

Syllabus



PSYC GU4695: Psychology of Close Relationships

Fall 2019

Course Information

Instructor: Usha Barahmand

Class Hours: TBD

Class Location: TBD

Credit Hours: 4

Office Hours: By appointment

E-mail: usha@barahmand.com

I will respond to any student email within 48 hours during the work week. Please do not wait until the evening before an assignment is due to contact me; I will likely not respond to questions or concerns until the next day.

Course Description

This course is an exploration of the psychology of close human relationships. Our main purpose will be on learning about the life cycle of adult intimate (i.e., romantic) relationships, ranging from stages of initial attraction and relationship initiation to growth and maintenance of the relationship, and in some cases, dissolution. Although other close relationships such as close friendships, family, and work relationships will also be addressed and integrated into the course, they will be of secondary importance. Class meetings will consist mainly of facilitated discussions and student-led presentations on topics such as the biological bases of attraction and love, commitment and interdependence, relationship cognition, attachment, communication, sexuality, relational interaction patterns, relationship satisfaction, and the social context of relationships (e.g., the influence of others) conflict, relationship dissolution, and relationship maintenance. Students are expected to read and comment on papers, participate actively in class discussions and presentations, and complete written assignments. 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 value of a seminar is a function of the quality of individual contributions to each meeting. I'll provide a basic structure for our meetings, but beyond that, the seminar will succeed on the strengths of our joint individual efforts. We're all responsible for the quality of this seminar experience. Accordingly, active participation by everyone is strongly encouraged.

Course Objectives

There are two overarching goals of the course. First, to develop a comprehensive overview of the research in relationship psychology and of its underlying theories. Second, given a realistic relationship scenario, to effectively apply, both theoretically and practically, the knowledge that you acquire in this course. Our weekly discussions and the short assignments that you will complete are intended to facilitate this process.

After completing the course, the student will be able to:

- 1) develop an understanding of theories and concepts associated with adult romantic relationships
- 2) become familiar with current scientific literature on close relationships
- 3) be able to critically evaluate research conducted on close relationships
- 4) have the opportunity to apply course material to realistic relationship scenarios

Seminar Evaluation

Seminar grades are based on the following five components, weighted as noted.

(I) Reading and Discussion (20%):

Each week, all students are responsible for reading the assigned material and are expected to actively participate in discussion. Your level of involvement will be assessed by me and constitute this component of your seminar grade.

(II) Discussion Leader (20%):

For every topic, one student will serve as lead discussant. Seminar enrollment will determine the number of times each student will serve as lead discussant. Students serving as lead discussants are responsible for leading the discussion of the assigned readings each week. The function of the discussant leader is to prepare, in advance, 8 to 10 discussion questions

pertaining to the theories, hypotheses, methods, results, broader meanings of the readings, etc. These questions should be typed and copies should be provided to all seminar participants as they will be used to direct our group discussion. Lead discussants are free to structure their questions as they wish (perhaps questioning theories, hypotheses, methods, results, broader meanings of the readings, etc.). Assignment to topics will be determined during our first meeting.

(III) Article Presentation (10%):

Each student will prepare and make a presentation of one of the empirical articles relevant to close relationships listed below for each class topic. These presentations serve two functions. First, they are a means of exposing the class to research beyond the articles that all of us read. Second, they are a means of learning an important skill -- how to present an empirical paper in a limited amount of time. *In 15 minutes*, you will *summarize* the (a) theory and hypotheses, (b) method, (c) results, and (d) broader relevance of an article. Making appropriate use of visual media, covering only what absolutely needs to be covered, and presenting clearly what you have to say in no more than 15 minutes (the typical time allotted at a conference) are essential components of an effective academic presentation.

(IV) Hypothesis Testing (20%):

Empirical testing of both established and new ideas advances our understanding of close relationships. Because all seminar topics are active areas of research, each is amenable to hypothesis testing. To that end, each seminar participant will bring a hypothesis to each class meeting (only one hypothesis; typed; keep it brief, no more than a few sentences – one sentence is fine), inspired by the week's readings. We will then clarify and work out ways to test your hypotheses together at our meetings. Please bring two copies of your hypothesis to class. You will keep the first copy, noting any ideas generated by the group for referral in considering possible research proposal topics (described below). The second copy is the one you will hand in to me at the conclusion of each class. One of your hypotheses will serve as the subject of your research proposal and proposal presentation (described below).

(V) Research Proposal and Proposal Presentation (30%)

To strengthen your ability to link research hypotheses with specific operational definitions, empirical procedures, and analyses, you will prepare a research proposal based upon one of your hypotheses (described above). Proposals should include: (a) a title page; (b) an abstract page; (c) an introduction, including a discussion of relevant theory and research and development/justification of one or more testable hypotheses; (d) a method section that thoroughly describes how you plan to test your hypotheses (a description of your sample, data

collection procedure, possible scale items, etc.); (e) a discussion of how your data will be analyzed (e.g., establishing the reliability and validity of your measures; if experimental, conducting any necessary manipulation checks; specification of what sort of statistical analyses would be employed to test each of your hypotheses); (f) consideration of limitations of your proposed research; and (g) references. The proposal should be written in APA style (6th edition), and it should not exceed *15 double-spaced pages* (excluding title page, abstract page, and reference pages). Proposals are due by the last day of class (December 6). You will also make an oral presentation of your proposal to the class at one of our two final class meetings (on either November 29 or December 6). Use of PowerPoint or other visual media is encouraged. Time allocated for each presentation will be determined by seminar enrollment (generally 15 to 20 minutes per presentation).

Grading Scale:

97-100= A+
94-96= A
90-93= A-
87-89= B+
84-86= B

80-83= B-
77-79= C+
74-76= C
70-73= C-
60-69= D

Class Policies:

Academic Integrity:

As members of this academic community, we are expected to maintain the highest level of personal and academic integrity. Consider this excerpt from the Columbia University Faculty Statement on Academic Integrity: “[E]ach one of us bears the responsibility to participate in scholarly discourse and research in a manner characterized by intellectual honesty and scholarly integrity.... The exchange of ideas relies upon a mutual trust that sources, opinions, facts, and insights will be properly noted and carefully credited. In practical terms, this means that, as students, you must be responsible for the full citations of others’ ideas in all of your research papers and projects... [and] you must always submit your own work and not that of another student, scholar, or internet agent.” More information about Columbia University

[Faculty Statement on Academic Integrity can be found](https://www.college.columbia.edu/faculty/resourcesforinstructors/academicintegrity/statement)

here: <https://www.college.columbia.edu/faculty/resourcesforinstructors/academicintegrity/statement>

Plagiarism

Plagiarism – whether intentional or inadvertent – is a serious violation of academic integrity, and will thus not be tolerated. You are required to submit exclusively original work that you wrote, composed, or ideated on your own. If you are uncertain or have any questions about what constitutes plagiarism, I encourage you to read the information provided on Columbia’s website about the various forms of plagiarism and ways to avoid it. Here is the link to a relevant webpage on plagiarism: <https://www.college.columbia.edu/academics/dishonestyplagiarism>

I am obligated to report any incident of plagiarism to the appropriate channels at the university, which may result in significant penalties that may impact your academic career at Columbia. If you feel overwhelmed, confused, or that you are likely to resort to plagiarism, please talk to me. It is better to inform me beforehand so we can try and remediate the issue, whatever it might be, than to deal with such a serious offense after the fact.

Attendance:

Given the seminar style of this course, class participation, and thus attendance, is mandatory. At times, unplanned absences may occur. Such absences will be excused and not affect your final grade as long as they are documented (e.g., a dean’s note). Regardless, you will be responsible for the work due in that class, including reading responses and other requirements. Please inform me of any absences as early as possible so I can plan in advance if any changes might be needed.

Late Assignments:

In general, late assignments will not be accepted and graded. Under very certain circumstances, you will be allowed to submit your assignment within 24 hours of the due date. Such circumstances may include a sudden or unplanned event that significantly impacts your ability to submit your assignment on time.

Class Etiquette:

If you typically use your laptop for note taking, accessing the assigned readings or response papers, you are welcome to use your laptop for these purposes. In general, as a show of respect to your fellow classmates and instructor, please refrain from using electronic devices during class, including cell phones and laptops for unrelated reasons

Students with Disabilities/Exceptionalities:

Students with any disability or exceptionality that may require any accommodations are requested to contact the Office of Disability Services(ODS) in Lerner Hall before the start of the course to register for these accommodations. The procedures for registering with ODS can be found at <http://health.columbia.edu/services/ods> or by calling (212) 854-2388. I also ask that you speak with me on the first class to inform me of any required accommodations, and I would be more than happy to be of service and assistance to address them.

Typical Seminar Format:

Introductory remarks ! 10 minutes

Discussion of assigned readings ! 50 minutes

Article presentation ! 15 minutes + 5 minutes for questions

Hypothesis testing → 30 minutes

Seminar Topic Schedule

Date	Topic
Week 1	Introductions / Overview / Assignments / Welcome to Relationship Science
Week 2	Evolutionary Approaches
Week 3	Attachment Approaches
Week 4	Interdependence Approaches
Week 5	Social Cognitive Approaches
Week 6	Methodological and Data Analytic Issues in Relationship Research
Week 7	Relationship Initiation
Week 8	Relationship Commitment
Week 9	Relationship Maintenance
Week 10	Social Context and Dyadic Relationships
Week 11	Technology, Social Media and Dyadic Relationships
Week 12	Relationship Dissolution
Week 13	Research Proposal Presentations
Week 14	Research Proposal Presentations

Seminar Readings

Session 1: Welcome to Relationship Science

Assigned Reading:

Reis, H. T. (2012). A history of relationship research in social psychology. In A.W. Kruglanski & W Stroebe (Eds.), *Handbook of the history of social psychology* (pp. 213-232). New York: Psychology Press.

Campbell, L., & Simpson, J. A. (2013). The blossoming of relationship science. In J. A. Simpson & L. Campbell (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of close relationships* (pp. 3-10). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Session 2: Evolutionary Approaches

Assigned Readings:

Kenrick, D. T., Neuberg, S. I., & White, A. E. (2013). Relationships from an evolutionary life history perspective. In J. A. Simpson & L. Campbell (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of close relationships* (pp. 3-10). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Maner, J. K., & Ackerman, J. M. (2013). Love is a battlefield: Romantic attraction, intrasexual competition, and conflict between the sexes. In J. A. Simpson & L. Campbell (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of close relationships* (pp. 137-160). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Gildersleeve, K., Haselton, M. G., & Fales, M. R. (2014). Do women's mate preferences change across the ovulatory cycle? A meta-analytic review. *Psychological Bulletin*, 140, 1205-1259

Moss, J. H., & Maner, J. K. (2016). Biased sex ratios influence fundamental aspects of human mating. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 42, 72-80.

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

Potential Presentations:

Pazda, A. D., Prokop, P., & Elliot, A. J. (2014). Red and romantic rivalry: Viewing another woman in red increases perceptions of sexual receptivity, derogation, and intentions to mate-guard. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 40, 1260-1269.

Jonason, P. K., Garcia, J. R., Webster, G. D., Li, N. P., & Fisher, H. E. (2015). Relationship deal breakers: Traits people avoid in potential mates. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 41, 1697-1711.

Session 3: Attachment Approaches

Assigned Readings:

For a helpful overview of adult attachment theory and research by Chris Fraley of U of Illinois, please read the material located here:

<http://www.psych.uiuc.edu/~rcfraley/attachment.htm>

Hazan, C., & Shaver, P. R. (1994). Attachment as an organizational framework for research on close relationships. *Psychological Inquiry, 5*, 1-22

Fraley, R. C. (2002). Attachment stability from infancy to adulthood: Meta-analysis and dynamic modeling of developmental mechanisms. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 6*, 123-151.

Brumbaugh, C. C., & Fraley, R. C. (2006). Transference and attachment: How do attachment patterns get carried forward from one relationship to the next? *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 32*, 552-560.

Mikulincer, M., & Shaver, P. R. (2013). The role of attachment security in adolescent and adult close relationships. In J. A. Simpson & L. Campbell (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of close relationships* (pp. 66-89). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

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

Potential Presentations:

Arriaga, X. B., Kumashiro, M., Finkel, E. J., VanderDrift, L. E., & Luchies, L. B. (2014). Filling the void: Bolstering attachment security in committed relationships. *Social Psychological and Personality Science, 5*, 398-406.

Overall, N. C., Girme, Y. U., Lemay, E. P., & Hammond, M. D. (2014). Attachment anxiety and reactions to relationship threat: The benefits and costs of inducing guilt in romantic partners. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 106*, 235-256.

Session 4: Interdependence Approaches

Assigned Readings:

Kelley, H. H. (1991). Lewin, situations, and interdependence. *Journal of Social Issues, 47*, 211-233.

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.

Arriaga, X. B. (2013). An interdependence theory analysis of close relationships. In J. A. Simpson & L. Campbell (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of close relationships* (pp. 39-65). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Fitzsimons, G. M., Finkel, E. J., & vanDellen (2015). Transactive goal dynamics. *Psychological Review*, 122, 648-673.

Potential Presentations:

Lydon, J., & Karremans, J. C. (2015). Relationship regulation in the face of eye candy: A motivated cognition framework for understanding responses to attractive alternatives. *Current Opinion in Psychology*, 1, 10-13. VanderDrift, L. E., &

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

Session 5: Social Cognitive Approaches

Assigned Readings:

Banse, R., & Imhoff, R. (2013). Implicit cognition and relationship processes. In J. A. Simpson & L. Campbell (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of close relationships* (pp. 475-499). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Aron, A., Lewandowski, G. W., Mashek, D., & Aron, E. N. (2013). The self-expansion model of motivation and cognition in close relationships. In J. A. Simpson & L. Campbell (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of close relationships* (pp. 90-115). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

McNulty, J. K., Olson, M. A., Meltzer, A. L., & Shaffer, M. J. (2013). Though they may be unaware, newlyweds implicitly know whether their marriage will be satisfying. *Science*, 342, 1119-1120.

Tan, K., & Agnew, C. R. (2016). Ease of retrieval effects on relationship commitment: The role of future plans. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 42, 161-171.

Iannone, N. E., McCarty, M. K., & Kelly, J. R. (2017). With a little help from your friend: Transactive memory in best friendships. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships. Potential Presentations*:

Etcheverry, P. E., & Le, B. (2005). Thinking about commitment: Accessibility of commitment and prediction of relationship persistence, accommodation, and willingness to sacrifice. *Personal Relationships, 12*, 103-123.

McNulty, J. K., Baker, L. R. & Olson, M. A. (2014). Implicit self-evaluations predict changes in implicit partner evaluations. *Psychological Science, 25*, 1649-1657.

Session 6: Methodological and Data Analytic Issues in Relationship Research

Assigned Readings:

Charania, M., & Ickes, W. J. (2006). Research methods for the study of personal relationships. In A. L. Vangelisti & D. Perlman (Eds.), *The Cambridge handbook of personal relationships* (pp. 51-71). New York: Cambridge University Press.

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.

Bolger, N., Davis, A., & Rafaeli, E. (2003). Diary methods: Capturing life as it is lived. *Annual Review of Psychology, 54*, 579-616.

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

Potential Presentations:

Tenney E. R., Vazire S., Mehl M. R. (2013). This examined life: The upside of self-knowledge for interpersonal relationships. *PLoS ONE 8(7)*: e69605.

Slatcher, R. B., Selcuk, E., & Ong, A. D. (2015). Perceived partner responsiveness predicts diurnal cortisol profiles 10 years later. *Psychological Science, 26*, 972-982.

Session 7: Relationship Initiation

Assigned Readings

:

- 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.
- Knee, C., Patrick, H., & Lonsbary, C. (2003). Implicit theories of relationships: Orientations toward evaluation and cultivation. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, *7*, 41-55.
- Graziano, W. G., & Bruce, J. W. (2008). Attraction and the initiation of relationships: A review of the empirical literature. In S. Sprecher, A. Wenzel, & J. Harvey (Eds.), *Handbook of relationship initiation*, pp. 269-295. New York: Psychology Press.
- Cavallo, J. V., Murray, S. L., & Holmes, J. G. (2013). Regulating interpersonal risk. In J. A. Simpson & L. Campbell (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of close relationships* (pp. 116- 134). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Cameron, J. J., Stinson, D. A., & Wood, J. V. (2013). The bold and the bashful: Self-esteem, gender, and relationship initiation. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, *4*, 685-692.

Potential Presentations:

- Stinson, D. A., Cameron, J. J., & Robinson, K. J. (2014). The good, the bad, and the risky: Self-esteem, rewards and costs, and interpersonal risk regulation during relationship initiation. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, *32*, 1109-1136.
- Sprecher, S., & Treger, S. (2015). The benefits of turn-taking reciprocal self-disclosure in get acquainted interactions. *Personal Relationships*, *22*, 460-475.

Session 8: Relationship Commitment

Assigned Readings:

- Rusbult, C. E., Agnew, C. R., & Arriaga, X. B. (2012). The Investment Model of Commitment Processes. In P. A. M. Van Lange, A. W. Kruglanski, & E. T. Higgins (Eds.), *Handbook of theories of social psychology, Volume 2* (pp. 218-231). Los Angeles: Sage.
- 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.
- Murray, S. L., & Holmes, J. G. (2015). Maintaining mutual commitment in the face of risk. *Current Opinion in Psychology*, *1*, 57-60.

Segal, N., & Fraley, R. C. (2016). Broadening the investment model: An intensive longitudinal study on attachment and perceived partner responsiveness in commitment dynamics. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 33*, 581-599.

Lemay, E. P., Jr. (2016). The forecast model of relationship commitment. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 111*, 34-52.

Potential Presentations:

Hui, Chin Ming; Finkel, E. J., Fitzsimons, G. M., Kumashiro, M., Hofmann, W. (2014). The Manhattan effect: When relationship commitment fails to promote support for partners' interests. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 106*, 546-570.

Ogolsky, B. G., & Surra, C. A. (2014). A comparison of concurrent and retrospective trajectories of commitment to wed. *Personal Relationships, 21*, 620-639.

Session 9: Relationship Maintenance

Assigned Readings:

Aron, A., Norman, C. C., Aron, E. N., McKenna, C., & Heyman, R. E. (2000). Couples' shared participation in novel and arousing activities and experienced relationship quality. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 78*, 273-284.

Showers, C. J., & Zeigler-Hill, V. (2004). Organization of partner knowledge: Relationship outcomes and longitudinal change. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 30*, 1198-1210.

Agnew, C. R., & VanderDrift, L. E. (2015). Relationship maintenance and dissolution. In M. Mikulincer & P. R. Shaver (Eds.), *APA handbook of personality and social psychology: Vol. 3. Interpersonal relations* (pp. 581-604). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Murray, S. L., Holmes, J. G., Griffin, D. W., Derrick, J. L. (2015). The equilibrium model of relationship maintenance. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 108*, 93-113.

Cloutier, A., & Peetz, J. (2017). People, they are a changin': The links between anticipating change and romantic relationship quality. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships.*

Potential Presentations:

Girme, Y. U., Overall, N. C., & Faingataa, S. (2014). "Date nights" take two: The maintenance function of shared relationship activities. *Personal Relationships, 21*, 125-149.

Huynh, A. C., Yang, D. Y. J., & Grossmann, I. (2016). The value of prospective reasoning for close relationships. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*.

Session 10: Social Context and Dyadic Relationships

Assigned Readings:

Agnew, C. R., Loving, T. J., & Drigotas, S. M. (2001). Substituting the forest for the trees: Social networks and the prediction of romantic relationship state and fate. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *81*, 1042-1057.

Keneski, E., & Loving, T. J. (2014). Network perceptions of daters' romances. In C. R. Agnew (Ed.), *Social influences on close relationships: Beyond the dyad* (pp. 126-147). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Etcheverry, P. E., & Le, B. (2014). The influence of subjective norms on close relationships. In C. R. Agnew (Ed.), *Social influences on close relationships: Beyond the dyad* (pp. 105-125). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Etcheverry, P. E., & Agnew, C. R. (2016). Predictors of motivation to comply with social referents regarding one's romantic relationship. *Personal Relationships*, *23*, 214-233.

Feng, B., & Magen, E. (2016). Relationship closeness predicts unsolicited advice giving in supportive interactions. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, *33*, 751-767.

Potential Presentations:

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.

Besikci, E., Agnew, C. R., & Yildirim, A. (2016). It's my partner, deal with it: Rejection sensitivity, normative beliefs, and commitment. *Personal Relationships*.

Session 11: Technology, Social Media and Dyadic Relationships

Assigned Readings:

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.

Forest, A. L., & Wood, J. V. (2012). When social networking is not working: Individuals with low self-esteem recognize but do not reap the benefits of self-disclosing on Facebook. *Psychological Science, 23*, 295–302.

Marshall, T. C., Bejanyan, 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.

Emery, L. F., Muise, A., Dix, E. L., & Le, B. (2014). Can you tell that I'm in a relationship? Attachment and relationship visibility on Facebook. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 40*, 1466–1479.

Vanden Abeele, M., Schouten, A. P., & Antheunis, M. L. (2017). Personal, editable, and always accessible: An affordance approach to the relationship between adolescents' mobile messaging behavior and their friendship quality. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships.*

Potential Presentations:

Rains, S. A., & Brunner, S. R., & Oman, K. (2016). Self-disclosure and new communication technologies: The implications of receiving superficial self-disclosures from friends. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 33*, 42-61.

Gormillion, S., Gabriel, S., Kawakami, K., & Young, A. F. (2017). Let's stay home and watch TV: The benefits of shared media use for close relationships. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships.*

Session 12: Relationship Dissolution

Assigned Readings:

Agnew, C. R. (2000). Cognitive interdependence and the experience of relationship loss. In J. H. Harvey & E. D. Miller (Eds.), *Loss and trauma: General and close relationship perspectives* (pp. 385-398). Philadelphia: Brunner-Routledge.

Lewandowski, G. W., Aron, A., Bassis, S. & Kunak, J. (2006). Losing a self-expanding relationship: Implications for the self-concept. *Personal Relationships, 13*, 317-331.

Sbarra, D. A., & Hazan, C. (2008). Coregulation, dysregulation, self-regulation: An integrative analysis and empirical agenda for understanding adult attachment, separation, loss, and recovery. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 12*, 141-167.

Sbarra, D. A., & Beck, C. J. A. (2013). Divorce and close relationships: Findings, themes, and

future directions. In J. A. Simpson & L. Campbell (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of close relationships* (pp. 795-822). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Tan, K., Agnew, C. R., VanderDrift, L. E., & Harvey, S. M. (2015). Committed to us: Predicting relationship closeness following non-marital romantic relationship breakup. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 32*, 456-471.

Potential Presentations:

Lepore, S. J., & Greenberg, M. A. (2002). Mending broken hearts: Effects of expressive writing on mood, cognitive processing, social adjustment and health following a relationship breakup. *Psychology and Health, 17*, 547-560

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.