

PSYCH 448R CLOSE RELATIONSHIPS**Winter 2017****Instructor: Dr. Denise Marigold****When:** Tuesday 11:30am-2:20pm **Room:** REN 2918**Email:** dcmarigold@uwaterloo.ca **Phone:** 519-884-4404 ext. 28619**Office Hours:** Before or after class, or by appointment **Office:** REN 1602**COURSE DESCRIPTION AND LEARNING OBJECTIVES**

This course will focus on the life cycle of adult close relationships, ranging from stages of initial attraction and the development of an attachment, to growth and maintenance of the relationship, to conflict and in some cases, dissolution. We will examine current theories and research in the social psychological study of close relationships to gain a better understanding of the basic processes involved in intimate relationships. The assignments in this seminar will help you develop more effective oral and written communication skills. More specifically, by the end of the course you should be able to:

1. Describe how relationships develop and change over time using the most influential theories and frameworks in relationships research.
2. Discuss the roles of individual and contextual factors in shaping relationship behaviour.
3. Critically evaluate and integrate research from various scientific sources.
4. Operationalize variables of interest and design studies to effectively answer questions about relationship behaviour.
5. Evaluate the accuracy of media claims about relationships (e.g. advice) using scientific sources.
6. Gain insight into your own relationships experiences by applying research on relationship processes.

REQUIRED READINGS:

The required readings for each week can be found on the Learn website.

ASSIGNMENTS AND EVALUATION:

1) Attendance and Participation	20%
2) Thought Papers	15%
3) Seminar Leadership	20%
4) Scenario Analysis Exam	20%
5) Final Paper	25%

1) Attendance and Participation (20%)

DUE: Throughout the course

A seminar course is only successful if students attend and participate regularly. The criteria for evaluating class participation will be based on a student's understanding of material, the ability to foster discussion, demonstration of an understanding for others, and willingness to engage in seminar activities. Discussion is essential to the development and articulation of ideas. Discussion, like writing, is often hard work, requiring preparation and commitment. It also takes practice. Writing bi-weekly thought papers on the readings and attending class with several critical questions for that week's theme may assist with participation. When you are uncertain about something, please say so during class. You will be helping the group as a whole clarify ideas. If you are having difficulties with participation or course material, do not hesitate to meet with me for strategies.

In the last hour of each class, students will be given a research question related to that week's topic and asked to design a study that would effectively answer that question. In small groups you will then discuss your ideas and decide on one study which you will present briefly to the rest of the class for discussion. Students will evaluate their own and their group members' contribution to the study design and this will form 10% of your participation mark. The remaining 10% will be based on your attendance and contributions to class-wide discussions.

2) Thought Papers (15%)

DUE: Midnight on each Sunday before class (submitted to Learn Discussion Forum)

Every other week each student will complete a half-page single-spaced thought paper in response to the required readings (a total of 5 thought papers throughout the term). Thought papers are an opportunity for you to describe your reactions to the readings, critique one or two points, or raise new questions. Although these are not meant to be formal papers, the quality of your writing will be considered in your grade so be sure to organize your thoughts and write clearly. Students are expected to read each others' thought papers prior to class and be prepared to comment on others' ideas to stimulate class discussion.

Note that seminar leaders are not required to submit a thought paper. If your presentation falls on the same week your thought paper is due, you may skip that week.

3) Seminar Leadership (20%)

DUE: See schedule of readings

In groups of 2 or 3, students will be responsible for leading one hour of the seminar during the term (starting in Week 3). Each member will present a summary of one of the articles listed in the course outline for their chosen week. The summary should include a short description of the background of the topic, explanation of the methods and results (presenting these in graphs or tables is helpful), and some conclusions. Seminar leaders should prepare some questions based on their article to generate class discussion. Each article presentation should take no longer than 10 minutes. In addition, each leader should provide a one page summary of their presented article to classmates.

Although each member of the group is responsible for presenting an article individually, group members should work together to come up with examples from television, film, music, books, news media, internet, or other "lay" sources where this topic is represented to examine how scientific research results compare to popular notions of relationship processes. Class activities (e.g. questionnaires, demonstrations, role-plays) may be incorporated in the presentation in addition to the class discussion. Students may use Powerpoint if they wish. Together, group members should present a conclusion that summarizes the articles' findings and includes concrete suggestions for future research.

Seminar leadership will be evaluated according to: demonstrated knowledge and understanding of the topic, critical examination of readings/resources, communication of the material (presentation and summary hand-out), and engagement level of the class (activity). I will provide you with more detailed evaluation criteria early in the course.

4) Scenario Analysis – Open-Book Exam (20%)

DATE: March 21 (Week 11)

Students will be given stories of several couples' relationship trajectories (circumstances around the initiation, growth, and maintenance or dissolution of their relationships). You will use the theories discussed in the course to explain the couples' perceptions and behaviours, and suggest reasons why the relationship progressed as it did. You must cite specific articles from the course (either the required reading or seminar leaders' articles) to back up your analysis. You may bring all the articles to the exam with you. If you do the weekly readings, attend class, and participate in discussions, you should be well-prepared for this exam.

5) Final Paper: Thriving Relationships or Research Proposal (25%)

DUE: April 4 before midnight

For the final paper, you will write an article geared towards a popular Psychology magazine (e.g., Psychology Today). The question you are trying to answer for readers is "What makes close relationships thrive?" You may choose any topic in the relationships literature to focus on. You will need to concisely communicate the findings of at least three empirical articles on your topic (only one of the articles may be on the course reading list). You will integrate these findings, and any related theories or frameworks, to convey to your 'lay' audience practical advice for facilitating a thriving relationship. Use personal anecdotes, hypothetical scenarios, and media representations of your phenomena to make your article engaging for the reader, while still maintaining scientific integrity.

Alternatively, you can choose to write a research proposal. You will write the introduction and methods sections of an empirical journal article, and a limited discussion section (as you will not have actual results to discuss). You must reference at least three different articles.

Your paper should be about 5 pages double-spaced. APA format is required.

Assignment Deadlines

You are responsible for informing me in advance if you are unable to complete an assignment by the scheduled date. Missed due dates are only acceptable in the case of health problems (with a note from a doctor or counsellor) and for serious compassionate reasons. Late submissions, without advance permission, will be given a 10% reduction in the total possible grade for each 24 hours after the due date. No assignments will be accepted if submitted more than one week after the deadline.

WEEK 1 – Jan. 3: Introduction

WEEK 2 – Jan. 10: Relationship Initiation

Required Reading:

Jordan, C.H., & Zanna, M.P. (1999). How to read a journal article in Social Psychology. In R. F. Baumeister (Ed.), *The Self in Social Psychology* (pp. 461-470). Philadelphia: Psychology Press.

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.

Professor's Articles:

Luo, S., & Zhang, G. (2009). What leads to romantic attraction: Similarity, reciprocity, security, or beauty? Evidence from a speed-dating study. *Journal of Personality*, 77, 933-964.

Eastwick, P.W., & Hunt, L.L. (2014). Relational mate value: Consensus and uniqueness in romantic evaluations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 106, 728-751.

Cameron, J.J., Stinson, D.A., Gaetz, R., & Balchen, S. (2010). Acceptance is in the eye of the beholder: Self-esteem and motivated perceptions of acceptance from the opposite sex. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 99, 513-529.

WEEK 3 – Jan. 17: Attachment Style

Required Reading:

Mikulincer, M., & Shaver, P.R. (2005). Attachment theory and emotions in close relationships: Exploring the attachment-related dynamics of emotional reactions to relational events. *Personal Relationships*, 12, 149-168.

La Guardia, J.G., Ryan, R.M., Couchman, C.E., & Deci, E.L. (2000). Within-person variation in security of attachment: A self-determination theory perspective on attachment, need fulfillment, and well-being. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 79, 367-384.

Seminar Leaders' Articles:

McClure, M.J., Lydon, J.E., Baccus, J.R., & Baldwin, M.W. (2010). A signal detection analysis of chronic attachment anxiety at speed dating: Being unpopular is only the first part of the problem. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 36, 1024-1036.

Collins, N.L., Ford, M.B., Guichard, A.C., & Allard, L.M. (2006). Working models of attachment and attribution processes in intimate relationships. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 32, 201-219.

Marshall, T.C., Benjanyan, K., Di Castro, G., & Lee, R.A. (2013). Attachment styles as predictors of Facebook-related jealousy and surveillance in romantic relationships. *Personal Relationships*, 20, 1-22.

WEEK 4 – Jan. 24: Self-Regulation and Goals

Required Reading:

Murray, S.L., Holmes, J.G., & Collins, N.L. (2006). Optimizing assurance: The risk regulation system in relationships. *Psychological Bulletin*, *132*, 641-666.

Fitzsimons, G.M., & Finkel, E.J. (2011). Outsourcing self-regulation. *Psychological Science*, *22*, 369-375.

Seminar Leaders' Articles:

Impett, E.A., Gordon, A.M., Kogan, A., Oveis, C., Gable, S.L., & Keltner, D. (2010). Moving toward more perfect unions: Daily and long-term consequences of approach and avoidance goals in romantic relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *99*, 948-963.

Finkel, E.J., Campbell, W.K., Brunell, A.B., Dalton, A.N., Scarbeck, S.J., & Chartrand, T.L. (2006). High-maintenance interaction: Inefficient social coordination impairs self-regulation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *91*, 456-475.

Peetz, J., & Kammrath, L. (2011). Only because I love you: Why people make and why they break promises in romantic relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *100*, 887-904.

WEEK 5 – Jan. 31: Commitment

Required Reading:

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*, 357-391.

Lydon, J.E. (2010). How to forego forbidden fruit: The regulation of attractive alternatives as a commitment mechanism. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, *4*, 635-644.

Seminar Leaders' Articles:

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.

Wieselquist, J., Rusbult, C. E., Foster, C. A., & Agnew, C. R. (1999). Commitment, pro-relationship behavior, and trust in close relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *77*, 942-966.

Schoebi, D., Karney, B.R., & Bradbury, T.N. (2012). Stability and change in the first 10 years of marriage: Does commitment confer benefits beyond the effects of satisfaction? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *102*, 729-742.

WEEK 6 – Feb. 7: Marriage

Required Reading:

Huston, T.L. (2009). What's love got to do with it? Why some marriages succeed and others fail. *Personal Relationships*, 16, 301-327.

Finkel, E.J., Hui, C.M., Carswell, K.L., & Larson, G.M. (2014). The suffocation of marriage: Climbing Mount Maslow without enough oxygen. *Psychological Inquiry*, 25, 1-41.

Seminar Leaders' Articles:

Schoenfeld, E.A., Bredow, C.A., & Huston, T.L. (2012). Do men and women show love differently in marriage? *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 38, 1396-1409.

Doss, B.D., Rhoades, G.K., Stanley, S.M., & Markman, H.J. (2009). The effect of the transition to parenthood on relationship quality: An 8-year prospective study. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 96, 601-619.

Grote, N. K., & Clark, M. S. (2001). Perceiving unfairness in the family: Cause or consequence of marital distress? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 80, 281-293.

WEEK 7 – Feb. 14: Sex

Required Reading:

McNulty, J.K., Wenner, C.A., & Fisher, T.D. (2016). Longitudinal associations among relationship satisfaction, sexual satisfaction, and frequency of sex in early marriage. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 45, 85-97.

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

Seminar Leaders' Articles:

Mark, K.P., Milhausen, R.R., & Maitland, S.B. (2013). The impact of sexual compatibility on sexual and relationship satisfaction in a sample of young adult heterosexual couples. *Sexual and Relationship Therapy*, 28, 201-214.

Fallis, E.E., Rehman, U.S., & Purdon, C. (2014). Perceptions of partner sexual satisfaction in heterosexual committed relationships. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 43, 541-550.

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

WEEK 8 – Feb. 28: Relationship Maintenance

Required Reading:

Knee, C. R. (1998). Implicit theories of relationships: Assessment and prediction of romantic relationship initiation, coping, and longevity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 74, 360-370.

Neff, L.A., & Karney, B.R. (2009). Stress and reactivity to daily relationship experiences: How stress hinders adaptive processes in marriage. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 97, 435-450.

Seminar Leaders' Articles:

Stafford, L., & Merolla, A.J. (2007). Idealization, reunions, and stability in long-distance dating relationships. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 24, 37-54.

Laurenceau, J.P., Barrett, L.F., & Rovine, M.J. (2005). The interpersonal process model of intimacy in marriage: A daily-diary and multilevel modeling approach. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 19, 314-323.

Gable, S.L., Reis, H.T., Impett, E.A., & Asher, E.R. (2004). What do you do when things go right? The intrapersonal and interpersonal benefits of sharing positive events. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 87, 228-245.

WEEK 9 – Mar. 7: Insecurity and Self-Fulfilling Prophecies

Required Reading:

Stinson, D.A., Cameron, J.J., Wood, J.V., Gaucher, D., & Holmes, J.G. (2009). Deconstructing the "reign of error": Interpersonal warmth explains the self-fulfilling prophecy of anticipated acceptance. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 35, 1165-1178.

Marigold, D. C., Holmes, J.G., and Ross, M. (2007). More than words: Reframing compliments from romantic partners fosters security in low self-esteem individuals. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 92, 232-248.

Seminar Leaders' Articles:

Murray, S.L., Griffin, D.W., Rose, P., & Bellavia, G.M. (2003). Calibrating the sociometer: The relational contingencies of self-esteem. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 85, 63-84.

Downey, G., Freitas, A.L., Michaelis, B., & Khouri, H. (1998). The self-fulfilling prophecy in close relationships: Rejection sensitivity and rejection by romantic partners. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 75, 545-560.

Lemay, E.P. Jr., & Clark, M.S. (2008). "Walking on eggshells": How expressing relationship insecurities perpetuates them. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 95, 420-441.

WEEK 10 – Mar. 14: Conflict and Aggression

Required Reading:

Finkel, E.J., Slotter, E.B., Luchies, L.B., Walton, G.M., & Gross, J.J. (2013). A brief intervention to promote conflict reappraisal preserves marital quality over time. *Psychological Science*, *24*, 1595-1601.

Finkel, E.J., DeWall, C.N., Slotter, E.B, McNulty, J.K., Pond Jr., R.S., & Atkins, D.C. (2012). Using I³ theory to clarify when dispositional aggressiveness predicts intimate partner violence perpetration. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *102*, 533-549.

Seminar Leaders' Articles:

Christensen, A., & Heavey, C. (1990). Gender and social structure in the demand/withdraw pattern of marital conflict. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *59*, 73-81.

Simpson, J. A., Rholes, W. S., & Phillips, D. (1996). Conflict in close relationships: An attachment perspective. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *71*, 899-914.

Frye, N.E., & Karney, B.R. (2006). The context of aggressive behavior in marriage: A longitudinal study of newlyweds. *Journal of Family Psychology*, *20*, 12-20.

WEEK 11 – Mar. 21: Relationship Interventions Scenario Analysis (Open-Book Exam)

Required Reading:

Cordova, J.V., Jacobson, N.S., Christensen, A. (1998). Acceptance versus change interventions in behavioral couple therapy: Impact on couples' in-session communication. *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy*, *24*, 437-455.

Johnson, M.D. (2012). Healthy marriage initiatives: On the need for empiricism in policy implementation. *American Psychologist*, *67*, 296-308.

WEEK 12 – Mar. 28: Relationship Dissolution

Required Reading:

Davis, D., Shaver, P.R., & Vernon, M.L. (2003). Physical, emotional, and behavioral reactions to breaking up: The roles of gender, age, emotional involvement, and attachment style. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *29*, 871-884.

Kellas, J.K., Bean, D., Cunningham, C., & Cheng, K.Y. (2008). The ex-files: Trajectories, turning points, and adjustment in the development of post-dissolutional relationships. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, *25*, 23-50.

Seminar Leaders' Articles:

Eastwick, P.W., Finkel, E.J., Krishnamurti, T., & Loewenstein, G. (2008). Mispredicting distress following romantic breakup: Revealing the time course of the affective forecasting error. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 44*, 800-807.

Slotter, E.B., Gardner, W.L., & Finkel, E.J. (2010). Who am I without you? The influence of romantic breakup on the self-concept. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 36*, 147-160.

Sbarra, D. A, Smith, H. L., & Mehl, M. R. (2012). When leaving your ex, love yourself: Observational ratings of self-compassion predict the course of emotional recovery following marital separation. *Psychological Science, 23*, 261-269.

Accommodation for Illness or Unforeseen Circumstances:

The instructor follows the practices of the University of Waterloo in accommodating students who have documented reasons for missing quizzes or exams. See http://www.registrar.uwaterloo.ca/students/accom_illness.html

Academic Integrity:

Academic Integrity: In order to maintain a culture of academic integrity, members of the University of Waterloo are expected to promote honesty, trust, fairness, respect and responsibility.

Discipline: A student is expected to know what constitutes academic integrity, to avoid committing academic offences, and to take responsibility for his/her actions. A student who is unsure whether an action constitutes an offence, or who needs help in learning how to avoid offences (e.g., plagiarism, cheating) or about “rules” for group work/collaboration should seek guidance from the course professor, academic advisor, or the Undergraduate Associate Dean. When misconduct has been found to have occurred, disciplinary penalties will be imposed under Policy 71 – Student Discipline. For information on categories of offenses and types of penalties, students should refer to Policy 71 - Student Discipline, <http://uwaterloo.ca/secretariat/policies-procedures-guidelines/policy-71>.

Grievance: A student who believes that a decision affecting some aspect of his/her university life has been unfair or unreasonable may have grounds for initiating a grievance. Read Policy 70 - Student Petitions and Grievances, Section 4, <http://uwaterloo.ca/secretariat/policies-procedures-guidelines/policy-70>. In addition, consult <http://arts.uwaterloo.ca/student-grievances-faculty-arts-processes> for the Faculty of Arts' grievance processes.

Appeals: A student may appeal the finding and/or penalty in a decision made under Policy 70 - Student Petitions and Grievances (other than regarding a petition) or Policy 71 - Student Discipline if a ground for an appeal can be established. Read Policy 72 - Student Appeals, <http://uwaterloo.ca/secretariat/policies-procedures-guidelines/policy-72>.

Academic Integrity website (Arts):

http://arts.uwaterloo.ca/arts/ugrad/academic_responsibility.html

Academic Integrity Office (uWaterloo): <http://uwaterloo.ca/academic-integrity/>

Accommodation for Students with Disabilities:

Note for students with disabilities: The AccessAbility Services (AS) Office, located in Needles Hall, Room 1401, collaborates with all academic departments to arrange appropriate accommodations for students with disabilities without compromising the academic integrity of the curriculum. If you require academic accommodations to lessen the impact of your disability, please register with the AS Office at the beginning of each academic term.

The use of Turnitin in this course:

Turnitin.com: Plagiarism detection software (Turnitin) will be used to screen assignments in this course. This is being done to verify that use of all material and sources in assignments is documented. In the first week of the term, details will be provided about the arrangements for the use of Turnitin in this course.

Note: students must be given a reasonable option if they do not want to have their assignment screened by Turnitin. See <http://uwaterloo.ca/academic-integrity/integrity-waterloo-faculty/turnitin-waterloo> for more information.

Intellectual Property. Students should be aware that this course contains the intellectual property of their instructor, TA, and/or the University of Waterloo. Intellectual property includes items such as:

- Lecture content, spoken and written (and any audio/video recording thereof);
- Lecture handouts, presentations, and other materials prepared for the course (e.g., PowerPoint slides);

- Questions or solution sets from various types of assessments (e.g., assignments, quizzes, tests, final exams); and
- Work protected by copyright (e.g., any work authored by the instructor or TA or used by the instructor or TA with permission of the copyright owner).

Course materials and the intellectual property contained therein, are used to enhance a student's educational experience. However, sharing this intellectual property without the intellectual property owner's permission is a violation of intellectual property rights. For this reason, it is necessary to ask the instructor, TA and/or the University of Waterloo for permission before uploading and sharing the intellectual property of others online (e.g., to an online repository).

Please alert the instructor if you become aware of intellectual property belonging to others (past or present) circulating, either through the student body or online.

A respectful living and learning environment for all.

1. It is expected that everyone living, learning or working on the premises of Renison University College will contribute to an environment of tolerance and respect by treating others with sensitivity and civility.
2. Harassment is unwanted attention in the form of jokes, insults, gestures, gossip, or other behaviours that are meant to intimidate. Some instances of harassment are against the law in addition to Renison University College policy.
3. Discrimination is treating people differently because of their race, disability, sex, sexual orientation, ancestry, colour, age, creed, marital status, or other personal characteristics. The Ontario Human Rights Code considers actions and behaviours rather than intentions.
4. If you experience or witness either harassment or discrimination, you may contact the Renison University College Harassment and Discrimination Officer at megan.collings-moore@uwaterloo.ca (519-884-4404, ext. 28604).