The construct of complementarity is a cornerstone of the interpersonal perspective. While the definition of complementarity has varied (e.g., Benjamin, 1974; Carson, 1969; Tracey, 1993, 1994), the endorsement of the general view that the behavior of one individual constrains the behavior of another in a predictable manner is a common assumption. However, the research on the presence and importance of complementarity has yielded equivocal findings. I wish to argue that these findings are understandable given the ill-defined nature of complementarity in the literature. Most of the examinations of complementarity are poor representations of the construct.

1. Complementarity exists at the level of the behavioral interchange. This focus dates from the seminal work of Sullivan, Bateson, and Carson. Each behavior carries information about how the other participant is to behave. In this sense, each behavior is instructive and constraining. The other individual has the choice of adhering to this instruction or not, thereby instructing the original person how to behave in return. This sequential behavioral instruction exchange is the key element of complementarity. If individual B acts in accordance with how individual A implicitly instructs, then a complementary interaction results. For a relationship to continue over time, there needs to be a high degree of these complementary interactions. So only examinations of this behavioral interchange level accurately evaluate complementarity. Aggregate ratings of behavior, e.g., overall ratings of behaviors over, say, an hour of interaction, yield global means of how someone behaved and in no way incorporate when these behaviors were demonstrated. If someone was dominant half the time, was this when the other person was submissive or when the other person was dominant? Hence, examination of aggregate ratings of two participants yields little information on the sequential nature of the behaviors, the key to the determination of complementarity. It follows that ratings that are even further removed from the actual sequential interaction, such as the use of trait ratings, would be even poorer bases for the examination.

[continued on page 6]
Donald J. Kiesler (continued)

Born in 1933 in Louisville, KY, in 1958 he completed his undergraduate work at Bellarmine University in Louisville. In 1963 he was awarded his Ph.D. in clinical psychology from the University of Illinois at Champaign. During 1963–1964 he was first a U.S.P.H.S. Postdoctoral Research Fellow and subsequently Director of the Carl R. Rogers psychotherapy research project at the University of Wisconsin Psychiatric Institute in Madison. From 1964–1967 he served as Assistant Professor in Psychology at the University of Iowa in Iowa City, and from 1967–1973 as Associate Professor and Professor of Psychology at Emory University in Atlanta, GA.

Coming to Virginia Commonwealth University in Richmond, he was Director of the doctoral program in clinical psychology initially from 1973–1976, then resumed the Directorship position from 1992–1998. In 1975, he spearheaded the effort to obtain full accreditation of the clinical psychology program, the first accredited clinical program in the Commonwealth of Virginia.

Dr. Kiesler was director of psychotherapy research for the Wisconsin Study of psychotherapy for patients with schizophrenia (Rogers, Gendlin, Kiesler & Truax, The Therapeutic Relationship with Schizophrenics, 1967). In addition, he helped develop and validate the Rogerian Experiencing Scale as an observer coding measure of patient involvement and improvement during psychotherapy sessions. The Experiencing Scale coding manual he developed with Marj Klein, Philippa Mathieu-Coughlan, and Eugene Gendlin served as a prototype for coding systems developed by subsequent process researchers. His 1966 Psychological Bulletin article “Some myths of psychotherapy research and the search for a paradigm” was widely heralded as a breakthrough publication in clinical psychology. In 1981, the article was awarded a special citation by the Institute for Scientific Information, being “identified as one of the most cited items in its field” based on data from the Science Citation Index (SCI) and the Social Sciences Citation Index (SSCI). In 1992, the article was cited by the journal Clinician’s Research Digest as one of twelve “classic articles” in the field of clinical psychology and was honored again in 1996 by the journal Psychotherapy Research as a publication “that over the years … had an unusual impact on psychotherapy research and moved the field in new directions.”

His 1973 volume on methods and measures in psychotherapy process research (The Process of Psychotherapy: Empirical Foundations and Systems of Analysis) reviewed the empirical psychotherapy process measures developed to that date. It also defined and described a series of methodological issues crucial for any psychotherapy coding system that etched an imprint on the next generation of programmatic psychotherapy process researchers (as summarized in Greenberg & Pinsof, 1986).

Beginning in the late 1970s, Dr. Kiesler concentrated on developing and applying contemporary interpersonal theory to personality, psychopathology, and psychotherapy. He is one of the major developers and refiners of the interpersonal circumplex model, which for the past 50 years has been a major theoretical model for studies of personality, psychopathology, and psychotherapy. His 1983 Psychological Review article presented a circumplex taxonomy that integrated previous circle versions, summarized and clarified the propositions of complementarity articulated by Carson (1969), and offered expanded and new propositions for personality, psychopathology, and the goals and procedure of interpersonal diagnosis and psychotherapy.

Among his key interpersonal publications are the 1982 Handbook of Interpersonal Psychotherapy which he co-edited with Jack Anchin; his 1988 book, Therapeutic Metacommunication: Therapist Impact Disclosure as Feedback in Psychotherapy; his 1996 book, Contemporary Interpersonal Theory and Research: Personality, Psychopathology, and Psychotherapy; and his 1999 volume, Beyond the Disease Model of Mental Disorders. Each of these books subsequently impacted the further development of clinical psychology, with his 1996 book considered to be an authoritative summary of that psychology subdiscipline.

He also developed two circumplex-based interpersonal communication measures (Impact Message Inventory, Check List of Interpersonal Transactions) that have been used in hundreds of studies of interpersonal communication. The Impact Message Inventory, in particular, reflected his belief that interpersonal behaviors are importantly mediated by internal cognitions and emotions, and that study of these internal events was essential in making sense of overt interactional events.

He is survived by his wife, E. Allison Hall Kiesler; by two of their three children, Sarah Hall Kiesler and Benjamin Hall Kiesler (an infant daughter, Rachel Hall Kiesler, died in 1987); and by a son from a previous marriage, Barry Donald Kiesler. Born in 1933 in Louisville, Kentucky of parents John Valentine Kiesler and Mildred Foushee Kiesler, both deceased, Dr. Kiesler is survived also by his three brothers: John Valentine Kiesler, Jr. of Columbia, Maryland, Dr. Thomas A. Kiesler of Rockville, Maryland, and Michael J. Kiesler of St. Louis, Missouri.

Join Us for the 10th Annual SITAR Meeting
Kenneth Locke

I want to remind everyone of the fast-approaching 2007 Meeting of the Society of Interpersonal Theory and Research in Madison, Wisconsin, on June 18-19.

We are proud of how many compelling presentations and events will be offered during those two days.

Bruce Wampold (University of Wisconsin) will open the first day with an invited address entitled “Psychotherapy: The Interpersonal Healing Practice.” Jacques Barber (University of Pennsylvania) will open the second day with an invited address entitled “The Relation of Consistency Across Interpersonal Relationships with Symptoms and Functioning.” The program also features 21 regular papers on a wide array of topics such as narcissism, interpersonal assessment, romantic relationships, and interpersonal aspects of depression.

The first day will close with a poster session that will showcase 16 posters on a diversity of topics ranging from shyness to gossip. After the poster session, there will be a student social hour during which students can spend time getting to know each other before we all reconvene for a “communal” dinner.

Finally, this being our 10th anniversary conference, the program also boasts two special presentations. First, since the symposium honoring Timothy Leary at the 1994 American Psychological Association Convention was a catalyst in the genesis of SITAR, Steve Strack will be presenting a “Timothy Leary Video Retrospective” which will feature segments of that 1994 symposium as well as other highlights of the life and times of one of our most famous and colorful colleagues. Second, on Monday afternoon, Lynn Alden, Michael Gurman, Leonard Horowitz and Aaron Pincus—each being a founding member and Past-President of our society—will host a panel and open discussion on “The Past and Future of Interpersonal Theory and Research”.

In sum, the 2007 conference will offer a plethora of posters, panels, and presentations covering a vitalizing variety of interpersonal issues. For more information about our illustrious invited speakers or the lovely city of Madison, please see the other pieces in this newsletter (below and on page 8), or see our February newsletter, which is available on the newsletter page of our website: www.vcu.edu/sitar/newsletter.htm The full meeting program is available on the conference page of our website: www.vcu.edu/sitar/conference.htm

A Preview of Madison—One of My Favorite Cities
Michael Gurman

As I write this, we are in the final stages of planning for this year’s SITAR meeting which, as you know, returns us to Madison, Wisconsin, one of the Midwest’s most livable and likable destinations.

As you plan your own trip, consider spending time, either before or after the conference exploring some of the many attractions of Madison. Both the Lowell Center and the Madison Doubletree (our preferred hotel) are within a few blocks of State Street, which at one end is bounded by Capitol Square and at the other end by the beautiful campus of UW-Madison. Take a free guided tour of the Capitol, a near exact replica of the U.S. Capitol, complete with its magnificent granite dome. If you arrive on Saturday, you will be able to enjoy the very popular Dane County Farmers’ market, held throughout the summer on the Capitol Square. Take a stroll along State Street, with its many shops, coffee houses, and restaurants. If you get hungry (or thirsty), consider one of the interesting ethnic restaurants that line State Street, stop for a great sandwich at Marigold’s, or seek out some authentic Wisconsin beer and brats.

Those who prefer scenic beauty are advised to take a leisurely walk along the shores of Lake Mendota, or to simply enjoy the view of boats, people, and water from the steps of the Union Terrace. Or consider exploring the botanical riches of Madison’s famed Arboretum, by either bike or foot. (Bike rentals are readily available in Madison, one of the most bike-friendly cities in the country.) Finally, the University of Wisconsin campus is worth a discovery tour as well. A walk up UW’s Bascomb Hill will reward you with a breathtaking view (literally and figuratively) of the city and the lake.

See you in Madison!
Social Allergens, Prototype Structure, and the Allergic Person’s Frustrated Interpersonal Motives by Lynne Henderson, visiting scholar at Stanford University

Social allergens are: “...behaviors or characteristics of other people that grate on your nerves” (O’Connor & Nadin, 2004). If those behaviors are repeated, they produce “a reaction of escalating annoyance or disgust” (Cunningham, Shamblen, Barbee, and Ault, 2005). The following are examples of such behaviors: 1) Person D (“dominating”) is always telling me what to do: he is arrogant and acts superior; 2) Person C (“clingy”) follows me everywhere, clings to me like a child; I have to take care of her.

As O’Connor noted in the last SITAR newsletter (Vol. 7, Issue 2, February 2007), these behaviors tend to be relatively extreme and rigid, and people who display them tend to be extreme on the circumplex. O’Connor mentioned their resemblance to personality disorders (O’Connor & Dyce, 2001), and Len Horowitz and I have been struck by the similarity as well. We have been interested in the relationship of social allergens to interpersonal motives and therefore applied an interpersonal analysis to social allergens (Henderson & Horowitz, 2006). First, we decided to distinguish between the “irritating” person and the person who “gets irritated.” We asked three questions: 1) What is the irritating person trying to get from other people? 2) Why does he or she irritate others — what frustrated motive produces irritation? 3) Which people are most apt to become irritated?

To answer those questions, we drew upon our revised interpersonal theory (Horowitz, et al, 2006), which posits that 1) an interpersonal behavior is driven by a person’s motives. Because an observer often does not know the motive, the behavior by itself is ambiguous. When Person A flatters Person B, Person A’s motive may be communal, agentic, or a combination of the two. 2) When a behavior occurs, it invites a “complement”. Connecting behavior invites connecting behavior, and an attempt to influence invites yielding behavior. 3) When the partner does not provide the complementary behavior, where I meant “not accurate” and 7 meant “extremely accurate”.

A prototype structure was evident for both allergens. The attributes in italics indicate that interpersonal motives are part of the prototype. For Person D the most prototypic characteristics (mean ratings > 5.0) were: bossy, controlling/domineering, overbearing/powering, annoying/irritating, self-centered/egocentric/self-absorbed, and demanding. The most prototypic characteristics for Person C (mean ratings > 5.0) were: dependent/not self-reliant, insecure/lacks self-confidence, afraid to take risks, lonely, and wants approval/wants to please. Both sets of characteristics included the word irritating in the middle range, suggesting that irritation is part of the prototype. In brief, Person D appears motivated to control others, whereas Person C seems motivated to have others take charge.

In our second study we asked why Person D and Person C irritate partners. What motive is frustrated in the allergic person? Eighty-four percent (N = 104) of a sample of undergraduates (N = 124) rated their annoyance in response to Person D as six or above (on a 1-7 rating scale) and gave reasons for their annoyance. Illustrative reasons were:

- I feel I like to be a peer, not a subordinate to friends.
- Cocky people are entitled to their beliefs, but don’t have to express it into my face.

Fifty-eight percent (N = 71) of the sample rated their annoyance in response to Person C as six or higher and gave reasons for their annoyance. Examples were:

- Closer to me than I want to be to her. Clingy needy people - the kind you can’t get rid of. I don’t want to have to cater to them and their dependency; it’s restricting.

We then asked neutral raters to “translate” people’s reasons into frustrated motives or goals. Eight raters read each reason, and, using Locke’s Circumplex Scale of Interpersonal Values (CSIV; Locke, 2000, see Figure 1 for illustrative items), translated each reason into “frustrated interpersonal goals” by selecting the items on the CSIV that seemed to most closely match the stated reason. Every goal or value that was selected by 5 or more raters was regarded as a valid translated frustrated goal of the person’s stated reason.

An example of a response to Person D was, “I feel I like to be a peer, not a subordinate to friends.” The translation of the response was given by the following set of goals: It is important to me that “they not tell me what to do” (item 4; agency), “they respect what I have to say” (item 30; friendly agency), and “they show me respect” (item 46; friendly agency). Another example of a response, “Arrogance – they think they are so much better” was translated...
Henderson (cont.)

into: It is important to me that “they understand when I'm right” (item 9, agency) and “they show me respect” (item 46, friendly agency).

An example of a response to Person C was, “Closer to me than I want to be, it's restricting.” The translation was It is important to me that “they respect my privacy” (item 25, agency), “I put my needs first” (item 28, distant agency), and “they keep their distance from me” (item 31, distance).

The most commonly frustrated goals in response to Person D were in the agentic quadrant. These most commonly frustrated goals in response to Person C were in the distant agentic quadrant. Therefore we hypothesized that people with strong goals in either of these octants would find the corresponding social allergen the most irritating.

To find out whether our hypothesis was correct, we then asked (Study 3), “Who would be apt to be irritated?” We predicted that people with strong goals in the friendly agentic quadrant would find Person D most irritating and that people with strong goals in the distant agentic quadrant would find Person C most irritating.

The participants were 57 undergraduates. We used Locke’s Circumplex Scale of Interpersonal Values (CSIV; Locke, 2000) and a 27-item Social Allergen Scale adapted from O’Connor to measure motives and Social Allergens respectively.

As predicted, the higher a participant was in agency (octant PA), the more irritated he or she was by Person D, and the more a participant wanted to avoid embarrassment (octant FG) or needed others’ approval (octant JK), the more irritated he or she was by Person D. Thus, our findings suggested that dominant people—as well as people who believed they couldn’t defend themselves—were the most irritated. Regarding Person C, the more someone wanted distance, the more buffered he or she was by someone who was clingy, consistent with our predictions.

We concluded that the prototype clarified the irritating person’s wants: For Person D, it was to be in charge by controlling or dominating. For Person C, it was to be taken care of, to obtain approval. We also concluded that the irritated person is frustrated by these “invitations.” Person D frustrates a partner's desire for respect or desire to “be heard”—and, in that way, frustrates a partner. On the other hand, Person C frustrates a partner’s desire for distance and space. Furthermore, we found that the allergic reactions were most likely to occur in people with strong relevant motives. If an agentic motive is strong, a person is more apt to be irritated by Person D. If a negative communal motive (for distance, separateness) is strong, a person is more apt to be irritated by Person C.

O’Connor’s research revealed that social allergens were most often found on the distant/hostile side of the circumplex, and that less than one percent were on the friendly side (O’Connor, 2007). However, when participants were asked for behaviors from different parts of the circle they could generate them, although 50% of the time the allergens nominated were rated as being hostile. Consistent with these findings, our results also suggested that Person C was on the friendly, agreeable side of the circumplex, and fewer people found Person C irritating than Person D (58% vs. 84% for Person D). Those who were most irritated by Person C reported feeling that they had to cater to them or allow their privacy to be invaded. These responses suggest intrusive tendencies on the part of Person C, or at least, a lack of empathy for the irritated person. While Person C may not be viewed as overtly hostile, the behavior may be viewed as unresponsive to the needs of the irritated person, thereby inducing hostility. More research is needed to understand the frustrated motives better and to determine whether clarifying the motives of either person, or both, reduces irritation and frustration.

References
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tion of complementarity. I demonstrated (Tracey, 2004) that the support for complementarity varies as a function of its closeness to the original sequential exchange definition of the construct.

2. There is ample evidence that different interpersonal behaviors do not “lead” to their complement in equal amounts (Orford, 1986; Strong et al., 1988). The main issue is that friendly behaviors are reciprocated more readily than hostile behaviors (Tracey, 1994). However, I have demonstrated that while there are strong base rate effects (i.e., people are just more likely to respond in a friendly manner than hostile manner), once they are accounted for, each behavior is equally constraining on the subsequent behavior of the other individual. Hostile behavior is thus as constraining as friendly behavior, but how this manifests itself is in the reduced presence of friendly behavior given its higher base rate. All behavior constrains the behavior of the other individual in a similar manner—toward complementarity. Thus a hostile behavior will reduce the probability of a friendly response from a high rate to a low rate. Continued over time this could result in exchanges of hostile behavior. So complementarity is probabilistic in its manifestation at the behavioral level. Models that examine complementarity in a deterministic manner, i.e., a hostile behavior must be followed by a hostile behavior, are overly simplistic and miss this key issue.

3. Context is an important moderator of complementarity (Kiesler, 1996; Tracey, 1993). Complementarity is theorized to exist most in continuing relationships. If the interaction between two individuals is relatively brief, there is little press to behave in a complementary manner. Better tests of complementarity will thus involve real relationships that exist over time. Social roles can enhance or harm complementarity. If someone is a teacher, he or she will behave in a dominant manner most of the time as a function of the role. Students generally are constrained to behave in more submissive manners. So typical behavior that an individual may exhibit in another situation would not be as evident in this situation. The roles of the situation would constrain the behaviors demonstrated.

4. Not all circumplex models containing dominance and affiliation are appropriate for defining complementarity. There are many circumplex models and measures, but not all theoretically translate into complementarity. For example, the Inventory of Interpersonal Problems (IIP-C) has been used as a measure to define complementarity (e.g., Dinger et al., 2007, in examining the complementarity between clients and therapists). The IIP-C is an excellent instrument that nicely conforms to the interpersonal circumplex. It does have the underlying dimensions of dominance and affiliation. However, the theory relating interpersonal problems to definitions of complementarity is non-existent. Why should the problems of one individual “fit” or complement those of another, and why should this be related to relationship outcomes? While we are blessed with many interpersonal circumplex measures of several different aspects of behavior, this does not mean that any translate automatically into definitions of complementarity.

5. While it is plausible to posit that interpersonal traits would be predictive of client behavior in therapy, it is less tenable to make a similar assumption for therapists. Therapists certainly have role constraints which will affect their behavior but also they have extensive training on appropriate ways of responding and much of this dampens typical behavioral demonstration. Hence, the predictability of the behavior between participants in a therapeutic interaction are very different. Client behavior is more predictable given traits while therapist behavior is less so (Tracey, 1993). Hence, matching therapist and client traits for complementarity makes no sense. Further such an “input” approach is very removed from the sequential interaction nature of the process and finally the context of where in therapy these behaviors occur. I (Tracey, Sherry, & Albright, 1999) have provided support for a stage conception of successful interpersonal interventions which requires focus on where and how complementarity occurs.

I dearly love the construct of complementarity. I see it as some of the core glue that defines interpersonal models of personality and psychotherapy. However I also see it as a very misconstrued construct, and one that is too easily mis-defined and mis-tested. So the above 5 points are a few of my particular complaints. It is easy to misunderstand complementarity. I recall a poster presentation that I did several years ago where I was presenting on complementarity in therapy, and a woman came up and engaged me in a long conversation about the need to be nice. In my myopic self-focus, I interpreted this as referring to the general reason for the high base rate of friendly behavior, and how this could affect complementarity. However over time it became clear that she meant that it is important to say nice things to others, i.e., to compliment them. As another example, I wrote the first draft of my master’s thesis on “complementarity.” I did not realize that there was a different meaning between a complement and a compliment. “I” is not equal to “E,” nor are the many methods that have been used to examine complementarity.
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Greetings all! I can’t believe another academic year has come to an end and another SITAR meeting is just around the corner! Unfortunately I won’t be able to attend this year (missing my first meeting in 7 years!). Mark Lukowitsky, a graduate student from Pennsylvania State University, has kindly volunteered to act as the graduate student representative in my absence over the course of the meeting. For example, he will attend the executive business meeting to ensure that the student voice is heard and considered in all discussions. Thanks very much Mark!

Those of you who attended last year’s meeting may recall that, after the poster session, we had a student get-together at a nearby pub before gathering with the rest of the group for dinner. This event went very well, and therefore we decided to make it an annual event. Mark Lukowitsky is working with our on-site host, Dr. Michael Gurtman, to choose a location for the get-together this year, and Mark will also coordinate the event. Please be sure to listen for announcements about when and where the get-together will take place so that you can join in on the fun.

We are still using this section of the newsletter to introduce some of the graduate students from various labs to the membership. In this issue, I am pleased to introduce to you two students from Dr. Marc Fournier’s lab at the University of Toronto, and two students from Dr. Pat Markey’s lab from Villanova University. I believe all four students will be attending the meeting, so please be sure to welcome them!

Before the meeting, it might be a good idea to look back at old issues of the newsletter as well, and remind yourself of some of the other students who have been introduced. You may recall that one of the purposes of the Graduate Student Corner is to introduce students to the membership so that we become familiar faces at the meetings. Be sure to let us know if you or your lab has not yet been featured in the newsletter. We’re always happy to receive input with regard to other information to include in the Graduate Student Corner, too. Have a great time in Madison everyone!

My name is Bonnie Cheng and I am a Master’s student in personality psychology at the University of Toronto, under the supervision of Dr. Marc Fournier. I’ve worked with Dr. Fournier since my undergraduate studies on social rank styles, emergent leadership, and affect. For my Master’s thesis, I am looking at extraversion, social status, and affective experiences in university dormitories. Given that extraversion has been found to be the trait most predictive of social status in face-to-face social groups, we are looking at how extraverted individuals attain social status in university residences, with the prediction that extraverts attain status by producing states of positive affect in their household members. This is my first SITAR conference, and I look forward to meeting you!

Hello all, my name is Greg Schell. I am completing my Master’s degree at the University of Toronto under the supervision of Dr. Marc Fournier. My research interests lie in the integration of social-cognitive and interpersonal approaches to personality. My Master’s thesis research is concerned with interpersonal expectancies and the consequences that these expectancies have on social status and reputation. In the coming years I hope to examine social-cognitive tendencies associated with approach and avoidance motivations in interpersonal interaction as well as how these tendencies operate to influence social status. My other interests lie in the role of mindfulness and regulatory focus in interpersonal interaction and behavior. This summer will mark my first SITAR conference and I am looking forward to presenting a poster at this year’s gathering.

Hello, my name is Wendy Eichler, and I will be a second year graduate student at Villanova University. I was introduced to SITAR and interpersonal theory through my master’s thesis advisor, Dr. Patrick Markey, and am looking forward to presenting our work at my first SITAR meeting this June. Our research investigates how the interpersonal circumplex is linked to actual behaviors, using a behavior mapping method. In addition, for my thesis, I plan to explore the relationship between parent-child complementarity and relational conflict. My research interests span the areas of personality assessment and interpersonal models of psychotherapy, among others. I am eager to absorb the diverse programs of research at the upcoming SITAR meeting, and hope to meet future collaborators!

Hi! My name is Sara Lowmaster and I have just completed my second, and final, year of Villanova University’s Master’s program. For the past two years I have been a member of the Interpersonal Relations Laboratory under the direction of Dr. Patrick Markey. My research has focused on complementarity and the accuracy of personality judgments during interpersonal interactions. I was first introduced to interpersonal theory as an undergraduate member of Dr. Aaron Pincus’ lab. These experiences served as an impetus for my current research interests of assessment, personality disorders, and interpersonal relationships. I will further pursue these research interests with Dr. Les Morey in the clinical Ph.D. program at Texas A&M University this fall. At last year’s SITAR conference I presented a poster that utilized Sadler’s joystick tracking device to assess complementarity in female dyads. I am looking forward to seeing everyone in Madison and at future meetings.
SITAR: Mission, Aims, and Activities

The Society is an international, multidisciplinary, scientific association devoted to interpersonal theory and research. By encouraging systematic theory and empirical research, it seeks to clarify the processes and mechanisms of interpersonal interactions that explain interpersonal and intrapersonal phenomena of normal and abnormal psychology.

The goals of the Society are (1) to encourage the development of this research, (2) to foster the communication, understanding, and application of research findings, and (3) to enhance the scientific and social value of this research.

The activities of the Society include: (1) regular meetings for the communication of current research ideas, methods, and findings; (2) discussion of work in progress; (3) maintenance of an inventory of data and data-gathering resources available for use by members of the Society; and (4) facilitation of collaborative research.

NEWS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

SITAR is registered with the US and State of California as a nonprofit, charitable organization. As such, donations of cash, goods, and services to the Society are eligible for tax exemption on US and California income tax returns.

The Executive Council gratefully acknowledges gifts of cash and materials from members and nonmembers during the past year that totaled US$702.90. Some of these gifts were targeted for graduate student memberships and travel grants.

Please consider making a donation to SITAR that you may earmark for general operating expenses, fundraising, or underwriting costs for student members.

Guest Speakers for SITAR’s 10th Annual Meeting in Madison: Bruce Wampold and Jacques Barber

Bruce E. Wampold, Ph.D., ABPP, who was trained in mathematics (BA, University of Washington) before earning his doctorate in Counseling Psychology (Ph.D., University of California, Santa Barbara), is Professor of Counseling Psychology at the University of Wisconsin-Madison. He is a Fellow of the American Psychological Association (Divisions 12, 17, 29, 45) and a Diplomate in Counseling Psychology of the American Board of Professional Psychology. Currently his work involves understanding counseling and psychotherapy from empirical, historical, and anthropological perspectives. His analysis of empirical evidence, which has led to the development of a contextual model from which to understand the benefits of counseling and psychotherapy, is found in The Great Psychotherapy Debate: Models, methods, and findings (2001, Erlbaum and Associates). He is the author of over 100 books, chapters, and articles related to counseling, psychotherapy, statistics, and research methods, and will be the recipient of the 2007 Distinguished Professional Contributions to Applied Research Award from the American Psychological Association.

Jacques P. Barber, Ph.D., ABPP, is a professor of psychology and associate director of the Center for Psychotherapy Research in the department of psychiatry at the University of Pennsylvania School of Medicine, and Foreign Adjunct Professor in the department of clinical neurosciences at the Karolinska Institute in Stockholm Sweden. He is currently finishing a NIMH funded Randomized Clinical Trial (RCT) of dynamic therapy vs. SSRI/SNRI for major depression. In collaboration with Barbara Milrod at Cornell, he has recently embarked on a two site NIMH funded RCT of dynamic therapy vs. CBT for panic disorder. In terms of psychotherapy process research, he has examined the impact of the therapeutic alliance and of therapists’ use of theoretically relevant interventions on the outcome of different therapies. Most important, he is examining models of therapeutic change that emphasize both relational and technical factors. He has conducted research on core conflicts and metacognition. Together with Hadas Wiseman, he is currently co-authoring a book titled Echoes of the Trauma: Relationship Themes and Emotions in the Narratives of the Children of Holocaust Survivors to be published by Cambridge University Press.