RELATIONSHIP RESEARCH NEWS

OFFICIAL NEWS JOURNAL OF THE INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR RELATIONSHIP RESEARCH

November 2017 VOL 16, NO. 2

PRESIDENT'S COLUMN

November 2017 Report

by Susan Sprecher
Illinois State University

I am excited to be in my second year as President of this wonderful organization, and to update you (through this column) on all of the exciting things going on.

Some conference updates:
First, hats off to the organizers of the 2017 June mini-conference (and New Scholar Workshop) at Syracuse University. Laura VanderDrift, and her committee, consisting of Joy McClure, Leonard Newman, and Jennifer Tomlinson, hosted a very stimulating mini-conference with the theme Interdependence, Interaction, and Relationships. In addition, the Mentoring Committee, chaired by Ashley Randall, arranged a New Scholar Workshop on the day prior to the conference, which provided excellent panels of speakers to graduate students, new assistant professors, and others.

Second, and as most of you know, the next IARR conference is July 12-16, 2018 in Fort Collins, Colorado, at Colorado State University. As noted by Jennifer Harman and the other local organizing committee members, *"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 beautiful 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."* The website for the conference is http://iarrconference.org/ and there you will see a wealth of information, ranging from accommodations and travel information to ideas for what to do before and after the conference for those who want to extend their stay. I had the opportunity to see the venue and accommodations this past summer during a visit to see a friend in the area, and I can vouch that this is going to be a great conference with great hosts and a great venue. For questions for Jennifer Harman, contact her at: Jennifer.harman@coloState.edu. For those interested in submission information, go specifically to the following page of the conference site: http://iarrconference.org/abstract-submission-instructions/ Note that the portal for submissions will open up in early November and submissions will be accepted until December 15th. If you have questions about the submission process, contact Lisa Neff, Program coordinator, at: lneff@austin.utexas.edu. Attention students planning to attend: The IARR board has approved a registration waiver program in which 90 students (meeting criteria that will be made available soon through the listserv and conference website) will be able to apply for an amount of $135 which provides about ½ the registration fee for the conference.

Third, IARR's history of hosting the best conferences of any professional organization to which you could belong, will continue. The Future Conferences Committee, chaired by Terri Orbuch, worked hard to identify the sites for the mini-conference(s) for summer of 2019 and a main conference for 2020. The sites have been selected and we are just finalizing some detail with the organizers before the sites are announced. Stay tuned for news in future listserv announcements, the website, and the spring RRN!

In terms of other events and progress, there is a lot on the horizon:

A small committee (Jessica Eckstein, Dan Perlman, and Leah Bryant) has been looking into replacing 123Signup, the management software of our membership renewal process, with another service that can offer more bells and whistles. We have chosen Wild Apricot, and hopefully all will be in place by the time you renew your membership in December.

Anita Vangelisti, Chair of the Awards Committee, invites self-nominations and other-nominations for various IARR Awards to be made next summer at the conference in Fort Collins. See the information later in this issue, or for more information, contact Anita, at: vangelisti@austin.utexas.edu.

The International Committee (chaired by Rozzana Sanchez Aragon), the Membership Committee (chaired by Madoka Kumashiro), and with the assistance of several others, including assistant Archivist, Stan Treger, have been instrumental in creating a new membership brochure and translating it into several languages. See these membership brochures (and pass them to colleagues and students) at the top of the homepage of IARR (IARR.org).

Susan Boon (our energetic archivist), along with the assistance of others (Stan Treger, assistant archivist) have been busy archiving information (e.g., conference programs). Go to the website for more information (http://www.iarr.org/document-archive/).

Brian Ogolsky has done a wonderful job editing the *IARR Relationship Research News.* However, he has only two issues remaining in his term. We would like to have the next Editor identified by April or May of 2018 in order to shadow and be mentored by Brian as he prepares his last issue. If you are interested in this position, please see the Call for Nominations in this issue and/or contact Beverley Fehr, chair of the Publication Committee, at bfehr@uwinnipeg.ca , for more information.

The teaching committee, chaired by Cheryl Harasymchuk, has been hard at work gathering teaching material (syllabi, assignments, etc.) from IARR members, and is in the process of posting them on the teaching page of the website. They would like to continue to update the section so send your new, innovative teaching materials as you develop them! Write to Cheryl, at: cheryl.Harasymchuk@carleton.ca or to Julie Verette Lindenbaum (lindej2@sage.edu), who is collecting syllabi.

Ashley Randall and her Mentoring Committee have launched a second phase of the mentoring program, which involves the organized opportunity for mid-career and senior members to mentor new scholars in our field. This is a program that benefits all, and I thank Ashley and her committee for persistence in this endeavor.

Interested in a leadership role in IARR? Jeff Simpson and the Elections Committee will be holding an election in early 2018 for several positions on the Board (see his call, this issue). In addition, committees will be rotating membership (and often Chairs) beginning next June. Anita Barbee, incoming President, will be searching for leadership of committees in April.

One issue that our Editors, Publication Committee, and Board have been discussing is how to respond to the widespread call in science for more transparency, open sharing, and reproducibility. The plan is to implement Level 1 of TOP Guidelines at our two journals over time. This will involve asking authors to declare whether they have taken steps such as pre-registration. More information from the Editors will be coming in the spring issue of RRN.

All interested members of the organization are invited to come early enough to the Fort Collins conference to attend the Business meeting, which will begin at about 3:30 on Thursday, July 12, right before the opening keynote address (by Jeff Simpson) at 5:30. Arrive early, register, and then check in at the business meeting to learn about what is going on in the organization. All welcome and more detail to come!

Let me end this column by reminding you to begin to think about your submission to IARR 2018 summer conference. Also tell your colleagues and students! Hope to see you there next July.

INSIDE THIS ISSUE OF RELATIONSHIP RESEARCH NEWS

RELATIONSHIP RESEARCH NEWS

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

Associate Editors

Laura VanderDrift	Casey Totenhagen	Sylvia Niehuis
Syracuse University	University of Alabama	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

The November issue of *Relationship Research News* is ready to roll and full of outstanding content. It is hard to believe that our team is now finished with our second year of work. The call for our replacements is already imminent as you will see at the back of this issue. I thought it beneficial to offer a few thoughts about why you should consider succeeding me as the next editor of this great publication.

1. Giving back to an amazing organization. If you are anything like me, you view IARR as a part of your extended family. A family that gives you an amazing intellectual experience every two years (and more if you regularly attend the mini-conferences). A family that helps promote your career by providing mentorship for students and new professionals. A family that roots for you to succeed. So why not think about the principles of equity theory and give back? After all, no one wants to violate the norm of reciprocity.
2. Name recognition. In the era of social media and advance analytics, the power of name-recognition cannot be understated. Even if you don't care much about it, your employer (and tenure committee) probably does. Putting your name at the top of this great publication is a great way to achieve this. Don't believe me? Let me share a quick story. While in line for one of the fabulous meals at the latest IARR mini-conference in Syracuse, a young scholar in front of me looked at my name tag and said, "I have no idea why, but I know your name from somewhere." I asked her if she read RRN and the lightbulb went on. As the mate selection researchers know, sometimes you just have to be present to be noticed.
3. Editorial experience. For those looking to expand their repertoire of academic service, editorships are often daunting and extremely time-consuming (I'm looking at you Geoff and Debby). But for those who are not ready for the commitment and round-the-clock demands of journal editing, RRN is a great stepping-stone. Because it is published twice a year, you have a lot of time to prepare for and think about the contents. The workload is very manageable and fairly predictable. Dare I even say that it is fun?

Now that I am done convincing you to take my job, I hope you will spend some time enjoying this issue.

In this issue you will see that the junior and senior spotlight columns went on hiatus so that we could pay respect to one of the pioneers of our discipline, George Levinger. John Holmes and Ted Huston did a wonderful job paying respect to an amazing man and outstanding scholar.

Dave Kenny is back with the latest in statistical humor. You won't want to miss his "trigger warnings."

New Professional Representative, Natalie Hengstebeck then gives us a taste of public scholarship in an informative "how-to."

Next, Cheryl Harasymchuk highlighted the teaching of Gary Lewandowski in her teaching spotlight column.

Don't miss the feature article in this issue. It is an extensive guide to securing funding for research written by the president elect of IARR, Anita Barbee. After reading it, I was ready to bang out a grant proposal on the spot.

Be sure to check out the journal updates from Debby Kashy and Geoff MacDonald and remember to accept the next review request that you receive!

The announcement section is full of new and exciting information about the main conference (including student scholarships) as well as the next round of IARR awards and elections. After reading about the exciting events (e.g., beer tours, karaoke) planned by Jen Harman for the main conference, I am counting the days. In fact, I am going to start practicing my Bon Jovi right now. I encourage you to do the same…as long as it isn't my song.

IN MEMORIUM GEORGE LEVINGER

John G. Holmes
University of Waterloo

Ted L. Huston
University of Texas at Austin

George Levinger (1927–2017) was Professor of Psychology at the University of Massachusetts in Amherst. Born in Berlin, Germany, he fled the Nazi regime with his Jewish family in 1935, first moving to Switzerland and then to London, before emigrating to the United States in 1941. He received his B.A. from Columbia University in 1946. After his army service in Tokyo, he received a 1951 M.A. in clinical psychology from the University of California, Berkeley, and a 1955 Ph.D. from the University of Michigan. He later taught at Bryn Mawr College (1957–60), Western Reserve University (1960–65), and the University of Massachusetts (1965–92). He was Professor Emeritus from 1992 until this year.

George Levinger was a pioneer in research and theory on close interpersonal relationships. After publishing various papers on marital relationships early in his career, he integrated previous social psychological findings about short-term relationships, studied in the laboratory, with his work on continuing close relationships. In 1972 Levinger authored the widely cited paper, "Attraction in relationship: A new look at interpersonal attraction" that distinguished among stages of superficial *awareness* of another person in the social network, (2) to repeated *surface contact*, and eventually (3) to a deepening *mutuality* that describes a genuine "pair relationship." As two partners become increasingly interdependent and concerned with each other, their mutual involvement was pictured by a growing intersection between two circles or mutual "life spaces." The buildup of the relationship can be gradual, but often it is spurred by events. Consolidation of the relationship, of commitment, is built on interactions becoming "meshed," resulting in rewarding interactions that increased attraction toward the relationship. Levinger creatively applied such topological representations from Kurt Lewin to an analysis of interdependence. The framework helped to spawn a research literature and debate on the multifaceted nature and measurement of mutuality, of closeness, and the factors that promote its development, on the one hand, and undermine it, on the other.

This paper and its sequels created a blueprint wherein existing research on attraction and relationships could be mapped, a task Levinger took on when he was asked to write for the *Annual Review of Psychology.* He enlisted one of us – Huston, then a neophyte – to work with him to identify research studies in 36 sociology and psychology journals, using his model to organize findings from the 405 studies published from 1972-1976 that were uncovered. The review showed that psychologists and sociologists had largely focused on attraction processes early in friendships and heterosexual romantic relationships, and on more superficial qualities and ease of interaction. Friendships (same-sex), romantic (cross-sex) and marital relationships (by definition at the time, also cross-sex) collectively accounted for a third of the published research. Just a mere handful of studies focused on all of the other gender permutations of romantic relationships. Levinger was a catalyst who brought together social scientists from multiple disciplines -- history, sociology, psychology, family studies, and communication -- to focus on ongoing relationships. In 1974, Levinger convened an interdisciplinary conference on close relationships at the University of Massachusetts, resulting eventually in the hugely influential book *Close Relationships*. Some observers consider the book to signal the beginning of a new field of study.

The past forty years have witnessed a widening of the lens of relationship researchers to cover a broad range of relationships, with far more work concentrating on established, ongoing relationships. There has been a surge of longitudinal studies, mounted by social scientists drawn from a variety of disciplines. Such work now focuses on the initial development of relationships, transitions in them, and studies linking one phase to another (e.g. courtship processes to what happens later). And partly because professional organizations like IARR and its prequels have been put in place, researchers studying different aspects of the full relationship arc, and those studying different types of relationships, see themselves as part of a multidisciplinary community of social scientists. Levinger's model has played an important role in that development.

Consistent with his interest in developmental change in relationships, Levinger also focused on processes of deterioration and ending. In his influential 1976 paper on a social psychological perspective on marital dissolution in the *Journal of Social Issues*, and in a later book with Moles, his analysis centered on the idea of "pair cohesiveness." Using a Lewinian perspective, he examined the various "forces" acting on the person. If the attraction forces are sufficiently strong, through interactions that were rewarding and stable, people are not very aware of their attraction to alternative relationships or to potential barrier forces to leaving. However, if these forces waned, alternatives and barriers become the focus of attention. If barriers to leaving are sufficiently strong, out of concern for children, for instance, a person who experiences low attraction is left stuck in an "empty shell" marriage.

In contributing to the subsequent multi-authored theoretical book *Close Relationships* (1983), Levinger's chapter on "Development and change" focused on the longitudinal sequence from **A**cquaintance to **B**uildup, to **C**ontinuation and consolidation processes, to possible **D**eterioration and **E**nding phases, and the transitions between those phases. This "A-B-C-D-E" model and his very thoughtful analysis of its transitions are powerful tools for viewing changes in couple relationships in general.

George Levinger was a warm and nurturing mentor to his younger colleagues, including the two current authors, and he will be sorely missed. In 1990, the International Society for the Study of Personal Relationships recognized his ground-breaking and substantial contributions to the field and gave Levinger its first Distinguished Career Contribution Award.

Selected Readings

Levinger, G., & Snoek, J. D. (1972). *Attraction in relationship: A new look at interpersonal attraction.* Morristown, NJ: General Learning Press.

Levinger, G. (1974). A three-level approach to attraction: Toward an understanding of pair relatedness. *In T. L. Huston (Ed.), Foundations of interpersonal attraction (*99-120). New York: Academic Press.

Levinger, G. (1976). A social psychological perspective on marital dissolution. *Journal of Social Issues, 32*, 21-47.

Levinger, G., & Raush, H. L. (1977). *Close relationships: Perspectives on the meaning of intimacy.* Amherst, MA: University of Massachusetts Press.

Huston, T. L., & Levinger, G. (1978). Interpersonal attraction and relationships. *Annual Review of Psychology, 29,* 115-156.

Levinger, G., & Moles, O. C. (1979). *Divorce and separation: Context, causes and consequences.* New York: Basic Books.

Kelley, H. H., Berscheid, E., Christensen, A., Harvey, J., Huston, T., Levinger, G., McClintock, E., Peplau, L. A., & Peterson, D. (1983). *Close relationships.* San Francisco: Freeman.

Levinger, G. (1983). Development and change. In H. H. Kelley, et al., *Close relationships* (315-359). San Francisco: Freeman.

Levinger, G., & Huston, T. L. (1990). The social psychology of marriage. In F. Fincham & T. Bradbury (Eds.), *The psychology of marriage* (19-58). New York: Guilford.

HUMOR COLUMN

Trigger is Not Just a Stuffed Horse

David A. Kenny

University of Connecticut

I was recently asked to be part of a committee to come up with a set of trigger words for a major, and I mean very major, professional society. These would be listed at either the beginning of a talk or at the top of a paper, and that way the listener could decide to leave and not hear the talk or the reader could decide not to look at the paper. Likely, you are thinking that these are words that are created by the politically correct, but that would be wrong. I am talking about words that strike fear in most everyone's heart. Words that lead some of us to break into tears, flee the room and hide in the bathroom, or do even worse. The trigger words I am talking about are statistical terms. The committee's hope is that the reader or listener would be able to know in advance if the paper or talk had one of the terms that they find objectionable, or psychically damaging and thereby prevent them from listening to the talk or reading the paper. Also, authors or speakers would know the list of trigger words and they might be able to find workarounds to avoid using these highly objectionable terms.

Math (maths to people who speak old English) fears are a serious problem. One estimate is that in the United States 68 percent of people have math anxiety. Over the nearly 50 years that I have been teaching statistics I have faced many students, good ones and poor ones, men and women, who have come into my office and broken down into tears sobbing that they are unable to complete my statistics course. (Given how many students there have been over the years, it occurs to me that maybe it says more about me as a teacher than the material, but of course that is not true, right?). Consequently, I am entirely supportive of this effort to create a list of statistical trigger words. If truth be told, several of them cause me anxiety.

I include some of the current trigger words that our secret committee is considering below, as well as my explanation as to why these words engender fear and loathing among so many. For those of you who have anxiety issues with statistics (likely nearly everyone), I would strongly urge you to stop reading this now. I fear seeing all these words at once is sure to cause many of you to break out in hives.

Type I and Type II Errors: The first thing that happens if we see the term "Type I (or II) Error," is that we cannot figure out which is which. To compound the problem, some smarty pants have even argued for Type III and Type IV errors! We are sometimes told to associate them with the Greek letters alpha and beta, but it is not usually a good strategy to use Greek to make sense out of anything (sorry Kostas). Besides not knowing which is which, it stresses us to think that research inevitably involves errors. It does not seem right that before you even do a study you need to decide what type of mistake you are more willing to make. It is like deciding whether you want to lose your left or your right arm.

Generalized Reciprocity: I am afraid this is a term I coined, and it is easily confused with Dyadic Reciprocity, Generalized Target Accuracy, and Generalized Meta-accuracy. It might seem that all I did is take a bunch of different terms and pair them up in every possible way. In all honesty, it was Bill Ickes who suggested the term as a replacement for Individual Reciprocity, which is probably an even scarier term. For some reason when I say that Generalized Reciprocity is simply the correlation between two latent variables, actor and partner effects, people still do not seem to understand what I am talking about.

Stereotype Accuracy. This term is due to Lee Cronbach and it is one of his four accuracies; the others, of course, being Elevation, Differential Elevation, and Differential Accuracy. Notice how Cronbach creates four terms but uses only three words: elevation, differential, and stereotype. I once counted and there are over 20 different ways perceivers can be accurate at knowing others, and Stereotype Accuracy is perhaps the most confusing. Part of the confusion is that it has little or nothing to do with stereotypes, at least in the way that we usually use think of it. The term is so confusing that

Dan Ozer has mercifully suggested we replace it with Normative Accuracy, still yet another accuracy term, and very frightening!

MAR, MCAR, and MNAR: Certainly the above terms are very confusing, but these are the most. These terms may be obscure to some readers, but for those who know something about missing data, you know that these three terms are almost guaranteed to send shivers up your spine. They were proposed by the statisticians Don Rubin and Rob Little. To add to the confusion, all three terms have the letters M, A, and R in them. Ideally, we hope that the missing data would be random, but that is not MAR, but MCAR. MAR stands for "missing at random," but it means that the missing data are non-random due to variables in the dataset and so the data are not really missing at random, which is not its name.

Bayesian: Here I include Bayesian inference, as well as Bayes theorem. You start with something called a posterior distribution, which has nothing to do with someone's fanny, but has to do with some fantasized conception of what we already know. Why would some 18th century Presbyterian minister have wasted his time thinking up such an idea? No wonder he never published it, and no one paid attention to it for years.

Canonical Correlation: This sounds like Pope Francis's favorite correlation and it is the correlation between two different sets of variables, which can be solved from the eigenvalue equations, of course. Two canonical variates are created, but we are told that their weights or loadings are usually uninterpretable. I am sure you all know that it is tested by (John?) Wilk's (Booth?) lambda. Not sure if I am proud or embarrassed to say that the third paper I ever published is how the second canonical correlation can be used to test a vanishing tetrad (perhaps itself a trigger word).

Non-centrality Parameter: The first thing you should ask is: What is the centrality parameter? There really is not one, or at least one that is called that. It all comes from the *t*-distribution, which was discovered by Gosset who called himself Student to protect trade secrets of the Guinness brewery.

Kurtosis: This describes a particular aspect of a distribution, but when you hear it, you start thinking of cirrhosis of the liver or osteoporosis of the spine. You know that high kurtosis is perhaps the worst problem you could have in your data, but you and most everyone else have no idea what it exactly means. You think it means "peakedness" but it is really "tailedness," whatever the heck that is. You are told that the opposite of kurtic is platykurtic, as if that is going to help. (Platykurtic sounds like some characteristic of a platypus.) It has something to do with the fourth moment of the distribution, again as if that is going to help you understand anything.

Logit link function: You have a dichotomous outcome and you talk to someone like me and you are told to use the logit link function. You run the analysis and you cannot find the error variance and you are told that because all of your coefficients are exponentiated you need to take their logarithms. It makes you wish you had just done an old fashioned chi-square test.

Likely by now, no one is reading this column as I have triggered all sorts of panic. I would suggest, if you want to stop thinking about all of this, check the recent news on your mobile, and you will forget about all things statistical. Maybe a better idea is just to watch cat videos on YouTube. That is what I plan to do.

NEW PROFESSIONAL'S COLUMN

Public Scholarship for Early Career Scientists

By Natalie D. Hengstebeck

Scholars Strategy Network

Why did you become a relationship scientist? To help people have better relationships? To answer a burning question? To contribute to public good? To shape policy? To teach undergraduates and write academic journal articles?

Whatever your reasons, I believe that you—my fellow new professional—have a role to play in public scholarship. Imagining America defines public scholarship as "scholarly or creative activity integral to a faculty member's academic area. It encompasses different forms of making knowledge about, for, and with diverse publics and communities. Through a coherent, purposeful sequence of activities, it contributes to the public good and yields artifacts of public and intellectual value." My goal for this article is to provide concrete examples of how to engage in public scholarship.

Why should you engage in public scholarship? Not only might it be beneficial for you (e.g., helping you bridge your personal and professional identities, expand your network, sharpen your research skills, provide good university publicity), but it also may contribute to the public good via boosting public support (and tax dollars) for science, increasing the public's science literacy, helping people have better relationships, and informing policy debates.

I know that we are all busy, but consider how other IARR members already engage in public scholarship. As a few examples, a number of members co-founded and/or contribute to the Science of Relationships; Eli Finkel is a frequent contributor for the New York Times; Ben Karney recently appeared on Adam Ruins Everything (a comedy show debunking popular misconceptions); Ben Le, Liz Schoenfeld, Tim Loving, and Gary Lewandowski, Jr. developed a free app to help the public better evaluate their relationships; Lisa Diamond has publicly testified about how her work was misconstrued in support of the Defense of Marriage Act; and Pearl Dykstra serves as the Deputy Chair of the High Level Group of Scientific Advisors for the European Commission.

So, what can you do? Professor M. V. Lee Badgett suggests three strategies for engaging in public scholarship: identifying a role for your research and ideas within the big picture, learning to communicate with diverse audiences, and building broad networks.

Identify a Role for your Research and Ideas Within the Big Picture

What is the big picture impact that you hope to achieve with your work? Do you want to share information to help people have better relationships? Strengthen public understanding of and support for science? Shape public policy?

Relative to scholars in other fields, relationship scientists have a particularly attentive public audience. (Who doesn't want to know how to have better relationships?!) Whether we choose to educate people about how to have better relationships and/or the value of science in our everyday lives, we can capitalize on this interest in our work. We may also think about how we can apply principles of relationship science (e.g., responsiveness, commitment) in other areas, such as building partnerships between academics, policymakers, community change agents, journalists, and the public.

For those of you interested in shaping policy, do you have expertise on government-sponsored relationship education programs? Same-sex parenting? Family leave policies and relationship dynamics? Early family relationships and political ideologies? Despite popular beliefs in academia about how research is (not) valued in policymaking, 82% congressional staffers reported that academics and issue experts were a valuable source of information and a preferred source over government agencies and national press.

Regardless of the impact you hope to achieve, there are numerous ways to situate relationship science within the big picture.

Learn to Communicate with Diverse Audiences and Build Broad Networks

Most graduate school programs do not teach you how to connect with broad audiences, but there are opportunities to cultivate these skills. Particularly important are writing and speaking for general audiences, which may be developed through writing for your local newspaper or becoming a contributor for Science of Relationships, delivering a TED Talk or Three Minute Thesis, or sharing cutting-edge relationship science on Twitter. As a starting point, see the following previous issues of RRN: Diane Holmberg on getting research coverage in the popular press (2003); Amy Muise on the pros, cons, and best practices for working with the media (2013); and Elizabeth Bernstein on building relationships with journalists (2013).

The membership of IARR is interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary, which lends itself well to thinking about the big picture, communicating with audiences outside our disciplines, and building broad networks. Many of our members have existing relationships with the media and ties to other associations that prioritize public scholarship (e.g., Council on Contemporary Families, Scholars Strategy Network).

Sometimes achieved as a side effect of helping people have better relationships, relationship scientists may contribute both by informing the public about how we do our science and/or advocating for social science more broadly. For those interested in advocating for social science and/or connecting with policymakers, this guide and this book may be particularly useful.

Additional Links to Helpful Organizations and Public-Facing Research Outlets

Science of Relationships, a counterforce against faux "relationship experts" providing research-based insight about relationships.

JSPR Relationship Matters podcast, a partnership between SAGE and the Science of Relationships featuring relationship scholars discussing their research.

The Conversation, an independent news source written by academics and researchers. (Available in Africa, Australia, Canada, France, Indonesia, United Kingdom, and United States editions.)

The Op-Ed Project, which offers individual and university op-ed training programs.

(USA) Council on Contemporary Families, an organization of research professionals that provides the press and the public with the latest research and best practices about American families.

(USA) Consortium of Social Science Associations, an advocacy organization that lobbies for the use and funding of social science research.

(USA) Imagining America, a consortium of universities committed to promoting publicly engaged scholarship, advancing diversity and inclusion, and leadership and mentoring in social justice work.

(USA) The Scholars Strategy Network, an association of university-based scholars dedicated to improving public policy and strengthening democracy. We connect scholars and their research to policymakers, media, and civic organizations.

I hope you find these resources a useful introduction to public scholarship. If you are a new professional and interested in discussing publicly engaged scholarship, please do not hesitate to contact me (natalie@scholars.org).

TEACHING COLUMN

Teaching Spotlight on Gary Lewandowski

By Cheryl Harasymchuk
Carleton University

Gary Lewandowski is a Professor at Monmouth University and has been honing his skills as an educator for the last 15 years (all while juggling his successful research program, Science of Relationships website and writing textbooks). Here is a recent conversation I had with Gary about his teaching experiences.

Do you have any teaching heroes?
I have two. The first is Dr. Susan Luek at Millersville University of Pennsylvania. She taught my very first psychology course. She showed me the importance of being rigorous and how you can have high standards while still having students enjoy the course. My other teaching hero is Art Aron who impressed upon me a very practical approach to teaching research methods and statistics. When you saw Art teach stats it was clear that he truly wanted his students to understand the process, rather than simply get the correct answers.

List two things you love about teaching and two

of your pet peeves related to teaching.
Love 1: There is no better feeling than pushing a student to achieve something that is beyond what she or he thought themselves capable of. When students are held to high standards and receive encouragement and empowerment along the way, they often surprise themselves with the final product.
Love 2: I love how as a professor we get to play a small part in our students' lives, during a period of intense self-development. I'm routinely amazed at the transformation my students undergo even over one semester, and certainly from the beginning to end of college.
Pet Peeve 1: Professors blaming students. Whether in the form of "today's students don't…" or "millennials can't…" or just simply chastising students for decidedly human behavior, I think profs could be more forgiving. Sure, students are late to class, check their phones, don't follow instructions, miss deadlines, etc. But everyone does these things, including faculty members. (Don't think so? Take a look around the room at your next large faculty meeting…)
Pet Peeve 2: The rare times when doing teaching observations and I'm forced to sit through Power Point slides packed with words as the professor reads the slide and students dutifully copy every word. Class time is a precious resource and this type of instruction seems like a missed opportunity to really discuss and debate ideas.

What is one of your favorite teaching assignments related to relationships?
I've increasingly become more of a fan of giving students less guidance/restrictions/rules on major assignments. Instead, I want to give some large guidelines and then leave it up to them to do something they like. My favorite assignment is what I've been doing recently where I tell students they have to do something that makes relationship science understandable and useful to a non-expert audience. They have to work in at least 10 sources and the final product should not be a research paper. Students really dislike the ambiguity at first (and that's partially the point), but ultimately rise to the challenge and produce really amazing projects. I've had several really clever board games, TV shows, relationship news programs, magazines, and an original relationship song that the student performed alongside a lyric video with supporting citations and imagery. The best part is that my students are all more creative than I ever could be, so if I had given more guidance they may never have done such interesting projects.

My first-year students love your Science of Relationships book and I wondered what prompted you to write a book like that?
The impetus came from conversations I was having with colleagues (primarily Ben Le & Tim Loving) about how so little of the quality relationship science that we do, makes its way into the world where people might benefit. I felt (and still do) that there is a need for writing that bridges the gap between journal articles and advice-based mass market books. The catch is that staying true to the science while writing in an engaging way is really difficult, but is a balance I think we've done relatively well in the book and on the website.

Do you use your Science of Relationships website to promote teaching in the classroom?
I primarily use the website as a way to promote interest in our field. Students really seem to like the site's format and writing style, so I use it to supplement topics I'm covering in class and to serve as coverage of topics I'm not able to get to. I think it is really important to show them ways to keep learning about relationships once the semester is over so the site has been really great for that. I also encourage students to use the site to get ideas for their thesis projects.

How much of your teaching experiences went into writing your 'Discovering the Scientist Within' textbook?
All of it. :) I had taught methods in a very traditional way, very successfully for many years, but always felt the course was underserving the students. Every department requires the course for every student, but I wasn't teaching it in a way that had every student in mind. Instead, I was trying to produce future researchers who would go to grad school like I had. When I thought about what was really important about the course, it had much more to do with trying to get students to think more scientifically about their world. My colleague Natalie Ciarocco and I completely overhauled our course to focus more on thinking through the research process, how that critical thinking and decision-making builds employable skills, and ultimately how science is inherently interesting when you pose interesting

questions. Students responded really well to the new format and as an instructor it was a refreshing and a much more enjoyable way to teach. It has been so fulfilling to hear how much students enjoy reading the textbook and how they truly appreciate how useful methods are.

What do you think is most important to be an effective teacher?

As teachers we have to keep the big picture in mind. Teaching isn't merely about transferring information to students. First, so many other mediums are capable of doing that already (cf. books, websites, podcasts, etc.) Not to mention that as science progresses, information changes. Rather, our job is to train students to think differently about their world, including being more skeptical, critical of information, and simply to ask more questions. Hard questions are more helpful to the world than easy answers any day.

Dr. Gary W. Lewandowski Jr. received his Ph.D. in Social/Health Psychology from the SUNY-Stony Brook working with Art Aron. Currently, he is a Professor and Chair at Monmouth University. Dr. Lewandowski's research, writing, and public speaking focuses on romantic relationships and the self (with a focus on self-expansion) and the scholarship of teaching and learning (SoTL). Dr. Lewandowski's research and writing on relationships has been featured in a number of media outlets including: *The New York Times, CNN, The Atlantic, Scientific American, USA Today, and The Washington Post.* He is a Co-Founder of www.ScienceOfRelationships.com, and co-author of *Discovering the Scientist Within: Research Methods in Psychology*.

FEATURE ARTICLE

Raising Funds to Support Research

By Anita P. Barbee
University of Louisville
President-Elect, IARR

Several texts have been written on how to manage an academic career, including raising funds to support research (Darley, Zanna, Roediger, 2004; Shepherd, 2016; Sternberg, 2016). I write this column from my personal experience, which is somewhat idiosyncratic given that I received my Ph.D. in Social Psychology (1988), but within five years found myself working in a School of Social Work (1993). Although I have primarily conducted research as an academic in a university setting, the applied nature of my adopted field likely gave me advantages unavailable to those interested primarily in basic research questions. Thus, in this column I will share examples from my own journey in securing extramural funding for research and demonstration projects in the United States, as well as principles that can be applied to scholars interested in more basic funding avenues as well as applied ones.

The Changing Context of Academia

I cannot talk about this topic without first making some comments about the context in which relationship research has been conducted over the past 25 years. First of all, well-trained relationship researchers in top tier Research I universities have mostly been able to secure at least some funding from the National Institutes of Health (NIH) or the National Science Foundation (NSF) in the United States, and the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada, for their research on a variety of relationship topics. Certainly, those topics that are theoretically rich and can be tied to mental health outcomes. Obtaining such funding was a bit easier in the 1980s and 1990s, when the field was smaller and funds were more abundant. In the last 15 years, as funds have tightened and neuroscience has been promoted, funding for relationship research has become more competitive, so that even well- designed studies are not funded. That is not to say that young scholars should not work towards obtaining such funding, especially those whose major professors were funded through these avenues or who have already received NIH funding for dissertations or post-doctoral studies. But, for those outside of those circles, or for those worried about the current political environment, other options might be worth considering.

Emphasis on Extramural Funding

Second, the emphasis on securing extramural funding has increased exponentially over the past 25 years. Although top private and public universities have always relied on extramural funding for research and infrastructure, during the years when the amount of federal and private funding for research was increasing (in the 1980s, 1990s and into the 2000s), state allocations to support public universities were shrinking. Thus, there was a push, particularly at public research universities, for faculty with extramural support to increase it and for faculty without such funding to secure it. The goal was to not only enhance the university's prestige, but to secure the overhead funds in order to make up for shrinking state support. In essence, university administrators expected researchers to do their fund-raising job for them. This pressure is highest for those in the bench sciences and medicine, but has steadily increased for those in the social sciences, as well.

Team Up and Think Applied

This pressure to secure extramural funds is unlikely to ever go away and is increasingly changing the nature of what it means to be a tenure-track professor. The good news is that another shift in the research landscape is towards more interdisciplinary, multi-disciplinary or transdisciplinary research. In this context, scholars from across the university, from Arts and Sciences, social work, medicine, engineering, law, and business, work together to solve intractable problems that have cross-cutting disciplinary solutions. So, for example, scholars from communication, family studies as well as the humanities can join with scholars in the sciences and business to work on important research projects. But, this means that while young scholars are developing their own lines of research and striving to prove that they are independent and accomplished scholars in their own fields, they must now spend some time networking with scholars from across the university in hopes that they can form successful teams and secure extramural funding together.

As a result of this push, some institutions now require that Assistant Professors secure extramural funding in the form of a federal grant before they receive tenure. This is especially challenging for qualitatively-oriented relationship scholars and those with purely basic research interests. So, between the general push for funds and the emphasis on interdisciplinary work, these trends are likely to force increasing emphasis on applied research questions. The implications are that new and even more established scholars should probably add to their research lines at least one question that has a clear applied focus, preferably in areas of high demand that could bring value to projects being conducted in medicine, engineering, business or social work. An alternative is to offer methodological or statistical expertise to transdisciplinary projects, which may suffice and still allow time for your own research.

A related point here is the strength of teams. I never write a grant proposal entirely on my own. I always gather a team of people to participate in the grant, beginning with the brainstorming phase. I may go to a quiet place and write much of each proposal, but I also ask for pieces from the grant team I have assembled and get their feedback all along the way. The team includes not only university faculty but also research staff, students, and community partners. Thus, in-between grant proposals, part of my preparation for the next proposal is building relationships with colleagues within my School and across the university and the nation, as well as building relationships with community partners. This is part of my preparation so that when a Request for Proposals (RFP) is released, I can secure letters of support, vitas, and other needed materials from everyone in a short period of time. And, it makes writing grant proposals, securing the funding, and running the projects much more fun and rewarding. Teamwork makes the lift lighter. One of the reasons IARR is such an important organization for building such relationships within and across colleges and universities is that it is interdisciplinary. There is no other place where I can meet and learn from relationship scholars from fields outside my own. Many collaborations on books, chapters, articles and grants have come from these cross-disciplinary professional relationships forged at IARR conferences.

Think Private Sector

Third, in the US, where knowledge, science and academia are increasingly undervalued and under attack, and where on-line education is being increasingly pushed, expect a disruption of the academic enterprise as we know it. It is difficult at this point to read the tea leaves, but there is a strong narrative undermining the value of a college/university degree as an aspiration for potential students or for higher education institutions as places to be protected, so that knowledge and innovation move forward. Unfortunately, business folks caught on to the fact that universities have been raking in large sums of money both from student tuition and grants. In order to divert that money to the private sector, a smear campaign has been promoted against the academy by those greedy for the dollars earmarked for tenure-track faculty and research. I have noticed over the past 10 years that knowledge generation, translation, and utilization is increasingly happening in the private sector, such as hospitals, industry, consulting firms, think tanks, and related entities. More and more of the grant funds and contracts that used to exclusively go to universities are now going to these private firms. I expect this trend to continue. For graduate students reading this article and for scholars in their early to mid-careers, aiming for jobs in or building collaborative relationships with well-endowed private research universities, top 20 public universities, or the private sector (like Mathematica, ICF International, PIRE and other consulting, research and evaluation firms) might be important for future planning.

Steps in Securing Funding

As noted above, if a new scholar comes from a top institution, has landed a job in a top institution, has already established relationships with top scholars in the field, or secured NIH funding for dissertations or post-doctoral fellowships, they are likely to be able to move into this world without too much trouble. But, these fortunate few will need to continue those relationships in order to write successful proposals. When a scholar has access to examples of successful proposals, enlists the help of mentors to serve as reviewers of the grant before it is submitted, and includes top scholars on proposals as consultants, the probability of success of the proposal substantially increases.

Importance of Networks and Feedback

I have spent my career at an urban university with a short history of extramural success that only achieved Research I status as I was beginning my work. Our School decided to take on a serious research focus in the late 1990s. One strategy our School used to help junior faculty develop relationships with top researchers in their fields of study was to offer a mentoring program. In the program, the faculty member identifies a top researcher in their field with NIH, NSF or other federal funding. They ask the faculty member, usually at another university, to be their mentor for one year. The School pays the faculty member $2,000 so that they can either go to visit the faculty mentor one or two times during that year or so that the faculty mentor can come to Louisville. The faculty mentor receives a gratis faculty appointment at our School so that they can add the role and status to their own vita. The contract the mentor and mentee draw up is that the two of them will work together on either a grant proposal the young faculty member is submitting or the young faculty member is invited to work on a grant project with the mentor. So far, every faculty member with a mentor has received foundation or NIH funding as a direct result of the relationship with the mentor. This mechanism has helped our faculty gain some necessary writing, methodological, and networking skills, while at the same time enhancing their confidence in the grant writing enterprise. It has paid off for them and for our School. We also pay top scholars to review our NIH grant proposals before they go out the door. This resource has helped improve our proposals and helped a few of them to be funded.

Steady Progress Running and Publishing Studies

What networked scholars already know and what others may want to emulate in preparation for writing a grant with NIH or NSF is the additional importance of conducting a series of rigorous studies in a line of research, publishing those studies in the best journals possible, and securing small intramural grants or foundation grants to collect pilot data before seeking a larger grant. The reputation of the PI, the testing of the methodology to be utilized in the funded study to show that it is feasible, and the ability to secure and run small grants are all pre-requisites to being allowed entre into the competitive space of NIH and NSF. As a bonus, these steps also can help in securing other types of federal funding from such entities as the Department of Defense (DoD), Administration on Children and Families (ACF), Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA), and National Institutes of Justice (NIJ) or from large Foundations such as the MacArthur Foundation, the William T Grant Foundation, the Ford Foundation, or the Kellogg Foundation.

Ask and Ye Shall Receive

Before accepting a position at a college or university, it is important during negotiations to ask for lab space, one-way mirrors for observational studies, any recording equipment needed in labs or out in the field, and other equipment, computer software or funds needed to pay research participants as part of the start-up package. Asking for a stipend to support a doctoral student assistant as part of the start-up package can help with data collection, data entry, data cleaning and some data analyses. Such resources give the new scholar time to write up studies conducted in graduate school or a post-doctoral fellowship and help him or her run a few studies for publishing and piloting purposes in preparation for a funding proposal.

It is also important to have a comprehensive budget for such needs worked out to present to the dean, chair, and faculty search committee, for when the discussions move to that point. Some new scholars make the mistake of believing that they will be more desirable as a candidate for a faculty position if their needs are modest. Others believe that they can make requests for resources after they settle in to their new job. Both assumptions are mistaken. A well-reasoned request for resources conveys a favorable image of thoughtfulness and ambition, and allows the chair and search committee to secure the requested funds from upper administration sources. Both opportunities fade after the hire is made.

Small Grants and Piloting

The first place to apply for pilot study funds is through the intramural funding sources the college or university offer. If the start-up funds help support studies during the first two years on the job, a small intramural grant or foundation grant can support research the next two years so that by the fifth year, a larger grant proposal can be attempted. It may take up to two years to get a major federal grant funded due to the high probability that the first proposal will be rejected. The university grants management office should have access to databases that generate granting agencies in your area of research. Meeting with the staff person who manages those databases and helping them understand your work with some good key words can help you be alerted to opportunities as they arise. One place they may purchase the rights to is the Foundation Center (www.foundationcenter.org). This resource can let you know about funding agencies in your state or local community, as well as the types of organizations and work the foundation has funded in the past. There are also some foundations that seek to support relationship research like the John Templeton Foundation. Even big Foundations, like the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation, have small grant options. So, if any of your work is related to health, RWJ is a good place to start.

Build It and They Will Come

Because I moved to a School of Social Work early in my career, I jumped into a very applied area that allowed me to use my knowledge of child development, families, and relationships as well as my methodological skills. My first projects at the Kent School of Social Work were evaluating a federally funded training program for child welfare workers, teaching them about substance abuse and how that problem affects families and may lead to maltreatment as well as how to work with families in such a way as to detect substance abuse problems and refer them to the appropriate treatment. I understood the content of the training from my background in Social Psychology with a co-Major in Child and Family Studies, and I knew how to design evaluation studies of programs. That consulting job gave me an entry to a position at the School working on a state contract to serve as the evaluator of all training for child welfare workers across the state of Kentucky. Those were both small grants that funded my time and the time of some staff and students. After a few years, I became a full-time faculty member and took over as PI of the training evaluation contract, expanded it to include other training offered by the same agency, and added side projects to evaluate innovations in the agency. Even though the work was very applied, I based the research questions in theory, used the most rigorous methods available, used the most reliable and validated measures, developed a model of how to best evaluate this type of intervention, and published the work we did. The field needed more rigor, so our team was able to fill a void, and I quickly gained a reputation as a strong methodologist and innovator. Within five years I had secured my first federal grant.

Build Relationships with Community Based Agencies

Using the field of child welfare as an example, it is important for relationship researchers to know that there are applied fields of study with steady streams of funds used for improvement and evaluation purposes in need of research and content expertise. Every state has a child welfare agency and many states utilize federal funds to contract with university based scholars, usually in Schools of Social Work, but sometimes in other departments, to administer pre-employment educational stipend programs and post-employment training programs for employees, as well as evaluation studies of these and other programs. For example, we have held an evaluation contract with the state to evaluate programs and training for 25 years to the tune of $7.6 million (an average of $300,000 annually). This work has funded students and staff and given us opportunities to do some actual research on real world problems in the field. In addition, there is a federal agency, the Children's Bureau, which administers funds to states, tribes and territories to serve children removed from their families to the foster care system due to child abuse and neglect. This same agency administers funds for capacity-building in these jurisdictions, demonstration grants, and research grants to test the efficacy of various practice and workforce interventions. My colleagues and I have secured seven grants from the Children's Bureau for research and demonstration projects totaling close to $19 million. Many of the proposals built on the research and findings emanating from that state contract work. All this is to say that looking for opportunities to contribute knowledge and skills to needy areas, investing in smaller grants and opportunities, and finding ways to build in more basic research questions, even in applied work, can help a researcher build towards the larger grant opportunities whether that is on your own or as part of a larger interdisciplinary team of researchers at the university.

Advocate for Overhead and Travel Funds

Another area for advocacy in your universities and departments is to ask for a portion of grant overhead funds to be allocated to the principal investigator (PI) as an incentive for grant writing and execution. Ten percent of the overhead funds from the $48 million in grants I and my colleagues have secured goes to my School and another 10% of the overhead funds goes to the PI into a research incentive fund (RIF) account. Those funds cover some expenses that are not permitted by the direct cost funds of the grants, such as the purchase of phone lines and computers and some of our travel. They also have allowed us to cover expenses such as unbudgeted equipment or paying participants on MTurk for student-run dissertations and small basic research studies. This is an added way that I have raised revenue for research purposes.

The additional travel funds raised through this mechanism have allowed me and my colleagues to present papers at numerous conferences annually. The networking that is done at those conferences has also been an invaluable part of the growth of my research portfolio. I continue to collaborate with relationship researchers at other universities because we see one another regularly at IARR Conferences. I am often asked to write chapters for books, join editorial boards of journals, or review for grant panels because of the people I have met at social work, child welfare, and training conferences.

Applied Relationship Research Avenues

In collaboration with my colleagues, we have also been able to secure funding of about $15 million for our applied relationship research over the past 11 years. Academics from other fields like Education, Family Studies, Family Therapy, Psychology, Sociology or Communication could receive the same type of funding. These studies have focused on testing the efficacy of various domestic violence programs and healthy relationship curricula on various outcomes such as reductions in intimate partner violence, reductions in high risk sexual behavior, reductions in teen pregnancy, reductions in the spread of sexually transmitted diseases, enhanced relationship skills, enhanced parenting skills, and increased involvement of fathers with children. We have received funding from the Violence Against Women Act-VAWA, the Healthy Marriage Initiative, and the Fatherhood Initiative- mostly through the Office of Family Assistance, but also through the Children’s Bureau (both part of DHHS, ACF). And, for our teen pregnancy prevention work, we have received funds from the Office of Adolescent Health where we conducted a cluster randomized controlled trial with almost 1500 youth testing the efficacy of two interventions compared to a control intervention. The healthy relationship based curriculum which embedded comprehensive sex education material inside of a curriculum emphasizing healthy relationship skills and intimate partner violence prevention information, *Love Notes*, performed better than a typical teen pregnancy prevention intervention or the control condition. Our current teen pregnancy work is being funded by the ACF, Family and Youth Services Bureau (FYSB). All of these are examples of alternate funding streams that can facilitate relationship scholarship.

Military, Mental Health and Addiction

So, when meeting with your university grants management officer to generate ideas for funding announcements to send your way, think about agencies besides NIH and NSF. The military spending is not going away anytime soon. If you can get your foot in that door, there are millions of dollars allocated for understanding family dynamics, domestic violence, managing PTSD at home, preventing suicide, helping children of military personnel cope with the trauma of separation or death of a parent, etc. All are topics of interest to the military. The DoD is a place to start, but each branch of the military has funding, some of which goes to these softer topics of family, mental health and trauma management. Related to these topics on mental health and substance abuse and the impact on families is work coming out of SAMHSA- which funds Centers on Trauma and demonstration projects on mental health and substance abuse treatment. They are always interested in understanding the role family members and significant others play in treatment compliance and triggering of episodes and relapse. We are in the middle of an epidemic with the opioid crisis, so funding is likely to increase in the near future.

Health

If you have any interest in health, the Centers for Disease Control also funds both research and demonstration projects. The Health Resources and Services Administration (HRSA) funds education and some applied research. Although the Office of Adolescent Health is being phased out by the current administration, the Family and Youth Services Bureau is picking up much of the funding aimed at family planning, abstinence education and relationship education. This is where you might also consider joining forces with colleagues from medicine, nursing, public health, social work or dentistry. Social support, couple coping, managing stress, and medication adherence all have a relationship component to them. One of my colleagues has an Endowed Chair in Oncology Social Work because of her research on couples coping with cancer. This field is wide open for application of relationship theory and findings for preventing, treating and coping with illness. Much of this work is being conducted overseas. USAID, Fulbright and other funders are interested in applications and adaptations of interventions and learning in other countries, as well.

Youth, Violence, Coercion and Education

If you have interest in domestic or dating violence, sexual coercion, or other forms of violence prevention or treatment, the CDC is one place to look as is the National Institute of Justice and OJJDP. Developing relationships with the juvenile justice system, youth detention centers, runaway shelters or other youth serving organizations can give you partners in writing grants. Certainly one system that is often a good partner where grant writing is concerned is one's local public school system. The Department of Education is funding numerous projects on what works in education, interventions to manage behavior and emotional problems of students entering the school system, and reducing disproportionality and disparities in terms of school discipline and outcomes.

Write Grant Proposals

In the mid-1990s, before I wrote my first federal grant proposal, I called one of my graduate school professors, Abe Tesser, and I said," Abe, what is the key to securing extramural funding?" He said, "Write grant proposals." He had to repeat this phrase several times before I finally got his point. Although preparation, matching the idea to the right granting agency, finding grant opportunities, networking with colleagues across your university, following directions, getting feedback on proposals, and partnering with community based agencies for applied work are all important, the MOST important thing to do is to write the proposal. Get over the fear and the worry and just write the grant proposal. You will get feedback that will teach you something. Eventually you will get funded.

I have written or co-written 80 grant proposals; 50% were funded. So, although my track record over a 20-year period is pretty good, the most important point here is that I WRITE GRANT PROPOSALS. I consider one of my jobs to be GRANT WRITING. Why is that important? Because, as you can see, some we win, some we lose. With each proposal, we get a little bit better, a little bit sharper and clearer, a little bit closer to what the funder wants to see. We are also trusted with more resources as we gain more experience. The first federal grant we secured was in partnership with a community based agency, and we only received $50,000 for the evaluation portion of the project. For my second federal grant as PI we received over $500,000. Ten years later, we received a grant worth almost $5 million, and last year I was part of a Consortium that received a grant worth $15 million. I tell you this to a) illustrate the importance of writing grant proposals, b) to demonstrate the role of experience and perseverance, and c) that this was accomplished at an under resourced institution. If we can secure these types of funds, so can you!

Do a Good Job

The final point is that once you write the proposal and get the grant, do a good job executing the project. Take it seriously. Follow all the rules- just as you did when completing the grant application. Turn in all bi-annual and final reports, make sure your university manages the funds appropriately and turns in their reports on time, attend all conferences and meetings, stick with the timeline, do everything you promised. If you cannot do so, let your program officer know why not, and seek their help in coming up with a solution to the problem or a way to make up for the loss. You are building a reputation in that granting agency. Some federal officers never leave and will tell others in the agency about how you were as a grantee. Other federal project officers move around, so your reputation will follow you to other agencies too. This will be to your benefit if you are remembered as a good grantee. This will be to your detriment if you get any black marks on your record. It does not mean you will get every grant you write for that agency in the future, but it does mean that when you do receive high scores on proposals, the program officers will vouch for your competence and consistency so that chances of winning the award are heightened.

Enjoy It

Most of the grant proposals that I write are in response to an RFP. This means that the agency is asking for very specific things they want to see in the proposal, but also allowing for creativity and any strengths you and your team can bring to a project. In addition, it means that there are about six weeks to turn the entire proposal around- up to 100 pages- with many appendices and forms, and budgets and justifications. It is a rush to write this type of grant. There is the rush of new ideas and imagining how an intervention can be installed and a research study can be conducted. There is the pulling together of all the puzzle pieces and bringing together of colleagues and partners. There is the drama of the looming deadline and rush to get it all written, perfectly addressing each and every question or criterion. There is the inevitable last minute snag of one type or another, overcoming the obstacle and successfully pushing the “send” button with the final product. It can be addicting, especially when there is the exhilaration of getting the letter telling you the grant was funded. That sensation may be followed by a feeling of dread, anxiety or panic when you realize you have to do everything you promised. But doing the work, engaging with the participants, analyzing the results, and making a difference in the field is gratifying. Even unsuccessful proposals can be fun in the writing. Rejection letters can bring the relief that you do not have to do that one now… maybe someday. Other times, when working on a manuscript or a chapter, you remember, “I wrote about this in that grant proposal… it wasn’t funded but the literature is perfect for this section,” or “the reasoning there is worth repeating in this chapter.” Seldom does the work I pour into a proposal not end up sharpening my thinking, adding to my knowledge of a subject or end up in another proposal or product. That means that I am targeting my work appropriately and not wasting time on projects in which I have little connection to or interest.

So, the opportunity to write grant proposals can be seen as a gift; a gift to your imagination, to your knowledge base, to your writing skills, and to your output. You can see running grant projects as a gift as well: a chance to work with colleagues and students; a chance to help an agency or social problem; a chance to engage youth; a chance to contribute to the economic well-being of your community; a chance to change your own skills in management, implementation and research; a chance to add to the literature, to knowledge, to academe. Ultimately, grants are not an end in themselves, but merely a vehicle to allow you to do the work you love and disseminate the findings in presentations and publications and hopefully to make a difference. Keep the end in mind, enjoy the journey, and you will look back on your career and be glad you took a chance to find funding for your research.

References

Darley, J., Zanna, M., Roediger, H. (2004). *The Compleat Academic (Second Edition).*

Sternberg, R. (2016). *Starting Your Career in Academic Psychology.*

JOURNALS UPDATE

Personal Relationships Report

By Deborah Kashy
Editor of PR

This past June, my editorial team and I marked our first anniversary at Personal Relationships. I would like to thank Julie Fitness, her team of associate editors, and members of the editorial board for their service to PR. Papers handled by our new team will begin appearing in print in the December issue (Volume 24, issue 4). My current editorial team includes Robert Ackerman, Claudia Brumbaugh, Megan Dillow, Michael Marks, and Lisa Neff. Three other members of my editorial team, Omri Gillath, Joe Pittman, and Brent Mattingly have ended their work for PR, and I would like to thank each of them for their dedicated efforts to the journal and IARR. Omri, who served as an associate editor for many years with Julie Fitness and agreed to stay on for a year in my term, has been snatched up by Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin. Joe has been pulled away by the powerful lure of retirement, and Brent is editing for JSPR with Geoff McDonald. I would also like to thank members of the editorial board and the many ad-hoc reviewers who contribute their time and efforts to PR. Finally, I have to thank Rachel Harvey who has served as the editorial assistant and problem-solver-in-chief for the past decade.

New and notable: PR is bringing back Distinguished Scholar Articles, a series featuring contributions by eminent relationship researchers. I am happy to report that our first two distinguished scholars will be Jeff Simpson and David Kenny. We anticipate recruiting several more influential relationships scholars for additional articles over the next three years.

Call for proposals for a Special Issue: We are now calling for proposals for a special issue to be published in PR in 2019. Topic area is open. Proposals should include a brief statement of the focal issues to be addressed by papers in the special issue. Key considerations for successful proposals include a broad base of researchers contributing to that area of scholarship as well as general interest of the topic to the IARR membership. If you are interested in serving as editor for a special issue, please email me at kashyd@msu.edu to initiate a discussion.

Report on the current standing of PR: I am happy to report that our teams of AEs and reviewers have consistently increased the speed with which papers are moving through the editorial process. There have been significant drops in the mean length of time from submission to first decision. In the past year our average time to first decision was approximately 60 days. Our acceptance ratio remains steady at about 21%.

I do have some concerns about PR, however. As you may know, Personal Relationships actually belongs to the IARR membership -- we contract with Wiley to publish it, but the journal itself belongs to us. It is therefore my responsibility to report to you on the current status of our journal. Unfortunately, the report is not as positive as it has been in the recent past. The impact factor for the journal has dropped from a high of 1.41 in 2013 to our current value of .74. In addition, the number of submissions has also dropped from its high of 244 in 2015-2016 to 193 in 2016-2017. This year, we are on track to drop again, although the decrease in submissions will likely be smaller (about 10-15 papers). I am concerned that the drop in submissions may be related to the drop in impact factor. I am therefore hoping that by directly alerting you to PR's current standing, I can encourage you to submit your high quality research to us for publication. As editor, my goal is for PR to be the premier outlet for interdisciplinary research on relationships of all types. It should be where you and your students go to read about newest developments, and where you are proud to place your own work.

Increasing the likelihood of success. I would like to note a few attributes of papers that are more likely to be accepted for publication in PR. Julie Fitness was particularly eloquent in her editor's statement in the November 2014 issue of RRN. She noted: "In short, the papers that fare the best in our review system have something original and interesting to say, are underpinned by coherent, integrative theorizing, demonstrate methodological rigor, and make a substantive contribution to our understanding of important relationship-related issues." Breaking this down, two key factors that increase the likelihood of success at PR include:

A sound theoretical rationale for the study. This is one of the most common criticisms reviewers raise. Papers need to establish why the research is important to the field. Simply stating that there hasn't been research in an area is unconvincing. Instead, your introduction should inform readers about the ways in which knowledge gained from your study will enhance the scientific understanding of relationships. In addition, papers that specifically address cross-cultural issues need to provide a clear discussion for why results might be expected to be similar or different across the cultures involved. Like IARR, PR is an international journal and we are very interested in publishing research conducted in non-North American countries and cultures. However, simply replicating well established findings in other cultures that have been shown in North America is generally not sufficient to warrant publication.

Strong methods. This is a very broad area as it concerns issues of sampling, the nature of data collection, replication (among others), data analysis, and statistical power. Other things being equal, studies that go beyond convenience samples, studies involving longitudinal designs, and studies with larger samples are more likely to be published. That being said, we also acknowledge that sometimes with specialized populations, it can be difficult to recruit research participants, and so samples may be small. In such cases we encourage authors to be sure that their discussion of results is appropriately calibrated to the strength of the evidence their study provides. However, we would also like to note that even cross-sectional studies using convenience samples are more likely to be published if replications (i.e., 2 or more studies that show similar findings) are included. Likewise, for experimental designs, showing that the phenomena emerge in more than a single study increases the likelihood of success. In short, our editorial group would like to emphasize the importance of replicability of research findings and methodological rigor. We have found that manuscripts reporting a single survey cross-sectional design based on a convenience sample rarely rise to the contribution level required for papers that are successful in PR.

In conclusion, in a time when other journals limit authors by placing restrictions on word- and page-lengths, PR imposes no such restrictions. Moreover, when you submit manuscripts to PR, you can expect to receive high-quality feedback in a timely manner. Thus, as editors of your journal, we strongly encourage you to submit your best work to PR for publication. We also strongly encourage you to review for PR, and if you have not reviewed for us in the past but are willing to do so, please contact me at kashyd@msu.edu so we can add you to our reviewer system.

Journal of Social and Personal Relationships Report

By Geoff MacDonald Editor of JSPR

In July of this year, JSPR underwent substantial turnover in our associate editor team. I am very grateful for the hard work and dedication of Kathy Carnelley, René Dailey, Lara Kammrath, Jody Kellas, and Matt Montoya who left the AE team after 2.5 year terms.

I was very fortunate to recruit some outstanding academics to become part of the new AE team. Graham Bodie, Sean Horan, Andy Merolla, Brian Ogolsky, Tila Pronk, Angela Rowe, and Casey Totenhagen are our new AEs beginning their 2.5 year terms. They will be joining a group of AEs who will be staying on for an additional 2.5 years that includes: Kari Adamsons, Susan Boon, Melissa Curran, Brent Mattingly, and Jennifer Theiss. In addition, JSPR's outstanding editorial assistant, Jessica Maxwell, will also be staying in that role. All together it's a fantastic team and I am grateful for everyone's contribution to JSPR's efforts.

You may notice that we are bringing in two more AEs than are leaving. This is a reflection of the high volume of articles being submitted to JSPR. In fact, Sage and IARR have agreed to expand JSPR to 10 issues per year (from 8) in order to accommodate the volume and cut down on our backlog of in press papers.

Finally, keep an eye out for two very exciting special issues to appear in JSPR in 2018. Lara Kammrath, Melissa Curran, and Jean-Philippe Laurenceau have assembled a special issue on statistical and methodological issues in relationship research that will be available online shortly and will be officially published at the start of 2018. In addition, Amy Muise and Emily Impett are in the process of finalizing a special issue on sexuality in the context of relationships that will appear in summer of 2018. Both of these special issues feature outstanding articles from top scholars in their respective areas and will provide excellent, cutting-edge primers for researchers both new to and familiar with these topics.

Journal of Social and Personal Relationships
November 2017 [Volume 34, Issue 7]
Table of Contents

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Call for Papers

IARR Conference
Fort Collins, CO July 12-16, 2018

Get your submissions ready for the biennial conference of the International Association for Relationship Research in Fort Collins, CO July 12-16th, 2018! The submission portal for abstracts will open on November 1st, 2017 and submissions will be accepted until December 15th at 11:59pm in the last time zone on earth.

Individuals submitting a single presentation for consideration as either a talk or poster will be asked to submit two abstracts: (a) a shorter abstract consisting of no more than 100 words, to be used for the conference program and (b) a longer abstract consisting of no more than 350 words, to be used for review/evaluation purposes. Individuals wishing to submit an organized symposium for consideration will be asked to submit an abstract of no more than 350 words summarizing the theme of the symposium, along with the short and long abstracts for each of the individual talks in the session. Priority will be given to papers that have completed data collection prior to abstract submission. An individual may be a presenting/first author on **one submission** only.

There are many exciting events planned for the conference that are included with the registration price including several cocktail parties (one with a live band), karaoke at the on-campus brewery in the Lory Student Center at Colorado State University, and a banquet awards dinner. There are also many optional activities you can add on to your conference experience (e.g., brewery tours, white water rafting, hiking in the Rock Mountain foothills), and early registrants can also get tickets for a newcomer-old timer social networking event or free tasters at New Belgium Brewery.

Whether you decide to stay at the conference hotel or in on-campus housing, there are very affordable options. In addition, after submitting an abstract you will have access to an on-line conference discussion forum where you can connect with other attendees, find roommates, etc.

For more details and to stay up-to-date on conference activities, please visit www.iarrconference.org

Hope to see you in Colorado next summer!

Jennifer J. Harman, PhD
Zeynep Biringen, PhD
Co-Chairs, Conference Planning Committee
Colorado State University

Lisa Neff, PhD
Chair, Program Committee
The University of Texas at Austin

ATTENTION STUDENT MEMBERS OF IARR

Announcing the 2018 IARR Conference Student Submission Awards!

Please note that this is an early announcement. You cannot apply for this until early in 2018, after receiving notification of a submission acceptance for the IARR 2018 main conference.

If you meet the eligibility criteria below, please consider applying (in late Feb.) for a reduced conference registration award. The award consists of $135, which would be applied toward the cost of registration (this translates to about ½ of the registration fee, and you would still be responsible for the other ½). These awards are intended to help defray the expense of attending the 2018 IARR Conference in Fort Collins, Colorado particularly for student members who are traveling longer distances to attend conference.

Award eligibility criteria are:
Status as a current student member of IARR (go to www.iarr.org to join if you are not already a member); being an author of an accepted submission (an oral presentation or a poster);

willingness to volunteer 1-2 hours at the conference

In addition, the following criteria will be utilized if there are more applicants than funding:
Distance to Fort Collins; not having received a registration award for a prior IARR conference; number of years of membership in IARR

Specific directions for how to apply will be sent through email announcements and will be on the IARR website by January. If you have any questions at this stage, write to Susan Sprecher (sprecher@ilstu.edu).

Call for Nominations IARR Awards

Awards for Publications

Article Award: IARR, 2018
This award honors an article published by a current member of IARR in *Personal Relationships* or *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships* during 2015 or 2016 that has made a significant and original contribution to the study of personal relationships. The Awards Committee will review all the articles published in PR and JSPR during those years, but letters of nomination (self or from others) that note the contributions of particular articles are welcome. All nominations **must be received by November 10, 2017.** Please send any nominations to the Chair of the Awards Committee, Anita Vangelisti (email: vangelisti@austin.utexas.edu).

Book Award: IARR, 2018

This award honors a book published by a current member of IARR during 2015 or 2016 that has made a significant and original contribution to the study of personal relationships. Nominations should include:
* A letter of nomination that describes the contributions of the book, and
* Five copies of the book forwarded from the publisher, or online access to the book made available to the committee.

Self or other nominations are welcome. All books and nominating statements **must be received by November 10, 2017**. Please send both books and nominating statements to the Chair of the Awards Committee, Anita Vangelisti (email: vangelisti@austin.utexas.edu). Address: Dr. Anita Vangelisti, Department of Communication Studies, 1 University Station, A1105, The University of Texas at Austin, Austin, TX 78712-1105, USA.

Professional Awards

Note that for all the awards listed below, all nominations and letters of support must be provided by current members of IARR (with the exception of students who may write letters of support).

Self or other nominations are welcome for all the awards listed below. All materials **must be received by 1 February, 2018.** All the relevant material should be emailed to the Chair of the Awards Committee, Anita Vangelisti (email: vangelisti@austin.utexas.edu).

International Scholar Award

This award honors the scientific and/or capacity building activities of IARR members who are non-native English speaking scholars with a Ph.D. or equivalent degree. The scholar needs to be a citizen in a developing or least developed country. For a listing of countries from which scholars are eligible to apply, please see the United Nations listing of developing and least developed countries at http://unstats.un.org/unsd/methods/m49/m49regin.htm#developed. Nominees will be judged on their accomplishments relative to their opportunities.
Nominations should include a statement that describes the accomplishments of the nominee in relation to the advancement of the science of relationships within their respective country and/or abroad through (1) the conduct of high quality research (including research outputs in language(s) other than English), and/or (2) the organization of capacity building activities for other non-English speaking relationship scholars. In addition, two letters supporting the nomination are required.

IARR Fellows

Fellow status will be awarded to IARR members who have made sustained, outstanding contributions to the scientific study of relationships, in the areas of research, teaching, service, and/or application. Candidates will only be considered after 10 years of postdoctoral contribution. Nomination materials should include a nomination letter, the nominee’s current CV, and two additional letters of support.

Steve Duck New Scholars Awards (2 awards)

These awards provide small grants ($500) to (1) a graduate student and to (2) a new scholar (within 3 years of receiving his or her Ph.D.) in support of their research on personal relationships. Self-nominations are expected, and should include:

A proposal (5 page maximum) that outlines the relevant literature, the purpose and hypotheses of the research, the proposed design and methodology, and a budget that clearly indicates how the grant monies will be used to support the project, the applicant's curriculum vitae, and a letter of recommendation from an informed colleague.

Teaching Award

This award recognizes excellence in teaching in the field of personal relationships at the undergraduate and/or graduate level. Nominations should include:

A teaching portfolio that includes (a) a statement of teaching philosophy, (b) sample syllabi, and (c) summaries of course evaluations, the nominee's curriculum vitae, and two letters of support from colleagues and two letters of support from current and/or former students.

Mentoring Award

This award recognizes an outstanding mentor in the field of personal relationships. Nominations should include: A letter of nomination that describes the manner in which the mentoring relationship has advanced the professional development of those who were advised, supported, or sponsored by the mentor, the nominee's curriculum vitae, and up to three additional letters of support.

Gerald R. Miller Award for Early Career Achievement

This award honors the distinguished scientific achievements of scholars who are still within 10 years of receiving their Ph.D. degrees.

Nominations consist of: A letter of nomination that describes the accomplishments of the nominee, the nominee's curriculum vitae, and two additional letters supporting the nomination.

Berscheid-Hatfield Award for Distinguished Mid-Career Achievement

This award honors the distinguished scientific achievements of scholars who are in the middle stages of their careers, that is, between 10 and 25 years post-Ph.D. Nominations consist of: A letter of nomination that describes the accomplishments of the nominee, the nominee's curriculum vitae, and two additional letters supporting the nomination.

Distinguished Career Award

This award recognizes a full career of eminent, notable contributions to research and theory in relationship science. The award is intended to acknowledge a long span of work that has enriched our understanding of personal relationships and contributed much to the field. Nominations consist of: A letter of nomination that describes the accomplishments of the nominee, the nominee's curriculum vitae, and two additional letters supporting the nomination.

Dissertation Award

This award honors an outstanding dissertation in the field of personal relationships that was defended from October 2015 to October 2017. A small cash prize is presented ($300). Nominations consist of: A letter of nomination from the dissertation advisor, and a summary (3 page maximum) of the dissertation. Nominees advancing to a second round of evaluation will be asked to provide an electronic copy of either the full dissertation or a manuscript that reports the research.

Call for Nominees
IARR Election

Please Submit Nominations (including Self-nominations) by February 1, 2018

Each year IARR elects various officers for positions that will start on August 1st. In 2018, the IARR Elections Committee seeks nominees (including self-nominees) for the following 5 positions: Vice-President, Secretary, Member-at-Large, Publication Committee Chair, New Professional Member.

Please submit nominations (including self-nominations) by **February 1** to the Elections Committee chair, Jeff Simpson (simps108@umn.edu). Once nominations have been received, the Elections Committee will identify two nominees to run for each position. Thus, being nominated does not guarantee one will appear on the ballot. Careful consideration, however, will be given to all nominations.

Prior involvement with IARR is desirable, but not required. All nominees will be reviewed by the Elections Committee to ensure candidates are current IARR members.

Thank you for participating in the nomination process.

The IARR Elections Committee
Jeff Simpson, Chair
John Caughlin
Diane Felmlee
John Holmes
Nickola Overall
Jennifer Theiss

Call for Nominees
Editor of *Relationship Research News, 2019 - 2021*

The IARR Publications Committee is soliciting nominations for editor of the Relationship Research News (RRN) to succeed Brian Ogolsky, whose editorial term ends with the November issue of 2018. Ideally, the new Editor will be selected by July of 2018 and shadow Dr. Ogolsky's production of the November 2018 issue. The IARR Handbook indicates that the newsletter editor shall normally serve for a three-year period. The editor, with the assistance of Associate Editors recruited by the Editor, shall prepare editions of the newsletter for regular distribution to the members and to subscribers. Currently IARR is publishing two electronic issues of RRN per year, each of approximately 20-30 pages. The newsletter is also available on the IARR website shortly after its electronic distribution. The incoming editorial team's first issue will be the published in May 2019, and the last issue will be in November of 2021. The IARR publication committee is open to discussing with candidates other models for the newsletter.

Self-nominations for this important and rewarding role are welcomed. A completed nomination packet should include a vita, the names of two references, and a letter addressing such issues as goals for the newsletter and description of how the candidate would run the newsletter.

All nominations should be received on or before January 1, 2018. (We encourage preliminary notification if you are planning to apply.) Nominations should be sent (electronically) to Beverley Fehr, Chair of the Publications Committee at bfehr@uwinnipeg.ca.

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