

## **Interpersonal Behavior and Relationships**

**Psychology 838**

**Fall 2020**

**Mondays 3:00PM-5:50PM**

**Location: Zoom**

**<https://msu.zoom.us/j/96366148245>**

**Instructor:** Bill Chopik

**Email:** [chopikwi@msu.edu](mailto:chopikwi@msu.edu)

**Office:** 254 Psychology

**Office Hours:** By appointment

### **Course Overview**

#### **Course Goals**

The overarching goal of this course is to provide an introduction to theory and research relevant to our understanding of close relationships. The seminar is necessarily broad and covers most of the dominant perspectives and traditions in relationships research in social/personality today—biology/evolutionary psychology approaches, interdependence theory, culture and context, attachment theory. Methodological advances and new emerging trends (e.g., sexuality and sexual behavior, technology) in the field of close relationships will also be covered. At the end of the course, you will have a firm grasp of what the new trends in the field are, representative findings in relationship science, an intuition about the dominant theoretical perspectives, and an idea about where the field is going.

A secondary goal is to give you professionalization opportunities. Specifically, you will be tasked with leading and facilitating class discussions, interacting with visiting speakers, and producing an end-of-semester project that will give you experience in study design or grant writing. Throughout the course, there will be opportunities to discuss professionalization issues as well.

#### **Readings**

There is no required textbook for the course. Copies of each week's readings will be available at <https://d2l.msu.edu/>. If you have trouble accessing any of the course material, please contact me.

We'll be drawing on chapters from multiple books about close relationships. I recommend getting them eventually, but they are not required for the course. Below are just a few suggestions if you wanted a more "deep dive" into the field. The Bradbury/Karney book is an undergraduate textbook.

Cassidy/Shaver is the definitive text about attachment theory (I read it cover-to-cover my first semester of grad school). Vangelisti/Perlman will provide the most comprehensive and current overview of the field; the chapters are written by a who's who of the field. Kenny/Kashy/Cook provides an accessible introduction to dyadic data analyses. Other texts exist and I'm happy to provide recommendations but these would be a good start if you wanted to learn more about the field.

Bradbury, T. N. & Karney, B. R. (2013). *Intimate Relationships (2nd edition)*. New York: W. W. Norton.

Cassidy, J., & Shaver, P. R. (2016). *Handbook of attachment: Theory, research, and clinical applications (3<sup>rd</sup> edition)*. New York: Guilford Press. (I like the 2008/2<sup>nd</sup> edition slightly more).

Kenny, D. A., Kashy, D. A., & Cook, W. L. (2006). *Dyadic data analysis*. New York: Guilford Press.

Simpson, J. A., & Campbell, L. (2013). *The Oxford handbook of close relationships*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Vangelisti, A. L., & Perlman, D. (2018). *The Cambridge handbook of personal relationships* (2<sup>nd</sup> edition). New York: Cambridge University Press.

## **Course Requirements**

**Constructive participation in seminar (15% of your final grade).** It is critical that everyone reads the course material and participates in the seminar meetings. You are required to produce 2 discussion questions each week about the upcoming seminar meetings. If you are leading a class discussion (see next), you do not need to submit questions for that week. You must post your questions to d2L by 6:00pm on Sunday.

**Leading class discussions (15% of your final grade).** You will be required to lead discussions of readings twice during the semester. The discussion can take any form you would like but should also integrate the discussion questions posted by your classmates. When you are leading the discussion, you do not have to post questions for that week.

**Reaction papers (40% of your final grade).** You will be required to complete four reflection papers that must be at least 2 pages single-spaced written in a narrative format (1 inch margins; 12 pt font, Times New Roman). Reaction papers are meant to give you the opportunity to reflect on the readings and discussions that took place in class the previous three weeks. The first reaction paper will take a different form and will be based on an activity we complete during the first week and some discussion prompts. All papers will be submitted to d2L.

**Speaker interactions (10% of your final grade).** Part of the professionalization experience is interacting with other people you don't know who present their research. The best questions are those that are thought-provoking, challenge a speaker (in a non-antagonistic way), and prompts an answer that tells us more about relationship science. Each student is expected to ask at least 3 questions over the course of the semester.

**Complete a final project (20% of your final grade).** You must turn in a final written project that is either (a) a research proposal/design of a study examining a close relationships process or (b) a variant of an NSF/NIH grant application that proposes and justifies a study. Examples of the latter can be provided upon request. This project must be at least 3 pages single-spaced (1 inch margins; 12 pt font; Times New Roman). An outline of your topic is due on November 16<sup>th</sup> via email to me (chopikwi@msu.edu). The final project is due by 5PM on December 14<sup>th</sup>. The final project will be turned into d2L.

## **Course Schedule and Assigned Readings**

### **Week 1: Introductory Information and Fast Friends**

September 14<sup>th</sup>

No readings.

## **Week 2: History of the Field**

September 21<sup>st</sup>

Speaker: Allison Farrell, Miami University

Clark, M. S. (2018). What is good and what is missing in relationship theory and research? In A. L. Vangelisti & D. Perlman (Eds.), *The Cambridge handbook of personal relationships* (pp. 28-38). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Finkel, E. J., Simpson, J. A., & Eastwick, P. W. (2017). The psychology of close relationships: Fourteen core principles. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 68, 383-411.

Pearlman, D., Duck, S., & Hengstebeck, N. D. (2018). The seven seas of the study of personal relationships research: Historical and recent currents. In A. L. Vangelisti & D. Perlman (Eds.), *The Cambridge handbook of personal relationships* (pp. 9-27). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Reis, H. T., Aron, A., Clark, M.S., & Finkel, E. J. (2013). Ellen Berscheid, Elaine Hatfield, and the emergence of relationship science, *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 8, 558-572.

## **Week 3: Biological and Evolutionary Approaches**

September 28<sup>th</sup>

Speaker: Sara Chadwick, University of Michigan

Buss, D., & Schmitt, D. (1993). Sexual strategies theory: An evolutionary perspective on human mating. *Psychological Review*, 100, 204-232.

Eastwick, P. W. (2016). The emerging integration of close relationships research and evolutionary psychology. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 25, 183–190.

Krems, J. A., Neel, R., Neuberg, S. L., Puts, D. A., & Kenrick, D. T. (2016). Women selectively guard their (desirable) mates from ovulating women. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 110, 551-573.

Szepeswol, O., & Simpson, J. A. (2019). Attachment within life history theory: an evolutionary perspective on individual differences in attachment. *Current Opinion in Psychology*, 25, 65-70.

Optional: Eastwick, P. W. (2009). Beyond the pleistocene: Using phylogeny and constraint to inform the evolutionary psychology of human mating. *Psychological Bulletin*, 135, 794-821.

Optional: Fisher, H., Aron, A., & Brown, L. L. (2005). Romantic love: an fMRI study of a neural mechanism for mate choice. *Journal of Comparative Neurology*, 493, 58-62.

Optional: Jones, B. C., Hahn, A. C., Fisher, C. I., Wang, H., Kandrik, M., Han, C., ... & O'Shea, K. J. (2018). No compelling evidence that preferences for facial masculinity track changes in women's hormonal status. *Psychological Science*, 29, 996-1005.

Optional: Netchaeva, E., & Rees, M. (2016). Strategically stunning: The professional motivations behind the

lipstick effect. *Psychological Science*, 27, 1157-1168.

## **Week 4: Attachment Theory**

October 5<sup>th</sup>

Speaker: Thuy-vy Nguyen, Durham University

Fraley, R. C. (2019). Attachment in adulthood: Recent developments, emerging debates, and future directions. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 70, 401-422.

Fraley, R. C., & Shaver, P. R. (1998) Airport separations: A naturalistic study of adult attachment dynamics in separating couples. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 75, 1198-1212.

Girme, Y. U., Agnew, C. R., VanderDrift, L. E., Harvey, S. M., Rholes, W. S., & Simpson, J. A. (2018). The ebbs and flows of attachment: Within-person variation in attachment undermine secure individuals' relationship wellbeing across time. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 114, 397-421.

Hazan, C., & Shaver, P. (1987). Romantic love conceptualized as an attachment process. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 52, 511-524.

Optional: Arriaga, X. B., Kumashiro, M., Simpson, J. A., & Overall, N. C. (2018). Revising working models across time: relationship situations that enhance attachment security. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 22(1), 71-96.

Optional: Hadden, B. W., Smith, C. V., & Webster, G. D. (2014). Relationship duration moderates associations between attachment and relationship quality: Meta-analytic support for the Temporal Adult Romantic Attachment Model. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 18, 42-58.

Optional: Overall, N. C., & Simpson, J. A. (2015). Attachment and dyadic regulation processes. *Current Opinions in Psychology*, 1, 61-66.

## **Week 5: Interdependence Theory**

October 12<sup>th</sup>

Speaker: Elizabeth Dorrance Hall, Michigan State University

Holmes, J. G. (2004). The benefits of abstract functional analysis in theory construction: The case of interdependence theory. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 8, 146-155.

Murray, S. L., & Holmes, J. G. (2009). The architecture of interdependent minds: A motivation management theory of mutual responsiveness. *Psychological Review*, 116, 908-928.

Rusbult, C. E., & Van Lange, P. A. M. (2003). Interdependence, interaction, and relationships. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 54, 351-375.

Optional: Arriaga, X. B., & Agnew, C. R. (2001). Being committed: Affective, cognitive, and conative components of relationship commitment. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 27, 1190-1203.

Optional: Rusbult, C. E., Martz, J. M., & Agnew, C. R. (1998). The Investment Model Scale: Measuring

commitment level, satisfaction level, quality of alternatives, and investment size. *Personal Relationships*, 5, 357-387.

## **Week 6: Methodological Issues and Approaches**

October 19<sup>th</sup>

Speaker: Juliana Schroeder, University of California, Berkeley

Aron, A., Melinat, E., Aron, E. N., Vallone, R. D., & Bator, R. J. (1997). The experimental generation of interpersonal closeness: A procedure and some preliminary findings. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 23, 363-377.

Finkel, E. J., & Eastwick, P. W. (2008). Speed-dating. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 17, 193-197.

Joel, S., Eastwick, P. W., & Finkel, E. J. (2018). Open sharing of data on close relationships and other sensitive social psychological topics: Challenges, tools, and future directions. *Advances in Methods and Practices in Psychological Science*, 1, 86-94.

West, T. V. (2013). Repeated measures with dyads. In J. A. Simpson & L. Campbell (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of close relationships* (pp. 731-749). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Optional: Gillath, O., Karantzas, G. C., & Selcuk, E. (2017). A net of friends: Investigating friendship by integrating attachment theory and social network analysis. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 43, 1546-1565.

## **Week 7: Initial Attraction and Relationship Initiation**

October 26<sup>th</sup>

Speaker: David Lee, University of Buffalo

Baumeister, R. F., & Leary, M. R. (1995). The need to belong: Desire for interpersonal attachments as a fundamental human motivation. *Psychological Bulletin*, 117, 497-529.

Eastwick, P. W., & Finkel, E. J. (2008). Sex differences in mate preferences revisited: Do people know what they initially desire in a romantic partner? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 94, 245-264.

Joel, S., Eastwick, P. W., & Finkel, E. J. (2017). Is romantic desire predictable? Machine learning applied to initial romantic attraction. *Psychological Science*, 28, 1478-1489.

Knee, C., Patrick, H., & Lonsbary, C. (2003). Implicit theories of relationships: Orientations toward evaluation and cultivation. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 7, 41-55.

Optional: Engeler, I., & Raghubir, P. (2018). Decomposing the cross-sex misprediction bias of dating behaviors: Do men overestimate or women underreport their sexual intentions? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 114, 95-109.

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

## **Week 8: Relationship Commitment and Maintenance**

November 2<sup>nd</sup>

Speaker: Jaimie Krems, Oklahoma State University

Joel, S., Eastwick, P. W., Allison, C. J., Arriaga, X. B., Baker, Z. G., Bar-Kalifa, E., . . . Wolf, S. (2020). Machine learning uncovers the most robust self-report predictors of relationship quality across 43 longitudinal couples studies. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, *117*, 19061-19071.

Karney, B. R., & Frye, N. E. (2002). “But we’ve been getting better lately”: Comparing prospective and retrospective views of relationship development. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *82*, 222-238.

Neff, L.A., & Karney, B. R. (2005). To know you is to love you: The implications of global adoration and specific accuracy for marital relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *88*, 480-497.

Spielmann, S. S., MacDonald, G., Maxwell, J. A., Joel, S., Peragine, D., Muise, A., & Impett, E. A. (2013). Settling for less out of fear of being single. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *105*, 1049-1073.

Optional: Eastwick, P. W., Finkel, E. J., & Simpson, J. A. (2019). Relationship trajectories: A meta-theoretical framework and theoretical applications. *Psychological Inquiry*, *30*, 1-28.

Optional: Murray, S., & Holmes, J. (1997). A leap of faith? Positive illusions in romantic relationships. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *23*, 586-604.

## **Week 9: Relationship Dissolution, Bereavement, and Infidelity**

November 9<sup>th</sup>

Speaker: William Chopik, Michigan State University

DeWall, C. N., Lambert, N. M., Slotter, E. B., Pond, R. S., Jr., Deckman, T., Finkel, E. J., . . . Fincham, F. D. (2011). So far away from one's partner, yet so close to romantic alternatives: Avoidant attachment, interest in alternatives, and infidelity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *101*, 1302-1316.

Joel, S., MacDonald, G., & Page-Gould, E. (2018). Wanting to stay and wanting to go: Unpacking the content and structure of relationship stay/leave decision processes. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, *9*, 631-644.

Lucas, R. (2005). Time does not heal all wounds: A longitudinal study of reaction and adaptation to divorce. *Psychological Science*, *16*, 945-950.

Shaver, P. R., & Fraley, R. C. (2008). Attachment, loss, and grief: Bowlby's views and current controversies. In J. Cassidy & P. R. Shaver (Eds.), *Handbook of attachment: Theory, research, and clinical applications* (2nd Edition) (pp. 48-77). New York: Guilford Press.

## **Week 10: Technology, Social Media, and Relationships**

November 16<sup>th</sup>

Speaker: James Kim, Western University

Finkel, E. J., Eastwick, P. W., Karney, B. R., Reis, H. T., & Sprecher, S. (2012). Online dating: A critical analysis from the perspective of psychological science. *Psychological Science in the Public Interest*, 13, 3-66.

LeFebvre, L. E. (2018). Swiping me off my feet: Explicating relationship initiation on Tinder. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 35, 1205–1229.

Orben, A., & Przybylski, A. K. (2019). Screens, teens, and psychological well-being: Evidence from three time-use-diary studies. *Psychological Science*, 30, 682–696.

Saslow, L. R., Muise, A., Impett, E. A., & Dubin, M. (2013). Can you see how happy we are? Facebook images and relationship satisfaction. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, 4, 411–418.

Optional: Pronk, T. M., & Denissen, J. J. A. (2020). A rejection mind-set: Choice overload in online dating. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, 11, 388-396.

## **Week 11: Sex and Intimacy**

November 23<sup>rd</sup>

Speaker: Brittany Jakubiak, Syracuse University

Birnbaum, G. E. (2018). The fragile spell of desire: A functional perspective on changes in sexual desire across relationship development. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 22, 101-127.

Carroll, J. S., Busby, D. M., Willoughby, B. J., & Brown, C. C. (2017). The porn gap: Differences in men's and women's pornography patterns in couple relationships. *Journal of Couple & Relationship Therapy*, 16, 146-163.

Meston, C. M., & Buss, D. M. (2007). Why humans have sex. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 36, 477-507.

Muise, A., Impett, E. A., Kogan, A., & Desmarais, S. (2013). Keeping the spark alive: Being motivated to meet a partner's sexual needs sustains long-term romantic relationships. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, 4, 267-273.

Optional: Meltzer, A. L., Makhanova, A., Hicks, L. L., French, J. E., McNulty, J. K., & Bradbury, T. N. (2017). Quantifying the sexual afterglow: The lingering benefits of sex and their implications for pair-bonded relationships. *Psychological science*, 23, 587-598.

Optional: Muise, A., Boudreau, G. K., & Rosen, N. O. (2017). Seeking connection versus avoiding disappointment: An experimental manipulation of approach and avoidance sexual goals and the implications for desire and satisfaction. *The Journal of Sex Research*, 54, 296-307.

Optional: Debrot, A., Meuwly, N., Muise, A., Impett, E. A., & Schoebi, D. (2017). More than just sex: Affection mediates the association between sexual activity and well-being. *Personality and Social*

## **Week 12: Relationships and Health**

November 30<sup>th</sup>

Speaker: Samantha Joel, Western University

Christakis, N. A., & Fowler, J. H. (2007). The spread of obesity in a large social network over 32 years. *The New England Journal of Medicine*, 357, 370-379.

Kiecolt-Glaser, J., & Newton, T. (2001). Marriage and health: His and hers. *Psychological Bulletin*, 127, 472-503.

Slatcher, R. B., & Selcuk, E. (2017). A social psychological perspective on the links between close relationships and health. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 26, 16–21.

Stavrova, O. (2019). Having a happy spouse is associated with lowered risk of mortality. *Psychological Science*, 30, 798-803.

Optional: Cohen, S., & Janicki-Deverts, D. (2009). Can we improve our physical health by altering our social networks? *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 4, 375–378.

Optional: House, J., Landis, K. R., & Umberson, D. (1988). Social relationships and health. *Science*, 241, 540-545.

Optional: Pietromonaco, P. R., Uchino, B., & Dunkel Schetter, C. (2013). Close relationship processes and health: Implications of attachment theory for health and disease. *Health Psychology*, 32, 499-513.

## **Week 13: Context, Culture, and Diversity**

December 7<sup>th</sup>

Speaker: Jeffrey Stokes, University of Massachusetts, Boston

Conley, T. D., Ziegler, A., Moors, A. C., Matsick, J. L., & Valentine, B. (2013). A critical examination of popular assumptions about the benefits and outcomes of monogamous relationships. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 17, 124-141.

DePaulo, B. M., & Morris, W. L. (2006). The unrecognized stereotyping and discrimination against singles. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 15, 251-254.

Kurdek, L.A. (2004). Are gay and lesbian cohabiting couples really different from heterosexual married couples? *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 66, 880-900.

Shiota, M. N., Campos, B, Gonzaga, G. C., Keltner, D. & Peng, K. (2010). I love you but . . . : Cultural differences in complexity of emotional experience during interaction with a romantic partner. *Cognition & Emotion*, 24, 786-799.

Skinner, A. L., & Hudac, C. M. (2017). “Yuck, you disgust me!” Affective bias against interracial couples. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 68, 68-77.



Optional: DePaulo, B. M., & Morris, W. L. (2005). Singles in society and in science. *Psychological Inquiry*, 16, 57-83.

Optional: Lehmiller, J. J., & Agnew, C. R. (2006). Marginalized relationships: The impact of social disapproval on romantic relationship commitment. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 32, 40-51.

Optional: Ross, J. M., Karney, B. R., Nguyen, T. P., & Bradbury, T. N. (2019). Communication that is maladaptive for middle-class couples is adaptive for socioeconomically disadvantaged couples. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 116, 582-597.