

# P: The Online Newsletter for Personality Science

Issue 8, October 2013

## Table of Contents:

- [Letter from the Editors](#)

### REPORTS

- [President](#)
- [Executive Officer](#)
- [Secretary-Treasurer](#)
- [Graduate Student/ Postdoctoral Committee](#)
- [JRP](#)
- [European Association for Personality Psychology](#)
- [Conference Program Committee](#)
- [Conference Organizing Committee](#)

### FEATURES

- [McAdams Interview](#)
- [De Pauw Interview](#)
- [Jackson Interview](#)
- [Safer Science](#)
- [Reflections on ARP](#)

### NEWS

- [2015 ARP Conference](#)
- [2014 SPSP Preconference](#)
- [2014 APA Conference](#)
- [ARP Member News](#)

### SPONSORS

- [Hogan Assessment Systems](#)

## Letter from the Editors

### Jonathan Adler and Erik Noftle

Hello, and welcome to the latest issue of *P*: The Newsletter of the Association for Research in Personality, from its new editors! We couldn't be happier to inherit the editorship from the efficient, skilled hands of Chris Soto and Simine Vazire. Chris has graciously agreed to stick around to help with the technical aspects of publishing *P* and Simine will be working on the local conference committee for ARP 2015, so both will continue to be closely involved with the association, for which we are all fortunate.

We hope you will find this issue of *P* informative, educational, and hopefully a bit provocative:

**Informative.** As always, this issue brings you reports from the key people who work to keep ARP running smoothly and efficiently: our president (Will Fleeson), executive officer (Lynne Cooper), and secretary/treasurer (Jen Pals Lilgendahl). We also include updates from the Journal of Research in Personality and from our dear friends across the pond at the European Association for Personality Psychology, as well as two recaps of the very successful conference in Charlotte this past June from the chairs of the program and local organizers committees.

**Educational.** In addition, we invited three current graduate students to interview three award-winning personality researchers about their work: Dan McAdams, the winner of the 2012 Block Award, and Sarah DePauw, and Joshua Jackson, the winners of the 2010 and 2011 Tanaka awards. See what these researchers have to say about their career highs and lows, what they find “intellectually exhilarating,” and how talking about research can be like dating. Thanks to Kathrin Herzhoff, Josh Wilt, and Kate Rogers for conducting these interviews.

**Provocative.** Finally, we have two short pieces designed to get you thinking. The first comes from Simine Vazire, who recaps one of the most-discussed symposia at the ARP conference in Charlotte, the “Safer Science” symposium. Simine reviews the discussion that unfolded about replicability, sample size, and much more, and she advocates for a “slow science” of personality. Second, Kelci Harris, a current graduate student in personality, offers her reflections on attending ARP for the first time and being struck by the lack of racial diversity in our field. We hope that both essays will spark reflection and discussion.

We would love to hear your reactions to this issue of *P*. Feel free to email us with your thoughts (Jon: [jadler@olin.edu](mailto:jadler@olin.edu), Erik: [enoftle@willamette.edu](mailto:enoftle@willamette.edu)), [blog about them](#), or comment on [ARP's Facebook page](#). We would also love to hear your ideas for future issues of *P*. If you have something you'd like to share with the ARP community, please send it our way!

We hope the academic year rolls along well for you.

Jon and Erik

# President's Outgoing Message: What Does This Organization Need to Do? Why?

## William Fleeson

The question I ask you in my last column is: What is this organization for? Why do we have an Association for Research in Personality? I will elaborate this question by first describing what we have done recently. This will communicate an answer to this question in descriptive terms - seeing what ARP does communicates in part what ARP is for. I will then consider some things ARP should consider doing in the future. This will provide an answer in normative terms. I will then ask you to consider your normative answers.

What does ARP do? What have we accomplished in the past two years? The biggest job we had was putting on the Third Biennial Conference of ARP. At the risk of bragging, I am going to say that this conference made me very proud. Mike Furr and the Conference Committee did an outstanding job, and the program put together by Jess Tracy, Oz Ayduk, and the rest of the Program Committee was one of the most interesting I've seen in a while. Please read their respective columns for more detail. We also raised over \$20,000 in donations for the Charlotte conference, thanks to the generosity of Wake Forest University, High Point University, Hogan Assessment Systems, and Elsevier.

Our second biggest accomplishments were stabilizing the twin legal and administrative pillars of the organization. First, we established new bylaws for the organization, bylaws that I believe will now provide the basis of the administrative operations of ARP. The amount of work involved was enough to earn Dan Ozer a special award of appreciation from ARP (before he was President-Elect). The other twin pillar was the establishment of tax exempt status. This took quite a bit of hard discussion, soul-searching, and government documentation to accomplish. Tax exempt status is important for saving lots of tax costs, for encouraging donations, and for allowing us to not pay taxes every year. Lynne Cooper deserves a lot of thanks for getting this through. My favorite moment in this process was when our application was rejected because we couldn't apply for tax exempt status since we already had it (we didn't), but since it had lapsed too long ago (it hadn't lapsed at all, because we never had it), we were not allowed to apply for renewal, and had to start a new application (which is what we had done).

We established an annual preconference slot at SPSP that will be sponsored by ARP, allowing us to keep in the mix at SPSP without committing us to holding a preconference in addition to our main conference. We established four standing committees of ARP, which will ensure that important work gets done on a regular basis. These committees are the Awards Committee, Web Committee, Training Committee, and Publications Committee. We began the process of enacting a formal relationship with EAPP. EAPP is a larger and richer organization from which we can learn a lot. We linked up several active blogs to our webpage, ensuring a constant infusion of creative energy. We continued the newsletter "P", under the excellent Editorship of Simine Vazire, Chris Soto, Erik Nofle, and Jonathan Adler. The ARP leadership has also written columns for P. There are many other things we do as well, such as maintain membership records, take in membership dues and conference registration fees and pay out to vendors, manage regular emails to the organization, maintain a webpage, interact with other organizations, and discuss initiatives and plans. Jen Lilgendahl and Lynne Cooper have been indispensable in accomplishing these things.

What do we need to accomplish next? Most importantly, continue the initiatives we have recently started. Beyond that, four things. (1.) Financial stability. The past two years have completed the process of putting the organization on stable administrative and legal pillars. The financial pillar is still rickety, but once that is complete, we will have completed the process of creating a stable platform from which to reach upwards. (2.) Do we want to grow? Why or why not? And how? Attendance has stayed relatively steady at the past three ARP conferences, at around 200 attendees. I want the field of personality to grow, because I'm utterly convinced that one fundamental route by which psychology affects behavior is via personality. Since it is important to me that the field of psychology discovers the causes of behavior, it seems important that personality be strongly represented. But perhaps growth is not needed any more. When I look at the young people in the field, I see great ideas, energy, and minds. But somehow these young people seem not to result in growing numbers. What is happening here? What do you think about this - does the field need to grow? Why or why not? (3.) Diversity. Our field seems remarkably white and male. I'm happy that we have made progress in the organization's leadership and at the recent conference in gender balance, but there is

more to be done. In terms of race and ethnicity, please read the thoughtful column by Kelci Harris, "Reflections on ARP", about the experience of an African-American, and think about what we can do. (4.) Awards. Awards are important not only for rewarding excellent performance, but for their communicative function. Awards communicate to departments and administrators that our field values its members. However, ARP is unnecessarily sparse in its awards.

The two years of my presidential term are already coming to an end. Especially considering the six months as president-elect, I find it remarkable that the time went so quickly. Dan Ozer has already stepped into the president-elect role with style, so I am comfortable that the organization is in good hands going forward. I still have two years as past-president, but Dan's skill and energy have made me relax about how much I will need to interject.

What does this organization need to do? Why? When we asked for your feedback last winter, wonderful ideas poured in. You may not have heard that those ideas formed the structure and content of the executive board meeting at SPSP. I hope that we members continue to think about the goals of the organization, to discuss them with each other, and to provide ideas and feedback to the organization leadership.

## Executive Officer's Report: The Inside Scoop

### M. Lynne Cooper

Since the last edition of P, published in January, the association has taken two very important steps toward securing its financial future. First, we are thrilled to report that ARP finally obtained status as a 501C3 (tax exempt) organization from the IRS. This culminates discussions about the need to obtain tax exempt status dating back to the formation of the association, and thus feels like a huge accomplishment to all of us! Many thanks to all who contributed to the effort, most especially Will and Jen.

Tax exempt status is crucial to the financial health of the Association in two important ways. First, because any monies we take in in excess of our expenses will be used to fund tax exempt activities that advance the field, we will not be required to pay taxes on those monies. Moreover, our tax exempt status is retroactive, meaning that we are not subject to back taxes on any monies that were made in the past. Second, obtaining tax exempt status creates new opportunities for fund raising given that individuals and businesses who donate to the Association will be able to claim those donations as charitable contributions on their federal income tax returns.

Second, the Executive Board voted at its June meeting to work toward accumulating a financial cushion of \$100,000. Part of this will serve as a cash reserve in the event of unexpected expenses, while the rest will be used as a basis for supporting awards and programs benefiting the field that the Association hopes to establish over the next few years. Although compared to some of our peer organizations, this is a very modest cushion, we believe that it is an appropriate goal for an organization of our size, and that having this amount set aside will allow us to work more effectively and creatively on behalf of the field. So we encourage you to share any thoughts or ideas you might have about how to build that cushion. Also please be on the lookout for new initiatives that will help us meet this important goal.

Finally, I would like to let all of you know that I will be stepping down as Executive Officer (XO) at the end of 2014. While that is more than a year away, it is not too soon to start thinking about whether you or someone you know would be interested in taking on this position. Serving as XO offers a wonderful opportunity to work with fabulously committed and talented colleagues, to keep you finger on the pulse of the field, and to make a contribution to the future of the Association and the field. I am happy to answer any and all inquiries about the position, should you be interested.

## Secretary-Treasurer's Report

### Jennifer Pals Lilgendahl

Hello, members of ARP! I hope the new school year is off to a great start for everyone. What has happened since our last issue of P? Two very important things. First, we finally achieved tax exempt status! This is a huge step for the organization, and although it was certainly a team effort, I want to thank Lynne Cooper for her tireless, “above and beyond”- level efforts to make this happen for us. Thank you Lynne! Second, we had our third successful stand-alone ARP Conference in Charlotte in June. I would like to thank our president, Will Fleeson, and everyone else on the ground in Charlotte for hosting a very well-organized, fun, and intellectually engaging event. Thanks also to the program chairs, Jess Tracy and Oz Ayduk, for putting together a power-house program featuring an exciting slate of talks, symposia and posters that successfully captured the current state of our vibrant and diverse field. For me, the Gala Dinner at the Mint Museum was a highlight of the weekend and a fitting finale for a spectacular conference. The bar has been set high for 2015!

At the conclusion of our meeting in Charlotte, the ARP Board had a very productive and forward-looking meeting, in which we discussed strategies for securing our long-term financial stability, and many exciting new ideas, including building our relationship with the European Association for Personality Psychology (representative Jaap Denisson was in attendance), supporting an ARP pre-conference at SPSP each year, and various possible technological interfaces with the Journal of Research in Personality. We were very pleased to have Irene Kanter-Schlifke, our new representative from Elsevier, join us at the Board meeting and we look forward to working with her. We also heard reports from each of our sub-committees (Web, Awards, Publication and Communication, Training) and anticipate benefiting in various ways from their efforts as the organization continues to evolve and grow. Please let me know if you have any specific questions about what was discussed at the Board Meeting in Charlotte or if you have ideas about what should be discussed at our next Board Meeting at SPSP in February.

As I have mentioned several times recently, it has become apparent that the size of our membership fluctuates in relation to whether or not it is a conference year. Right now, we are enjoying that “conference bump.” I am pleased to report that we have a very healthy and (I think) record high current membership total of 359, which breaks down to 219 regular members and 140 post-docs and graduate students. We continue to offer fee reductions for multi-year memberships in order to stabilize the membership base across the years, which will help our financial stability. With respect to our financial stability, a significant decision that was formally approved by the ARP Board in Charlotte was to work toward building up our financial reserves to a cushion of \$100,000. Such a reserve will better secure the future of ARP, give us the capacity to develop a wider array of programs, benefits, etc. for the membership, and, ultimately, strengthen our field as a whole. Such a goal requires us to consider various ways to generate more revenue, so stay tuned for more communications about this issue in the near future.

Finally, as we look to 2014, I would like to note that two of our Board Members, Dan Ozer and Simine Vazire, will be concluding their terms as of January and two new faces, Kate Mclean and Erik Nofle, whom we elected in the Spring, will be rotating on. We are certainly not saying goodbye to Dan and Simine, however, as Dan begins his term as our president and Simine has agreed to serve as the local conference committee chair for our next ARP conference in 2015. Looking ahead a bit, Lynne Cooper and I will be concluding our terms at the end of 2014, so please consider whether you or someone you know may be interested in serving as our next Executive Officer or Secretary-Treasurer.

In conclusion, it is an exciting time for ARP and we look forward to 2014. Please be in touch if you have any questions for me or ideas for us to consider, [jlilgend@haverford.edu](mailto:jlilgend@haverford.edu).

# Graduate and Postdoctoral Representatives' Report

## Grant Edmonds and Michael Boudreaux

The ARP grad student/postdoc committee organized a mentoring lunch at the 2013 ARP meeting in Charlotte, NC. By all measures it was a great success. During the Saturday lunch hour, four tables met to discuss four different topics: Sanjay Srivastava led “Finding an Academic Job in Personality Psychology,” Simine Vazire led “Replicability and Productivity,” Brent Donnellan led “The Peer Review Process,” and David Funder led “Teaching Personality Psychology.” We’d like to thank our four mentors again for generously offering their time and expertise!

Over thirty graduate student and postdoc members participated. There was much enthusiasm, and people signed up quickly. However, most participants were able to sit at their first choice table. Following the conference, we collected feedback using a short online survey. Twenty-four participants responded. There was unanimous support for having events like this at future meetings, and 95% of respondents felt that their most important questions were addressed. The most common suggestion for improving the event involved moving to separate rooms where conversations could be conducted in a quieter setting. For those who participated in the mentoring lunch and completed the survey, we offered a small prize to one lucky respondent chosen at random. Congratulations to Nicole Lawless who won the drawing! She received a \$25 Amazon.com gift card.

We hope that events like this will continue to be part of the biennial meeting of ARP. We plan to use all of your feedback to provide the best content and setting for the next ARP conference. Thanks to everyone who participated in this year’s mentoring lunch, and to those who provided valuable feedback.

Finally, special thanks to Elsevier for providing funds to support this year’s mentoring lunch.

We’d love to hear from you. If you have any suggestions or comments for the grad student/postdoc committee, please contact us via e-mail: Grant Edmonds, at [gedmonds\[at\]ori.org](mailto:gedmonds[at]ori.org), or Michael Boudreaux, at [mboud001\[at\]ucr.edu](mailto:mboud001[at]ucr.edu).

# JRP Editor's Report: Changes in Editorial Policy at the Journal of Research in Personality

## Richard Lucas

As many P readers will know, the Journal of Research in Personality recently announced some [new policies](#) that affect how papers are evaluated and selected for publication. These new policies were, in part, a reaction to the current “crisis in confidence” surrounding psychological research. However, this was not the only motivation for the changes, and we hope that the new policies lead to a further improvement in the already strong papers that JRP has been publishing. Of course, not all will agree that change is needed, and even among those who believe that some form of change is appropriate, disagreements about the precise nature of those changes likely exists. Because of this, I thought I'd take this opportunity to explain some of the choices we made.

In our August, 2013 Editorial, Brent Donnellan and I laid out three new policy changes that will affect submissions, at least for the near future. In our editorial, we acknowledged that there are many possible responses to the controversies that the field faces. Indeed, we expect that as the field as a whole considers issues of transparency, replicability, and reproducibility more fully, further changes will be needed. However, it also seemed to be the case that after much discussion about the problems that exist, few journals were taking any concrete steps to address these issues. Therefore, we thought that JRP could take the lead in developing policies that could address some of the clearer issues. At the same time, we know that change is difficult, and that policies that were too disruptive or too inconvenient could negatively affect authors' perceptions of the journal, which could ultimately backfire and hurt the journal. Thus, we focused on policies that were relatively uncontroversial and that could be implemented without too much additional burden for authors, reviewers, or editors.

The first policy will likely have the largest impact on authors, as it does require some additions to submitted papers, and it may exclude a larger number of papers from consideration. In short, we are now taking power and precision much more seriously in our initial evaluation of submitted papers, and we now require authors to explicitly discuss power and precision in their papers. Specifically, we ask that authors consider and describe what size effect seems plausible for their study, to justify this expectation by referring to existing literature, and to discuss the power and precision of their study in relation to this expected effect. We realize that for many areas of research, the size of the effect that is expected may be difficult to predict with any precision. However, in those cases, authors can still use evidence about typical effect sizes within personality psychology to guide their decisions about sample size (this usually means that they should expect relatively small effects and as a result, recruit relatively large samples of participants). We also acknowledge that some research is very difficult to conduct, and therefore large samples may be difficult in these areas. These difficulties can be factored into publication decisions. Therefore, there are no hard and fast rules about the precision a study needs to achieve; we just ask that authors provide a realistic discussion of these issues so readers will be aware of any limitations related to this issue.

Although we will consider the context of a paper when evaluating its power and precision, if a study is seriously under-powered (without a compelling reason why larger samples could not be recruited), then such studies will often be rejected without review at JRP (though such papers can be resubmitted if additional data are collected). We understand that this may exclude from consideration some studies that might otherwise have been acceptable for publication, but we think that this is a critical issue with which the field needs to contend. We hope that this policy will be adopted by other journals and that power and precision consideration will factor more heavily both in the early stages of the research process and when evaluating papers for publication. We should also note that to further the second goal, we encourage authors to include confidence intervals in their results when possible.

The second policy that we instituted will likely have the least impact on authors. This policy has to do with authors' willingness to share their data with interested researchers. Specifically, at the time of submission, authors are asked to indicate whether they will be willing to share their data with interested researchers who wish to verify the published findings. If authors are not able or willing to do so, they will be asked to provide an explanation, which the editors will evaluate before sending the paper out for review. Note that



this policy does not deviate from other guidelines for sharing data (such as policies from the APA), it just asks authors to affirm that they will be willing to follow these guidelines. Our goal is simply to remind authors that such data sharing is an essential part of the research process and perhaps even to encourage more data sharing by prompting authors to consider whether their data are in a format that would allow for easy sharing at the time of submission. In addition, because the willingness to share data is so important, authors who simply refuse to do so (without a compelling explanation) will not be able to publish in JRP.

Finally, our third policy should have a very positive impact on authors, as we now provide a new mechanism for submitting papers that describe research that replicates studies previously published in JRP. Many have argued that more replication is needed within the field, and the editors of JRP agree. We also know, however, that replication studies are often not valued as highly as original reports, and thus, authors may not be motivated to conduct them. Thus, we created a simplified review process meant to encourage replication of research previously published in JRP. Specifically, papers that present the results of a study or studies that replicate a paper published in JRP within the past five years will be subject to an abbreviated review process that focuses solely on the technical merits. In other words, reviewers will be asked not to consider the importance of the question or the plausibility of the hypothesis, with the rationale that these issues were already considered in the review of the initial paper. The policy is restricted to replications of papers that were published within the past five years. The rationale for this limitation is that standards for importance and interest value do change over time. Replications of older papers will still be considered; however, the extent to which the importance threshold will play more of a role in their evaluation. Authors who wish to conduct replication studies should attempt to do exact replications when possible, and all authors should shoot for especially high levels of power and precision with their replication attempts. Authors who have questions about whether their planned replication will likely be acceptable are encouraged to contact the editor-in-chief.

Again, the editors of JRP realize that change does not come without some negative consequences. However, we have attempted to keep author burden and the fairness of the process in mind when developing these new policies. We will also be closely monitoring submissions to see whether these changes have a benefit overall. And of course, these policies are subject to change in the future if we feel that they have unintended consequences or if further modifications are needed. Our goal is to deal with any concerns about these policies as they apply to specific papers in a fair and flexible manner, so authors who have concerns are certainly encouraged to contact the editors. And finally, we ask that if you agree with the importance of these initial steps, you should consider sending more of your papers to the journal as a way of supporting our attempts at improving the transparency, reproducibility, and replicability of personality research.

# European Association for Personality Psychology

## Marco Perugini and Jaap Denissen

Personality psychology is alive and well and more mature. Traditional theoretical divides between personality structure and personality processes (or bottom-up vs. top-down) are becoming thinner. There is growing shared awareness that studying personality is about studying processes but that these processes can be studied with reference to organizing structures, such as major trait dimensions or personality types. Likewise, studying personality structure is just a first step in the journey towards understanding the complex processes that underlie these structures and link them to dynamic behavioral outcomes. To use a metaphor, drawing a map that helps to locate and communicate systematically the location of interest related to the general coordinates is just the beginning of exploring the territory and uncovering islands, mountains, and valleys, what are their implications, and how they came about.

We know that the field has grown substantially during the last decades. We can see it in many ways, such as for example in the increased attendance to personality conferences, visibility of personality research, impact of personality journals, and growth of personality societies. The moment is right to coordinate efforts between societies to foster even further personality research in its manifold manifestations. As with so many cooperations, Europe and North-America are actively engaged in strengthening a mutual bond that has been forged over decades of productive collaborations. Needless to say, however, we must not forget to include other parts of the world (e.g., South-America, Africa) in these efforts.

This is the first time that the ARP adds one entry in the newsletter from the EAPP with the goal of becoming a regular feature. This initiative follows another first time, that one member of the Executive Committee of the EAPP (Jaap Denissen) attended the ARP Executive Committee meeting during the ARP conference in Charlotte, North Carolina. The EAPP will reciprocate. Both societies are engaged in creating active exchanges with each other with the goal of increasing communications and synergies between the two sister organizations. We need to start from somewhere and these two initiatives are a good way to start. Hopefully this is just the beginning of what will be a fruitful journey.

## JRP Editor's Report

### Ozlem Ayduk and Jessica Tracy

The third biennial stand-alone meeting of ARP was held June 20-22, 2013, in Charlotte, NC. Here we describe some of the highlights of the meeting as seen through the eyes of the program co-chairs. We want to begin by acknowledging and extending our thanks to the local organizing team, including Michael Furr (chair), Will Fleeson, Kathleen McKee, Jana Spain and Dustin Wood. We also want to thank the program committee members, Brent Donnellan, Chris Fraley, Iris Mauss and Vivian Zayas whose valuable input helped us shape the final program.

The meeting was attended by about 200 participants. The conference kicked off with a methods workshop (Thanks Sally Dickerson & Iris Mauss!) on Thursday morning followed by a Welcome Reception that evening. Friday's program started with Will Fleeson's Presidential Address, "A theory on whole traits" and the presentation of awards.

There was a great deal of interest in the conference this year, and the number of submissions exceeded our expectations. The committee received over two-dozen symposia and over 100 poster submissions. While we were able to accommodate most of the posters, due to space limitations and concerns about content overlap we had to turn down some excellent symposia submissions. The good news is that the final program was particularly strong covering a breadth of topics representing both traditional personality, such as personality structure, development, and pathology, and more interdisciplinary topics focusing on individual differences in emotions, close relationships, social status, and morality. There was also a very timely and well-attended symposium, chaired by Simine Vazire, in which speakers raised (and answered) questions about replicability in personality research, and made recommendations for how to practice a Safer Science. In addition to 16 symposia, over 100 posters were presented across two well-attended poster sessions on Friday and Saturday evenings.

The program also included two invited talks, by prominent scholars in personality science-- Laura King and Jeffrey Simpson, two of the Head Editors of JPSP. Both talks were well attended, and while Jeff provided a fascinating look at attachment dynamics and relationships--demonstrating the importance of individual differences for relationship functioning--Laura talked broadly about the current and future state of personality science, offering a number of suggestions for how the field should continue to move forward from where we are.

One session was devoted to honoring the newest generation of personality scholars: The Tanaka Dissertation Award symposium featured Joshua Jackson and Sara DePauw, the winners of 2011 and 2010 awards, respectively. Whereas Joshua Jackson discussed his work on how personality development is influenced by educational experiences, Sara DePauw's work focused on the links between temperament, personality, and problem behavior in youth.

Finally, the conference was capped off with a Gala dinner at the beautiful Mint Museum. It was a fantastic final evening, beginning with a cocktail hour on the Museum's enormous balcony, leading to a delicious dinner, and ending with dancing.

The informal feedback we received from the attendees suggests that the program was very well-received. People also indicated that they found with the ample opportunities offered for socializing, including the welcome reception, shared breakfasts and lunches, poster sessions, and coffee and snack breaks.

In short, we feel that this year's conference was a big success. We look forward to seeing you all again in the summer of 2015!

## Message from the 2013 ARP Conference Organizing Committee

### Mike Furr

The members of the local organizing committee (myself, Will Fleeson, Kathleen McKee, Jana Spain, and Dustin Wood) were very happy to welcome everyone to North Carolina for the 2013 ARP conference. The editors of P (Erik and Jon) asked for a brief summary of the conference from the local host's perspective, providing a bit of insight into the planning process.

Our committee began working almost immediately after the 2011 conference in Riverside, and our first goal was to find the best location in the region. We wanted a city that would be an easy and affordable travel destination, that would have great hotels and a vibrant downtown area, and that would offer plenty of food (and drink) options. Among several possibilities, Charlotte emerged as the clear choice, with the Marriott emerging as the ideal downtown hotel, and with the Mint Museum emerging as a perfect location for the gala dinner.

We then negotiated contracts with the hotel and with vendors for the gala dinner. There were many issues to consider, including guest room rates, the number of "confirmed" guest rooms, availability of conference spaces, and food and beverage minimums. Resolving such issues requires a careful balance between the vendors' needs/preferences, ARP's financial liability, and the desire for an enjoyable, affordable, and comfortable conference.

As the program began to take shape, we coordinated with Jess Tracy and Oz Ayduk (chairs of the program committee) to make sure that conference spaces could handle the number of sessions, types of sessions, number of posters, and so on. As the conference grew even closer, we also worked with the hotel to arrange menus for meals and breaks.

By the time the conference started, our work was mostly done. Aside from managing the registration desk and occasionally touching base with hotel staff, we were free to enjoy the conference along with everyone else!

To be sure, many people contributed to the success of the conference. We'd like to thank the program committee for putting together a fantastic set of presentations and posters - Oz Ayduk, Jess Tracy, Brent Donnellan, Chris Fraley, Iris Mauss, and Vivian Zayas. We'd also like to thank Max Barranti and Kelly Miskewicz, grad students in Wake Forest's Psychology Department who did a great job at the registration desk. We are very grateful for generous support from Wake Forest University, Wake Forest's Psychology Department, High Point University, Hogan Assessments, and Elsevier - their support contributed greatly to the conference's success. Finally, we'd like to thank all of you who attended the conference and made it so fascinating, informative, and fun. We look forward to seeing you all again in 2015.

## An Interview with 2012 Jack Block Award Winner [Dan McAdams](#)

by [Joshua Wilt](#)

### Why do you study personality?

I am interested in human nature, and the texture of individual human lives. “Personality” is the one concept in psychology that seems to encompass the big questions about human nature and individual lives. When I was an undergraduate student, my heroes in Psychology were mainly personality psychologists, or at least they studied the big questions about human nature and individual lives: Freud, Erikson, Murray, Ernest Becker. And I was drawn to philosophers and literary figures who addressed the same kinds of questions - especially Sartre, Kierkegaard, and Dostoyevsky.

### What is your most exciting discovery?

I don't think I have a discovery. I mean, my students and I have hit upon some cool findings. In this regard, I am gratified that we have been able to document a close connection between the tendency to show high levels of generativity on the one hand and to construct a redemptive life story on the other. In American society, redemptive narratives of the self provide psychological resources for leading a life of caring and commitment in adulthood. But I guess I am more of a synthesizer and theorist than a “discoverer” of empirical facts. With that in mind, I see my contributions as two-fold. First, I have argued for many years that what Erik Erikson long ago called “identity” may be readily construed, at least in part, as an internalized and evolving story of the self - an ongoing narrative that reconstructs the past and imagines the future in order to provide a person's life with a sense of unity and purpose. Today, we call this idea narrative identity. The second thing is my ongoing effort to articulate a conceptual framework for understanding personality and the development of self. My current take on this is that we begin life as social actors, defined by the social roles and broad temperament traits that eventually make up our social reputations in the eyes of others (and in our own eyes). With the exception of openness, the Big Five essentially track our reputations as social actors. In grade school, we become motivated agents, too, as we formulate goals, plans, and values that layer over our dispositional traits. In adulthood, we eventually become autobiographical authors, as well, constructing an integrative life story (narrative identity), which layers over our goals and values, which in turn layer over our traits. In adulthood, personality comprises a unique patterning of traits, goals, and stories - the self as actor, agent, and author - situated in history and culture.

### What is a high point in your career?

Winning the Jack Block prize last year for contributions to personality psychology was surely a high point. It is very gratifying to be recognized in that way. In terms of more intrinsic matters, however, a real high point for me was the 18-month period during which I wrote the bulk of my book, *The Redemptive Self: Stories Americans Live By* (2006). I woke up every morning totally excited to begin work on the project. I loved writing that book. I felt that I was exploring really important ideas and discovering new connections between different fields of study. It was intellectually exhilarating. I was depressed when the writing ended, and I have never had a writing experience that good since.

### What about a low point?

I have been blessed. Professionally speaking, I have not endured horrible low points. I did struggle a lot, though, early on in my career. Landing my first tenure-line job (Loyola University of Chicago, 1980) was really difficult. I came out of grad school with hardly any publications, and I was poorly socialized regarding professional issues - probably because I was so young and because my advisor in graduate school (David McClelland) did not consider professional socialization to be important. (In other ways, though, David was a fabulous advisor, and an inspiration.) I bombed a job interview at Brandeis, and a few years later at University of Chicago, and a few years after that at Purdue. I wanted the Chicago job really, really bad. Took me a couple of decades before I worked that all out, to tell you the truth. Every time I get a paper

rejected by a journal, I feel it is the worse thing that has happened. I call my wife up and tell her I am going to quit - "They just don't appreciate me ;" "Nobody gets what I am doing;" - I say stuff like that. She just laughs it off, and I usually feel back to normal within a day or two.

Usually you are on the other side of questions about high points and low points, and you have read thousands upon thousands of scenes from life stories. Given that you have just shared a small part of your life story pertaining to your career, how do you think that your own research has influenced how you construct your own life story?

I don't know. I have never been on the participant end of a life-story interview. For my overall life story, the high points, low points, and turning points are not typically about my career -- more about marriage and family issues, and other personal concerns. When I began research on life narratives in the 1980s, my sense was that people have very clear and readily demarcated episodes in their lives, and that these hold the key to narrative identity. I think my own life story -- as it was in my 20s and 30s -- contained clear scenes like that then. Today, though, things are a bit blurrier and harder to pin down, at least as far as my own life narrative is concerned. I tend now to think more in terms of chapters or plot lines in my own life story. Part of that is because I have experienced so many different events -- some really great, some not so -- that they tend to blur together now in my memory, more than was the case when I was younger and there were fewer scenes to keep track of. I also think that I have simply forgotten many details of earlier events, details that were very clear to me when I was younger. Having said that, there are still very vivid scenes that stand out in bold print in my own narrative identity. They tend to be from my late teens, 20s, and early 30s, in keeping with the research findings on the reminiscence bump.

Typically, a turning point scene follows narratives of a high point and low point scene in your life story interviews. Would you mind sharing a turning point in your career?

A turning point in my career was moving to Northwestern University from Loyola, in 1989. I went from a psychology department to an interdisciplinary program in Human Development and Social Policy (HDSP). (Now I am half in Psychology and half in HDSP, but when I started at NU it was all HDSP.) The entire ethos of HDSP was about culture, context, and life span development. Little interest among my colleagues in traditional personality psychology. My own research interests had already turned to life narratives, but it was not until I got to NU and immersed myself in the HDSP intellectual environment that I began to see how life stories are as much about society and culture as they are about the self. My colleagues in HDSP were very interested in how social institutions shape human lives. In order to connect to those interests, I decided to focus my attention on the life stories of highly generative midlife adults, because these are the kinds of men and women who are most meaningfully and deeply involved in some of the most important institutions in our society, such as schools, churches, and government. I received funding from the Spencer Foundation to launch a study of the life stories of especially generative teachers and community volunteers; a few years later I received more funding to examine the role of race in the construction of life stories and the performance of generativity. I became more of a life-span developmental psychologist, and maybe a little bit of a sociologist and cultural anthropologist at the same time. I never lost touch with my roots in personality psychology, however, but I did develop a broader perspective than I would have developed had I stayed in a psychology department.

Do you have any career advice for new researchers?

You have to strike a balance between being strategic and pursuing what you really love. In nearly every case, these two motives conflict. My sense is that many young scientists side with the strategic: In order to get pubs, they churn out as many studies as they can as fast as they can, adopting the most tried-and-true methods and taking on the easiest or safest topics - or the ones that are most fundable. When I get tenure, I will focus on my deepest passions, they say. But once they get tenure, the habits of mind have ossified, and they continue with the predictable program they have begun. I am exaggerating here to make a point. The point is that if you don't carve out part of your intellectual life to pursue your passion early on, it will be very difficult to do it later. In my case, I worked on two tracks early in my career. I continued a

relatively conservative line of research developed in my dissertation (building an empirical case for the construct validity of “intimacy motivation”), but at the same time I read widely (inside and outside of psychology), taught new seminars, and began doing exploratory interviews with people to develop nascent ideas regarding the nature of identity, which ultimately led to my life-story model of identity. It took nearly a decade of work on the life story model before I could publish a peer-reviewed empirical article on it. But eventually that second line of work became primary for me, along with research on generativity and related concepts. I have not done a study on intimacy motivation in 25 years.

## What are some important but understudied topics in personality?

I am not sure I can point to topics, but I think that there are under-represented approaches. In particular, approaches that focus on the meaning and structure of a single life - case studies, idiographic approaches, psychological biography - have always been under-represented in personality psychology, even back in Allport’s day. I believe that personality psychologists should focus more attention on the patterning of traits, goals, and stories that comprise an individual life. I also think that we need to do more sophisticated research regarding the interface of personality and culture. Looking at Big Five scores across, say, 60 different societies is not enough - in fact, I am not sure that tells us much of anything about personality and culture.

## Why do you think those approaches have received less attention, and what are some of the reasons that it is important for personality psychologists to study those approaches?

Idiographic, case-based research is labor- and time-intensive, and it tends not to be valued by the profession. Also, the rules or standards for high quality research in this domain are hard to articulate. Nonetheless, personality psychologists are better equipped than any other social scientists to shed light on the meaning and psychological structure of individual human lives. If we don’t do this, who will? We certainly don’t want to leave this task to the social psychologists, or journalists! At the end of the day, if our concepts and methods in personality science cannot help us understand individual lives, then how valuable are they?

## What are some of the most exciting developments in personality psychology?

Well, this kind of question is always a projective test, and an opportunity to display narcissism. To those ends, I surely think that the research that my students and I do on life narrative, psychological biography, generativity, and culture represents an “exciting” development. I am also excited about most approaches to understanding personality, social, and developmental psychology that inquire into the evolutionary roots of human functioning. I am a huge fan of evo psych - not in the usual, let’s show-how-men-and-women-are-different-when-it-comes-to-sex-and-mating sort of thing, but rather evolutionary perspectives on the nature of our cognitively-gifted, exquisitely social species - which gets us to topics like altruism, attachment, aggression, social identification, religion, and the nature of political structures. Jonathan Haidt’s work is fascinating in this regard. Evolution and culture are the two great macrocontexts for personality. Sorting out the relations between evolution, culture, and personality presents a very exciting challenge for the future.

## An Interview with 2010 J. S. Tanaka Personality Dissertation Award Winner [Sarah De Pauw](#)

by [Kathrin Herzhoff](#)

### Why do you study personality?

I was raised as the fifth of six children in a newly composed family so from an early age I was confronted with a lot of individual differences among me and my siblings and natural experiments of genes and environments. So I was already at a very early age interested in these individual differences. I was in my teens when I read my first book on personality. It was on the temperament types of Hippocrates. I was so enthralled by it and that passion stayed. Then during my masters and then my PhD process I stayed with my passion to study the relationships between personality and temperament. I think now that I have two children, almost three, I am also really fascinated by their individual differences and just talking about these differences and trying to understand them and conceptualize them. I really like that and enjoy that.

### What is your most exciting discovery?

I don't know if I can really speak on discoveries in my research because I see myself doing more integrative work and trying to do innovation through integration. But what really excites me in my work is that I found based on my empirical work on the different temperament and personality models, which is actually rather boring for some people, some keys that I can integrate fragmented trait frames, for instance, in pervasive developmental disorders like autism. I have some keys to integrate findings across multiple temperament and personality frameworks. I think that is rather neat and that is what I like to do and plan to do in the near future: to make some more integrations based on those keys. I just like to read and to study and then to see the big picture. That is a bit more how I like to do research.

### If you had to pick a high point in your career so far, what would it be and why?

This is very straightforward—maybe too straightforward—but I was really happy to receive the Tanaka award because this was even more [prestigious] than when an article was accepted or a more local prize or something like an award [was bestowed]. It was something more like that the real experts liked my work and thought it was good even though I come from Europe. (laughs) Apparently, I am the first European researcher [to have received this award] and I was really excited to see the list of all the Tanaka award winners. That was really a high point.

### What about a low point?

That high point is also related to my low point. That was the passing of my advisor, Ivan Mervielde. I know that he was really enthusiastic and really motivated me and encouraged me to apply for the Tanaka award. On the one hand, that is also a high point for his memory but losing him has been a very hard point in my career. That is life... (clears throat)

### Any career advice for new researchers? I am also especially interested in any advice for female and/or non-American researchers.

In Belgium and the Netherlands it is quite different than in the United States. Just for comparison, in Belgium we have two potential universities where you can go to work if you want to stay in Belgium. In Germany, it is a bit better, but maybe there are ten there and ten is a bit limited. So it is very good if you choose for international mobility or for national mobility in the States. That is what I see with a lot of other colleagues in the States and friends in the States: they are all just moving around. That is something that I choose not to do and that might not be a good career advice. I chose to have children and I try to combine a research career with family life, which is a challenge. At this point, I have a rather flexible job so that's great but I am not in a fixed career position, yet. I think what motivates me and what's my ambition is to write articles that impact. That's my advice: I want to write articles that have an impact, that are read,



that are widely read, and that are a substantial contribution to the literature, more than just another paper to enhance my list. I think if that's a career advice, it's my choice to try to make that my homework. I will see in a few years if this is good career advice. The citation rates of the paper that is also very important. For instance, if you publish in a very highly cited journal but your paper doesn't get cited, that is not ideal.

What are important but understudied topics in personality?

Aha! I think that Personality and neurodevelopmental disorders are really understudied and so that is one of the reasons why I became interested in [them]. I am becoming increasingly interested in [them] because I see so many links between, for instance, the research between the five factor model and personality disorders in adults, and the schizoid and personality disorder stuff and there is a lot of literature that has a lot of similarities with, for instance, autism-spectrum disorders. However, there are a lot of personality researchers interested in personality disorders but not in neurodevelopmental disorders which are manifested much earlier in life but are also very interesting to look at from a personality perspective. That is also [true] for ADHD—that might be the domain that some of the personality researchers are most interested in from all the developmental disorders and also have published on—and autism but also other syndromes. I see that there is a lot of interest in specifying the behavioral phenotype associated with the disorders, for instance, with Down syndrome or also with cerebral palsy or all kinds of genetic syndromes. But personality researchers are a bit hesitant to be involved in that; however, that is a very nice challenge to also look at these disorders and try to describe the individual differences from a personality perspective.

What have been some of the challenges in studying this population in terms of the measures, for instance?

If you are really looking at the genetic syndromes, there is the intellectual disability component, which is very important to take into account and we should also discuss and learn on that topic and also look at alternative ways to measure it. One idea is that we also should do something with the free parental descriptions—how the HiPIC is constructed. I know of some researchers who are starting to do that and they also find that most descriptors can be classified by the Big Five or by the Little Five. There are many arguments to also see that, for instance, the Five Factor Model can be validly used in the research on pervasive developmental disorders. It is something that we should study and discuss more and think about more. I think that it is a very interesting population, but understudied.

What are the most exciting developments in personality right now?

That we are evolving towards more multidisciplinary approaches and to implement personality in many other domains of psychology, or psychiatry, or even developmental pediatrics so that we can have more discussion across multiple disciplines to see how the personality concept can enhance and cross-fertilize across domains. For instance, at ARP there were very nice talks about personality and health and how personality is linked to lipid levels and blood pressure and stuff like that and I thought that was really neat and interesting. On the other hand, you also see the evolution towards more clinical practice that we are thinking about how can we change personality traits to get more adaptive and more positive outcomes. So the multidisciplinary impact of personality towards other disciplines, I think that is really nice to see and something that really is exciting. Economics is also getting increasingly interested in looking at personality antecedents and consequences and processes, predicting, for instance, mortality or job success—that is already a bit older. I think the multidisciplinary impact towards multiple disciplines that's really great.

Any closing words?

It was funny at ARP, when they saw me, they were all asking: "Is it your first baby?" and I said: "Oh no, it is my third." But then there was a frequent question: "How old are you?" I think it's a real challenge especially for a woman to be a researcher and a mother at this time before you have tenure or before you have a fixed position or a prospect. That's challenging. I have had mass of luck to this point. That's something that maybe we should talk more about: that it might be said that it's not evident, neither for

choosing children or just postponing having children or having family life. It's good that there is attention for that stuff.

Thank you so much, Sarah!

## An Interview with 2011 J. S. Tanaka Award Winner [Joshua Jackson](#)

by [Kate Rogers](#)

### Why do you study personality?

For whatever reason, I was always struck by the differences between people, rather than the similarities. I was always interested in why people do, choose, and think differently than I, and personality offers a platform to address those questions. I wager to guess that interest in individual differences is an individual difference in and of itself, and I am hanging out on one of the tails.

### What is your most exciting discovery?

Gosh, that is tough. Usually the most exciting is the latest discovery. If pressed, I think it's probably the study where I looked at changes in personality associated with military experience, partly because of the real world implications and partly because of the stat-wonkery involved. In terms of the real world implications, I think the study could have something important to say policy wise. Typically, discussions of war and the military are centered on more macro issues -- how much money is earmarked, how it should be used, when soldiers should be deployed - and only when tragedy strikes is there a real focus on the individual. This study explores how the military influences the personality of military recruits and finds personality changes associated with military experience. These changes in personality can have long-term ramifications for these individuals, impacting their interpersonal relationships and occupational attainment, for example. I think that if this study is replicated, there needs to be a frank discussion for anyone going into the military that there could be long-term psychological consequences. There is enough research out there on the effects of PTSD and suicide rates that I think recruiters should be more upfront about it.

### If you had to pick a high point in your career so far, what would it be?

In my short career thus far, I think getting a job was a definite highpoint; all of those years of hard work in grad school finally paying off. There are other high points as well: my first, first author in JPSP felt really great. My first lab meeting as a faculty member with all my students present was kind of big moment too; I tried to step back from the moment and had this feeling that things were coming together.

### What about low points?

Oh, there's just so many of them. Ha. I want to say some rejections, but those aren't too bad as it is part of the process. I would say working on a project for a long, long time and the results not playing out. The hours and hours, that weren't necessarily wasted, because I gained new skill sets, but there's a particular project I'm thinking of, where lots and lots and lots of time went into it with no discernable end product. You know, part of that is process of grad school and I can rationalize that away, but that was just no fun.

### Did you learn anything from that experience to help you avoid it in the future?

I don't think you can completely avoid it. I think it's good for everyone to go through that at least once because it's a good lesson to struggle. You should have a number of projects that span the spectrum of high risk/high reward to low hanging fruit, so failure will be part of the game. I think the worst is the first time you encounter it, so it is important to not think of it as wasted time but as just part of the process.

### So you're still willing to take the high risk stuff, even after that?

Oh yeah, that's the most exciting stuff. With a lot of these low risk, low hanging fruit projects, you have a pretty good idea of what the results will look like. The riskier projects address the big questions and it's the big questions that get me up each morning to go to work.

### Do you have any career advice for new researchers?

I think that balancing that high risk/high reward with getting some good publications that are moving the field forward is something to keep in mind. Collaborations are also important. Both for idea generation as well as being more efficient if you team up with people that have complimentary areas of expertise. It's also good to meet a lot of people and talk through your ideas with a lot of individuals. I see that the successful graduate students are ones who are able to work with multiple advisors or with other graduate students within their university as well as outside their university. Oh, and love what you research. That's kind of important.

Do you have any ideas as to how as graduate students we can increase collaboration because it's not necessarily the easiest thing.

No, no it's not, especially for academics as a whole; we're introverted and it's hard to get out of our shells. I guess the sensible thing would be to have a few drinks. But seriously, it is easy as going up to people and saying, "Hey I like your research, I'm interested in the same things". People love talking about their research, just show an interest, that's your in and it'll go from there. It's kind of like dating, if you go up to a lot of people and ask them, after a while it'll get easier. Plus it's also a cumulative effect where once you know someone, they introduce you to someone and your network continues to branch out.

What's the best advice someone has given you throughout graduate school or your career?

The best piece of advice was actually from Jeremy Biesanz, and it was initially said in reference to grad school, but it's applicable for your entire career. "Grad school (or insert whatever career period), is not a sprint, it's a marathon. So you have to pace yourself." It has come in handy many times. There are times where I feel like I'm sprinting and I'm going to run out of oxygen, but in those instances you have to step back and look at the bigger picture. Our research just takes so long to do, so you have to think about it as a multiyear process where you cannot meaningfully make progress in days or hours. When you're talking about a time frame of years, it's definitely a marathon, not a sprint.

What are the important, but understudied topics in personality?

Any answer I think to give is super myopic and self-absorbed as my initial thought is, "Oh, my own research of course!" I think that there needs to be more research looking at individual differences beyond the Big Five and incorporating all those together in some systematic framework. Right now our work consists of islands. People research goals, people do traits, people do interests or IQ, and I think that there's something to be had by combining all of those together. It's difficult to do, so that's probably why you don't see much of it out there, but I think that's really understudied.

What do you think are the most exciting developments in personality right now?

It's exciting that there's other fields getting interested in personality's power to predict basically any sort of outcome that people find important: health, wealth, personal relationships. These other fields want to incorporate our measures, which will make us a little more popular, and they want us to incorporate their methods, which will help us expand as a discipline. I think some of the most exciting stuff is that economists want to try to train character skills in children because it could have such a cumulative effect on their life. They're interested in it because it influences human capital -- their ability to get good jobs, make good money, and give back in terms of GDP. It is so exciting, I think, because for the longest time, I didn't think on that scale.

Where do you see the field of personality going, 10 or 20 years from now? What's the field going to look like?

I think it's going to be more cross-disciplinary, both within psychology as well as across other disciplines. Where basically anything under the sun, there's going to be some personality psychologist working in that domain. I think Bill Revelle has said it, how personality psychologists are the last kind of generalist in

psychology. I think you're going to see that more often, people are just going to expand in really interesting areas. It should make future ARP conferences really exciting.

## Safer Science

### Simine Vazire

At the last ARP conference in Charlotte, I organized a symposium called “Safer Science: How to improve the quality and replicability of personality research”. I got the idea for this symposium from various discussions I’d had about the “replicability crisis”. First, I served on an APS taskforce on this issue, during which my primary role was to throw a yellow flag every time the group made a recommendation that applied only to experimental designs. This experience made me reflect on which of the challenges our field faces are specific to experimental (i.e., mostly social and cognitive) psych, and what are the unique challenges faced by non-experimental research. It’s easy to get haughty about not dropping conditions or not peeking at your data when you work with large-scale correlational datasets. But we personality researchers are also susceptible to capitalizing on chance in other ways (it’s easy to do when our datasets have 7,000 variables).

The purpose of the Safer Science symposium was to stimulate discussion about what personality researchers can do to improve the quality of our research. I used the phrase “safer science” because, like sex, I believe that science is never completely safe - there will always be errors, false positives, and even fraud, and we should not delude ourselves that we can eradicate these. However, we can always do better. Some people seem to find the replicability crisis depressing - I find it uplifting because the popularity of the reform initiatives shows that we want to do better. This is what progress looks like. This is the only way a field becomes stronger. Rather than pointing fingers, personality researchers should join in.

There are signs of change everywhere. JRP has [new submission guidelines](#) emphasizing power and transparency, and encouraging replication studies. SPSP is in the midst of [similar changes](#). APS has already opened its doors to pre-registered replication reports, and is about to put in place new submission guidelines for Psychological Science. NSF is holding a workshop on replicability. It’s a brave new world.

What does this mean for personality research? The talks in the Safer Science symposium shed some light on some issues for us to keep in mind as we try to do better science. Here are a few highlights (with some editorializing from me):

- Replication studies are vital to our field’s scientific health, and should be encouraged. Replicators should not be treated as attackers - many are not out to tear anyone down but honestly want to know if they can replicate (and sometimes extend) a published finding. Likewise, even well-powered failures to replicate should not automatically be seen as a mark on the original researcher - some amount of error is expected by chance and should be chalked up to bad luck. (Funder talk)
- Personality journals tend to publish studies with larger sample sizes than social or social/personality journals (JP came out on top, followed by JRP) and a journal’s N-Pact factor (the average sample size of each study) is negatively correlated with its Impact Factor (Vazire & Fraley talk).
- Meta-analyses can give us an idea of what effect sizes to expect when planning our sample sizes, but because of publication bias, these estimates are likely inflated. When planning our studies and when interpreting published studies, we should keep in mind that the true effect size is likely smaller than the reported effect size. The smaller the sample, the more inflated the reported effect size is likely to be. (Srivastava talk)
- Papers that include multiple, under-powered studies that all report significant findings are statistically improbable. Thus, when such a paper is published, it likely means that there were other studies that ‘didn’t work’ (file drawer), or other creative techniques used to achieve a string of significant results from under-powered studies. (Schimmack talk)

So where do we go from here? First, we shouldn’t get too comfortable. None of the journals we examined reached the average sample size Sanjay recommended: 180 for 80% power (to detect an  $r$  of .10), or 300 for 90% power. The average sample size at JP - the journal that came out on top - is 178, at JRP it is 128, and at JPSP:PPID it is 122 (Fraley & Vazire, 2013). We are still falling short of adequate power. So lesson #1 is that we should, whenever possible, take the time to increase our sample sizes.

Second, we should remember to take the time to attempt to replicate our own and each other's work. And we shouldn't take an attempted replication as a sign of mistrust. Indeed, as Funder put it, we should be flattered if someone deems our finding important enough to be worthy of attempted replication.

Notice that I used the phrase "take the time" in both of these recommendations. That's because if we are to increase our sample sizes and replicate our results, it is going to take time. And time is something that none of us feel like we have an abundance of. So what are we to do? One option is to put all of our studies on mTurk, or start doing only self-report or vignette studies. That is my idea of research dystopia. Yes, we need larger samples and more replication, but not at the expense of methodological rigor - we need to continue using multiple methods, sampling non-college students, coding actual behavior, and tracking people over time. So there's only one solution. We need to join the slow science movement.

## References

Fraley, R. C. & Vazire, S. (2013). The N-Pact Factor: Evaluating the quality of empirical journals with respect to sample size and statistical power. Manuscript under review.

## Reflections on ARP

### Kelci Harris

This summer I attended ARP in Charlotte, and it opened my eyes to the lack of diversity in our field. I learned a lot from the symposia, poster sessions, and mentor lunch, but what I enjoyed the most about the conference was putting faces to the names of people whose articles I've read. I got to really see the field of personality psychology. What I saw, though, was mostly white and, for the older set, male. I shouldn't have been surprised, the demographics of academia are pretty well known, but nevertheless, there was a moment during one of the symposia when I looked around the room of about 75 people and I came to the all too familiar realization that I was only one of maybe four racial/ethnic minorities in the room. Every time this awareness creeps up on me, I wonder why it is that I am alone. This time, instead of shrugging that feeling off, I took some time to think about it, and this essay details what I've come up with.

I can't speak to the experiences of members of other underrepresented minorities. I can't even speak to the experiences of all African American students, so I will focus on my personal experiences in academia. Take them for what you will.

Looking back on my undergraduate experience at the University of North Carolina, there were lots of other African-American psychology majors. Many African-American students also participated in research. In my graduating class, of the 40 students who completed honors theses, six of us were African-American, which was representative of the percentage of African-American students on campus. There were also a few African-American faculty members in the psychology department concentrated in the clinical and developmental areas. The funny thing is, most of the research conducted by African-American members of the department, students and faculty, had something to do with race. And that wasn't just the case in the psychology department. Most of the African-American faculty members I encountered throughout the university, from romance languages to anthropology, conducted research about race. And that wasn't just the case at my school! When I was surveying department websites, trying to figure out where to apply for grad school, I noticed that African-American faculty members in psychology departments across the country seem to be studying race. After a while, it started to seem like to be African-American and an academic meant that one's scholarship had to somehow focus on the black experience. And in a way that makes sense. Simply being a member of a minority means that the world interacts with you in a different way than it would if you were not. Those interactions are a breeding ground for research questions that need to be answered. However, when you consider the "typical academic", the white male found in every department researching whatever suits his taste, it seems to me like the "African-American academic" mold is constraining. While race is one of the more personally relevant research topics for minority students, there are so many things about the world, beyond race, that are fascinating and worth studying. I'm suggesting that as a field we make it a priority to convince minority students that personality and individual differences research is relevant and worth pursuing.

Personality psychology should be intrinsically interesting to everyone, because, well, everyone has a personality. It's accessible and that makes our research so fun and an easy thing to talk about with non-psychologists, that is, once we've explained to them what we actually do. However, despite what could be a universal appeal, our field is very homogenous. And that's too bad, because diversity makes for better science. Good research comes from observations. You notice something about the world, and you wonder why that is. It's probably reasonable to guess that most members of our field have experienced the world in a similar way due to their similar demographic backgrounds. This similarity in experience presents a problem for research because it makes us miss things. How can assumptions be challenged when no one realizes they are being made? What kind of questions will people from different backgrounds have that current researchers could never think of because they haven't experienced the world in that way?

So what can we do about it?

Well for one, we can talk about it. I'm no expert in educational policy - I barely have my bachelor's degree - so any suggestions that I make would be much less informed than those made by people with more experience with the inner workings of academia. People like you, good reader. As researchers, solving



problems is our bread and butter, and so I'm sure that collectively we could come up with some pretty great solutions. Other areas do this through a diversity committee, whose job it is to think about these issues. We don't just have to talk amongst ourselves, it might also be good to reach out to whatever resources your universities have related to improving diversity at the university level, for example, the McNair Scholars program or summer programs geared towards recruiting students from underrepresented minorities. Not only would finding ways to engage with those programs at the university level be a way to convince a wide variety of students that personality research is awesome, it would also be a good way to learn effective recruitment techniques.

Making efforts to prioritize and promote diversity in our field means making efforts to better our field. Demographic shifts do not happen overnight. As we work to foster interest in personality psychology in a more diverse group of undergraduates, we should start to see that translate into more diversity among graduate students, and, eventually, faculty members. It will take time, but I do not believe our efforts will be in vain. In the end, our field will be stronger for it.

## Announcing the 2015 ARP Conference

### The ARP 2015 Organizing Committee

SAVE THE DATE! We are excited to announce that the next ARP conference will be held in **St. Louis, Missouri** on **June 11th to 14th, 2015**. The conference will take place in the [Chase Park Plaza Hotel](#), located in the [Central West End neighborhood](#), a vibrant area with lots of shops and restaurants. The Chase is home to two popular local restaurants, as well as a salon spa, a [fitness center](#), an outdoor pool, and a five-screen movie theater (popcorn, anyone?).

The Chase is on the city's [MetroLink subway line](#), and across the street from [Forest Park](#), one of the largest urban parks in the United States ([bigger than Central Park!](#)). The park has lots of trails for runners and cyclists (there are bike rentals nearby). Forest Park also has many [free](#) attractions:

- The [St. Louis Art Museum](#) just completed its new contemporary art wing over the summer.
- The [St. Louis Zoo](#) is consistently ranked one of the top zoos in the country (and it's free!).
- The [St. Louis Science Center](#)
- The [Missouri History Museum](#)

ARP will happen while baseball season is still going strong, giving attendees the opportunity to see just how much St. Louis loves baseball. The **St. Louis Cardinals** play at Busch Stadium in downtown St. Louis, near our most famous landmark, the **Gateway Arch**. Busch Stadium, as you might guess, is named for Anheuser-Busch, the makers of Budweiser. **Anheuser-Busch** headquarters are located on the banks of the Mississippi just south of downtown. There you can take a free tour of the factory, see the famous Clydesdales, and sample some "beer." Also downtown is one of the best attractions for kids of all ages: the [City Museum](#), which somehow manages to be an aquarium, an art installation, a jungle gym, and a place for found things all at once.

St. Louis has many excellent restaurants and bars. Here are a few to whet your appetite:

- [Brasserie](#)
- [Dressel's](#)
- [Farmhaus](#)
- [Stellina's](#)
- [Acero](#)

And, if Budweiser doesn't do it for you, check out these microbreweries:

- [Schlafly](#)
- [Urban Chestnut](#) - try the STL IPA

And of course, St. Louis is home to **Washington University**, where you can't go ten yards without bumping into a personality psychologist. In other words, St. Louis has something for everyone. We look forward to seeing you here in 2015!

-The ARP 2015 local arrangements committee:

Simine Vazire  
Dan Ozer  
Lynne Cooper  
Josh Jackson  
Randy Larsen  
Tom Oltmanns

Tammy English

With special thanks to the Wash U personality/social graduate students!

## ARP-sponsored Preconference at SPSP

### Erik Nofhle

Susan Krauss Whitbourne, Jennifer Lodi-Smith, and I are organizing the third annual preconference dedicated to lifespan development at SPSP, the Lifespan Social Personality preconference.

The preconference will take place on February 13, 2004. We have organized three symposia, all of which we expect to be of great interest to ARP members. The first symposium is on **personality development in late life**, and will include talks by Jennifer Lay, Jenny Wagner, Nicholas Turiano, and Cornelia Wrzus. The second symposium is on **moral and character development** across the lifespan, and will include talks by Brent Roberts, Daniel Lapsley, Tobias Krettenauer, and Lauri Jensen-Campbell. The third symposium is on **methods in lifespan social-personality psychology**, and will include talks by Jon Adler, Josh Jackson, Jenn Lodi-Smith, and Jack McArdle. We are very pleased that Jutta Heckhausen has agreed to be the discussant to close the preconference.

The preconference will also include an open poster session. All registered attendees are welcome to bring posters of their research to share.

More information about the preconference is here: <http://lodismith.canisiuspsychology.net/lspprecon.html>

Registration hasn't opened yet (as of 10/15/2013), but the above link will allow for registration soon.

Finally, we are delighted that ARP will be sponsoring the preconference this year! One feature of ARP sponsorship is that all students who are members of ARP will receive a \$10 reduction in registration fees for the preconference!

## Personality and Social Psychology at the 2014 APA Conference

### Jonathan Adler

I invite you to submit proposals for symposia and posters for the annual APA convention, to be held August 7-10 in Washington, DC. In my role as Program Chair for Division 8 (Personality and Social Psychology), I will be coordinating the program and welcome any questions. Please note that Division 8 only accepts symposia and poster submissions and does not accept individual papers.

In recent years, we have had excellent programs at APA, and we hope to have even more representation from personality and social psychologists in 2014. In particular, early career faculty and graduate students are encouraged to organize a symposium in their area of study or to submit a poster proposal of their work. *This year, we are especially interested in submissions that demonstrate the ways in which personality and social psychology connect to and inform other areas of psychology, including applied work in all areas and research with clinical relevance.* Also, please consider whether your symposium submission fulfills the criteria for Continuing Education, which is a straightforward process and dramatically increases attendance at sessions. APA non-members may submit proposals if at least one co-author is a member of APA or an APA member sponsors the proposal.

Submissions should be made online by **midnight EST on Monday, December 2, 2013** at <http://apacustomout.apa.org/ConvCall>. Full details about the procedures for submitting proposals can be found at <http://apacustomout.apa.org/ConvCallCollab/Call4Programs.pdf>.

Please feel free to contact me at [jadler@olin.edu](mailto:jadler@olin.edu) with questions or ideas for programming that you would like to see at the next APA convention.

## News and Announcements from ARP Members

Have a bit of news, or an announcement, that you'd like to share with the ARP community? Email us at [arpnewsletter@gmail.com](mailto:arpnewsletter@gmail.com) and we'll add it to our News & Announcements "plog".

Please see: [http://www.personality-arp.org/html/newsletter08/member\\_news.html](http://www.personality-arp.org/html/newsletter08/member_news.html)

# WE PREDICT PERFORMANCE

**People are your  
competitive  
advantage.**

In a business environment where most companies have access to the same resources and technology, successful companies differentiate themselves through their committed and knowledgeable workforce.

Hogan assessments identify work strengths, shortcomings, and core values, helping to ensure that you get the most from your employees, and that they get the most out of their careers.

[hoganassessments.com](http://hoganassessments.com) | 800.756.0632

