could more easily do group discussions and exercises).

One resource that I stumbled on was the teaching resource section on the IARR website. There were sample syllabi, recommended textbooks, exercises, media resources, and sample measures. With these resources, I felt less overwhelmed and I sketched out my own relationship course, a course that I have continued to develop ever since. I later learned that this trove of resources that helped me out my first year teaching the course was created by Kelly Campbell and the rest of the IARR teaching committee. I eventually became involved as a committee member and recently stepped in as the new Chair of the teaching committee (along with Lefebvre, Lewandowski, Lindenbaum, McIntyre, McClure, Sahak, and Stanton).

One of the teaching committee's goals is to promote best practices and resources for teaching close relationship courses. The main way we do so is by updating and maintaining the teaching resources posted on the IARR website. We are currently looking to build and update the site. More specifically, we are looking for recent assignments, measures, syllabi, and media resources for close relationships courses. Additionally, we are trying to promote the site. Given that this might be the first

time some of you have heard about the IARR teaching resource section on the website (or perhaps you heard about it but never used it), I urge you to check it out! If you have any teaching resources to share (or general feedback about the teaching portion of the website), please send them to Cheryl.Harasymchuk@carleton.ca.

FEATURE ARTICLE

Getting Started with ResearchGate

By Karen Blair
St. Francis Xavier University

Sarah Vannier
Dalhousie University

Justin Lehmiller
Ball State University

In a previous *RRN* Editorial, Justin Lehmiller explored the benefits of sharing your scientific research online through the academic networking site, ResearchGate (access that article here). We agree that there are many advantages to using ResearchGate including more readership, more citations, and greater accessibility of your work to other professionals and the public. In this article, we will delve more deeply into the details of setting up a ResearchGate account and understanding the various facets of the site. A brief disclaimer: Neither the authors of this article nor the editors of Relationship Research News have a vested interest in ResearchGate. There are other alternatives that you may also want to explore (e.g., Academia.edu).

Step 1. Create an account. Creating an account is free and fairly straightforward. The first step is answering the question "What kind of researcher are you?" Options include academic or student, corporate, medical, or not a researcher (e.g.,

journalist). Most IARR members will likely select "academic." Next, you fill in your institution and department. ResearchGate will automatically populate the options as you begin typing. Then you enter your name, institutional email address, and password.

Step 2. Confirm your authorship. ResearchGate will show you articles that it thinks you may have published. You can confirm which ones are yours and which ones are not. If none of the identified papers are yours, or you want to add papers after creating your account, just click "continue." Often, ResearchGate will continue to show you more and more possible papers by authors with similar names to yours. Just click "continue" when its suggestions cease to be relevant.

Step 3. Select your disciplines, skills and expertise. To add more detail to your profile concerning your research interests and skills, ResearchGate will ask you to select up to three disciplines, nine sub-disciplines, and a number of skills or areas of expertise from a pre-populated list. ResearchGate will use this information later to identify other people conducting research in your area. You can continue to update this list after your account is created. You will also be able to add more details about your current position and degrees earned.

Step 4. Upload a photo. You can add a picture to your profile. ResearchGate also finds photos of you online that you can use. Adding a photo is not necessary. However, using the same professional headshot or image across all of your professional social media profiles (e.g., ResearchGate, LinkedIn, Twitter) helps to cultivate a cohesive online presence.

Step 5. Activate your account. Check your institutional email to activate your account.

Now that you have a ResearchGate account set up, here a few other things you may want to do:

Follow other researchers. ResearchGate automatically generates a list of possible researchers who you might want to follow. This list is mostly based on existing members who are in your department, at your University, have cited you, or whom you have cited. After you follow someone, you will receive updates in your ResearchGate newsfeed about anything that they post, such as new research articles or questions. This can be a great way to stay up-to-date on the newest publications and research projects in your field.

Add more contributions. If you'd like to add additional publications or other types of contributions (e.g., research talks, book chapters, things you have published in *RRN*) that were not added while setting up your account, you can do this at any time. You can also "tag" your co-authors on any publications, which will automatically add the publication to their ResearchGate account, if they have one. If they do not yet have an account, it will give you the opportunity to invite them, which is entirely optional.

ResearchGate provides several options for sharing copies of your publications. Before choosing what to share, take a close look at the copyright agreement you signed with the publisher when your paper was accepted. Depending on this agreement, you may be allowed to upload submitted, accepted, or final versions of the article [see box on "Sharing research published in *Personal Relationships* or *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*]. You can also choose to upload a private copy of the article. This will not be publically available, but it will make it easier for you to share the article if someone requests it via a private message. Any time that someone makes a request, you can respond by simply clicking a button that says "send private copy," taking the hassle out of searching your computer for a copy and having to manually attach it to a message.

Add supplementary materials. ResearchGate can be great for researchers dedicated to more open science. In addition to uploading journal articles, you can upload raw data, tables, images, code, syntax, conference posters, or any other materials that might help other researchers to become more engaged with your work.

Create and follow projects. Projects are a great way to let people know what you are working on. You can add a description of the project, describe your project goals, describe your research methods, list collaborators, attach related publications or other types of contributions, and post updates. People who

are interested in your work will follow your projects. This also will be a good way for students and early career professionals to show the progression and development of their research programs.

Explore your metrics. ResearchGate keeps track of how often your papers are read and cited - sending you cheerful emails updating you on milestones you have reached with each one. Unfortunately, it only tends to count citations within other articles that have also been added to ResearchGate. You can also see how often your profile has been viewed and receive some information about the institution and country of the viewer (if they are also logged into ResearchGate while visiting your page). ResearchGate uses these metrics to provide you with your RG Score, which, according to ResearchGate, is intended to be a quantifiable metric of your research reputation, based on your research contributions and interactions with other members of the Research Gate Community. You can learn more about how this score is calculated here: https://explore.researchgate.net/display/support/Scor es

Ultimately, the RG Score only has meaning within the context of ResearchGate, and its success as a useful metric will depend upon the overall success of ResearchGate as an academic social networking site. ResearchGate also provides more standard metrics, such as your h-index, where h represents your productivity and impact, such that *h* is the number of articles that also have *h* citations. Once again, however, your h-index on ResearchGate is only calculated based on other articles that also appear on ResearchGate. At present, ResearchGate may not be the most accurate place to get metrics on your impact, and sites such as Google Scholar likely provide more accurate indices. Check those out.

Endorse each other's skills and expertise. If you and another researcher are following each other, you can endorse their skills and expertise. To do this, go to the profile of the person who you want to endorse, click on the tab that says "info," look at their list of skills and expertise (on the right-hand side), and click the plus sign beside any of the skills that you know they have. Your profile picture will appear beside the skills you have endorsed. We strongly encourage more senior researchers to endorse the skills and expertise of students and more junior

colleagues, as this can be helpful for early-career academics trying to establish their expertise in a field. While this may seem futile on a click-by-click basis, over time, large numbers of endorsements can begin to shape a picture of an individual researcher's collective reputation.

Other Features of ResearchGate

ResearchGate offers a vast number of other features, although we have covered the key areas above that are relevant to providing researchers with a new platform from which to share their research and grow their reputation. After you join, you can explore the other features available through the site. For example, on the right hand side of your profile page, if you scroll down to the bottom of the sidebar section, you will see a button that says "Export profile as a CV." Clicking this button will generate a word document that does a fairly good job of generating the major areas of your CV, including publications, education, and work experience. The more information and categories that you add to your ResearchGate profile, the more accurate and complete this generated CV will be. Although this probably won't replace your existing CV, it may provide a good starting place for graduate students or an easy way to cut and paste, in bulk, your most recent citations.

Finally, one of the other areas of the site that you will find is devoted to asking and answering questions. You can ask a question about absolutely any topic related to research and you are likely to receive a number of intelligent and helpful responses within a matter of hours, or even minutes. You can ask for suggestions about measures, statistical analyses, recommendations for new areas of literature, or even seek out new collaborators. In addition to asking questions, you can also answer questions if you happen to have information that you think would be useful based on other members' questions. Although the main value of this feature of the site is self-explanatory (quick access to answers and new options for making research connections), ResearchGate also incorporates your activity within this section of the site into your overall ResearchGate score.

Sharing research published in *Personal Relationships (PR)* or *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships (JSPR)* on ResearchGate

Each publisher has slightly different rules about what you can share publically. In general, these rules apply to three versions of the manuscript and outline which version you can share and where you can share it. We summarize below the guidelines from PR and JSPR with regard to ResearchGate; these guidelines also apply to similar websites like Academia.edu.

		Can I share it on Research Gate?	
Version	**Description**	**PR**	**JSPR**
Submitted	The original manuscript submitted to the journal. Does not incorporate changes based on reviewer feedback. If many changes were made, sharing this version may not be ideal.	Yes.	Yes.
Accepted	The manuscript that has been accepted. It incorporates all of the changes made based on reviewer feedback. The version sent to the journal to be typeset.	No.	Yes. *12-months after publication*
Final	This is the final version of the article as it appears in the journal. It is formatted and typeset in the style of the journal.	No.	No.

Both journals also allow authors to share the accepted version on a personal or institutional website. Articles published in JSPR can be shared immediately and articles published in PR can be shared 24-months after publication.

A note about formatting submitted and accepted versions. Generally, unless you paid for open access, you cannot post the final, journal formatted version of the manuscript online. However, that does not mean that you are stuck with the formatting from your original Word document. Because this is the version that readers will be seeing, feel free to make modifications that will make the manuscript easier to read. For example, it may make sense to move your tables or figures from the end of the manuscript (where APA has us place them) and instead embed them in the body of the text. You can also save the document in PDF format, instead of Word, and format the paper in any way that you wish. Also, keep in mind that most journals require you to include a citation and link to the final version on the cover page.

JOURNALS UPDATE

Tentative Contents of Upcoming Journals

Personal Relationships
June 2017 [Volume 24, Issue 2]
Table of Contents

Intimate partner support: A comparison of gay, lesbian, and heterosexual relationships
LILLIAN ELLIS and MARK DAVIS

Seeking help from a female friend: Girls' competencies, friendship features, and intentions
HEATHER A. SEARS and SUSAN M. MCAFEE

Stay away, but I may need your help! Mate choice and manipulation of prospective parents-in-law
MENELAOS APOSTOLOU

Humor in romantic relationships: A meta-analysis
JEFFREY A. HALL

Situational precursors of revenge: Social exclusion, relationship type, and opportunity
MAARTJE ELSHOUT, ROB M. A. NELISSEN, ILJA VAN BEEST, SUZAN ELSHOUT and WILCO W. VAN DIJK

Walking the walk, talking the talk: Love languages, self-regulation, and relationship satisfaction
SELENA BUNT and ZOE J. HAZELWOOD

Machiavellian flexibility in negative mate retention
DANIEL N. JONES and MELISSA S. DE ROOS

Analysis of group composition in multimember multigroup data
THOMAS LEDERMANN, MYRIAM RUDAZ and ALEXANDER GROB

Resisting revenge: An investigation of reasons for foregoing revenge in romantic relationships
SUSAN D. BOON, KYLER R. RASMUSSEN, VICKI L. DEVEAU and ALISHA M. ALIBHAI

Journal of Social and Personal Relationships
May 2017 [Volume 34, Issue 3]
Table of Contents

Physiology and pillow talk: Relations between testosterone and communication post sex
AMANDA DENES, TAMARA AFIFI, and DOUGLAS A. GRANGER

The perils of dating your boss: The role of hierarchical workplace romance and sex on evaluators' career advancement decisions for lower status romance participants
SUZANNE CHAN-SERAFIN, LYDIA TEO, AMIRALI MINBASHIAN, DAVID CHENG, and LU (NICK) WANG

Do differences matter?: A typology of emerging adult romantic relationships
PATRICIA ROBERSON, JERIKA CHRISTINE NORONA, JESSICA N. FISH, SPENCER B. OLMSTEAD, and FRANK FINCHAM

"Getting Involved": A thematic analysis of caregivers' perspectives in Chilean residential children's homes
MANUELA GARCIA QUIROGA, and CATHERINE HAMILTON-GIACHRITSIS

Can promoting romantic relationship quality help gay and bisexual men better face HIV stigma?
GIBRAN RODRÍGUEZ DE LOS REYES, and KARLA URRIOLA GONZÁLEZ

Dating out is intercultural: Experience and perceived parent disapproval by ethnicity and immigrant generation
SHARON SHENHAV, BELINDA CAMPOS, and WENDY A. GOLDBERG

ANNOUNCEMENTS

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

On the fence about attending the IARR Mini-Conference this June at Syracuse University? If you have attended IARR Mini-Conferences in the past, you already know how beneficial they can be, bringing together a group of people excited about relationship science to spend the weekend presenting research, discussing ideas, and thinking about the field together. It's a great way to get to know key members of the field in an intimate setting. If you haven't attended one yet, here's some more information:

The schedule is going to be packed with **excellent science**! The full agenda will be available on our website in the coming weeks. We received many fascinating abstract submissions, and have arranged a diverse series of thought-provoking invited addresses:

Keynotes & Invited Addresses:
Marianne Dainton (La Salle University), *Interdependence and Relational Maintenance*

Karen Fingerman (University of Texas), *The Pivot Generation: Midlife Adults' Relationships With Generations Above and Below*

John Holmes (University of Waterloo), *The Structure of Interdependence Shapes Cognition in Relationships*

Ed Lemay (University of Maryland), *Relationship-Protective Properties of Selfishness and Insecurity: Insights from Interdependence and Communal-Exchange Theories*

Jeff Simpson (University of Minnesota) and Nickola Overall (University of Auckland), *Partner Buffering of Attachment Insecurity*

Pat Shrout (New York University), An Invited Panel on Ways to Model Interdependent Data

The conference will also be packed with **networking and social activities**! We have a welcome reception (June 22), a dinner/dance reception (June 24), along with daily breakfasts, lunches, and ice cream breaks for informal mingling and discussion. For night-owls, there are several excellent restaurant and night-life options in Syracuse to keep the informal interactions going after formal programming ends. A list of suggestions compiled by locals will be distributed before the conference.

We also organized a **New Scholars Workshop** the day before the mini-conference (June 22). This is a full day pre-conference for graduate students and new scholars in the field with a welcome reception the evening before. New scholars will enjoy panel discussions led by senior scholars in the field, and will have the opportunity to participate in an interactive lunch to network and discuss research with each other and the senior scholars.

New Scholars Workshop Topics and Mentors:
Navigating the Job Market
-Liz Keneski (Facebook)
-Denise Solomon (Penn State University)
-Jennifer Tomlinson (Colgate University)

Being Successful in Year 1
-Levi Baker (UNC-Greensboro)
-Tricia Burke (Texas State University)
-Brian Ogolsky (University of Illinois)

Teaching Close Relationships Courses
-Rowland Miller (Sam Houston State University)
-Jennifer Theiss (Rutgers University)
-Valerie Young (Hanover College)

Obtaining Grants and Publishing
John Caughlin (University of Illinois)
Ed Lemay (University of Maryland)
Geoff MacDonald (University of Toronto)

Making the Most out of your Conference, Tips for Networking
M. Joy McClure (Adelphi University)
Melissa Curran (University of Arizona)
Ashley Randall (Arizona State University)

Still undecided? For more information, check out our website at iarr2017.com – we'll keep it updated as more information becomes available – or contact local area chair Laura VanderDrift (lvanderd@syr.edu) with any questions.

Hope to see you all in Syracuse this summer!

Save the Date

IARR Biennial Conference: 2018

Colorado State University (CSU) is excited to host the 2018 IARR 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). Interested attendees can expect the call for papers to appear late this year (October or November, 2017), and more travel and detailed information to appear on the IARR website in a few months. See you there!

Technology for Teaching Close Relationships

Love Lines is a new and unique tool for learning about close relationships. It is an online game that teaches undergraduates how to improve communication and resolve conflict in romantic relationships. Within its five levels, students identify positive as well as problematic romantic communication patterns and apply this new knowledge to resolving simulated romantic relationship conflicts. Love Lines was created by Dr. Ebony Utley who wanted to engage students who were disinterested in traditional textbooks. The game's content is based on her research with Americans about their intimate relationships. Students love the game for its simplicity, relatable concepts, and live chats that improve retention and help students apply course concepts in and out of the classroom. Demo videos, an instructor best practices manual, and free instructor access are all available at: http://multi.lovelinesonline.com/sample/.

Contact Dr. Utley at ebony.utley@csulb.edu or 562.985.5303 for more information.

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:
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