COURSE PROPOSAL PACKET

RELATIONAL PHYSICS

Engineering Human Connection

Proposed Course Title **Relational Physics: Engineering Human Connection**	**Course Category** Life Skills / Social & Behavioral Sciences
Framework Rouse Relational OS™ (ROS™)	**Proposed Level** Lower division — open enrollment
Proposed Credits 3 semester credits	**Prerequisites** None
Contact Hours 48 hours (16 weeks × 3 hrs/week)	**Submitted By** Shawn Rouse, Rouse OS Enterprises

info@RouseOS.com • www.RouseOS.com • © 2026 Shawn Rouse

Contents of This Proposal Packet

SECTION 1 — COURSE OVERVIEW AND RATIONALE

1. Course Overview and Rationale

The Gap This Course Fills

Adult life requires the operation of multiple complex systems: financial systems, legal systems, health systems, and technological systems. Each comes with formal education, language, and diagnostic tools. Relationships — the most emotionally demanding and time-intensive system most adults will ever operate — are left entirely to instinct.

The result is a documented pattern: adults enter their most significant relational commitments without structural tools, diagnose relational failure through emotional attribution rather than systemic analysis, and apply behavioral interventions to structural problems that those interventions cannot address.

This course fills that gap. It provides the formal relational education that was never formally given.

What This Course Is

Relational Physics: Engineering Human Connection is a 16-week, 3-credit community college course built on the Rouse Relational Operating System™ (ROS™) — a structural diagnostic framework that maps how human relationships function under real-world pressure.

The course introduces students to a new academic category: Relational Systems Engineering. Rather than treating relationships as purely emotional experiences, students learn to analyze them as load-bearing systems with measurable structural properties, diagnosable failure modes, and evidence-based repair protocols.

Why Community College

Community college students are disproportionately navigating high environmental load: financial pressure, employment instability, caregiving responsibilities, and limited institutional support networks. These are precisely the conditions under which relational systems fail. This population has the most immediate need for structural relational tools and the least access to them through traditional academic programming.

The course requires no prerequisites, no prior academic background in psychology or sociology, and is designed for open enrollment. It meets students where they are.

What Makes This Framework Academically Credible

The ROS™ framework does not exist in opposition to established academic disciplines. It is a structural measurement layer built on top of peer-reviewed research in psychology, sociology, behavioral science, and systems theory. Every core framework component is corroborated by published research (see Section 10 and Section 14).

The framework introduces one genuinely novel contribution: the ROSE™ equation (Rouse OS Equation™), the first unifying computational model in relational science, which translates environmental pressure, individual capacity, and structural conditions into a single measurable Net Load Index. This is the transition from descriptive relational science to computable structural diagnostics.

SECTION 2 — COURSE DESCRIPTION (CATALOG COPY)

2. Course Description

PROPOSED CATALOG ENTRY

RELATIONAL PHYSICS: Engineering Human Connection 3 Units • 48 hours lecture • No prerequisite

Introduces the Rouse Relational Operating System™ (ROS™), a structural diagnostic framework for understanding how relationships function under real-world pressure. Students learn to identify environmental stressors affecting relational systems, assess individual internal capacity, analyze behavioral bonding patterns, and sequence repair correctly. Topics include the Relational Honeycomb Model, the five structural regulators (Environment, Self, Mortar, Reciprocity, Time), the ROSE™ equation for calculating structural load, the 12 domains of Self capacity, the six mortar compounds and their bond types, reciprocity mechanics, and the integrated diagnostic sequence. Includes case studies, personal structural assessments, and a capstone diagnostic project. Satisfies Life Skills and Social & Behavioral Sciences Gen Ed requirement. (CSU/UC transferable — pending articulation review.)

Short Description (for schedule listings)

Applies structural diagnostic principles to human relationships. Students learn to identify pressure sources, assess relational capacity, and sequence repair using the Rouse Relational OS™ framework. Includes personal assessment, case study analysis, and capstone project. No prerequisite.

SECTION 3 — STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES

3. Student Learning Outcomes

Upon successful completion of this course, students will be able to:

SLO 1	**Explain** the structural mechanics of how relationships behave under real-world pressure using the ROS™ framework, distinguishing structural thinking from emotional attribution.
SLO 2	**Identify** the five structural regulators of relational stability — Environment, Self, Mortar, Reciprocity, and Time — and describe the diagnostic function of each.
SLO 3	**Calculate** the Net Load Index using the ROSE™ equation and interpret the resulting load state for a relational system.
SLO 4	**Apply** the integrated five-step diagnostic sequence to analyze a relational case, correctly identifying the origin fracture and distinguishing it from downstream symptoms.
SLO 5	**Distinguish** between capacity failure and character failure in relational dynamics and explain how this distinction determines the correct intervention pathway.
SLO 6	**Analyze** the six mortar compounds (Respect, Honesty, Reliability, Trustworthiness, Boundaries, Effort) and their corresponding bond types, and identify erosion patterns in case scenarios.
SLO 7	**Evaluate** reciprocity balance in a relational system, differentiate adaptive support from enabling using the Capacity Restoration marker, and identify the three repair window stages.
SLO 8	**Apply** ethical principles to the use of structural diagnostic frameworks, identify clinical escalation triggers, and articulate the scope boundaries of non-clinical practice.
SLO 9	**Create** a complete integrated structural case analysis demonstrating command of the full diagnostic sequence, correct origin identification, cascade mapping, and intervention sequencing.

SLO 10	**Complete** a personal Relational Honeycomb assessment and Net Load Index calculation, demonstrating self-application of the structural framework to their own relational system.

SECTION 4 — 16-WEEK COURSE SCHEDULE

4. 16-Week Course Schedule

Week (s)	Unit	Topics	Assessment
1	Unit 1The Problem	The Unwritten Syllabus™ concept • Why relationships fail structurally • Structural vs. emotional thinking • Defining a healthy relationship	Discussion 1A, 1B • Reflection 1.1, 1.2
2	Unit 1 cont.	Maria case study • Emotional vs. structural reframe practice • Knowledge Check 1	Knowledge Check 1
3	Unit 2Architecture	Relational Honeycomb Model • The five regulators • ROSE™ equation introduction • Net Load Index	Honeycomb mapping exercise • Reflection 2.1
4	Unit 2 cont.	NLI calculation practice • Environmental Illusion • Knowledge Check 2 • Personal ROSE™ assessment at RouseOS.com	Knowledge Check 2 • Reflection 2.2 (NLI)
5	Unit 3Environment	Pressure field • Four stabilizers • Three load states • Spillover mechanics • James case study • Knowledge Check 3	Knowledge Check 3 • Reflection 3.1, 3.2
6	Unit 4The Self	Center cell • 12 domains • Leaking Center Principle • Structural Saturation	Domain scan exercise • Reflection 4.1

Week (s)	Unit	Topics	Assessment
7	Unit 4 cont.	Identity Fusion • Capacity ≠ Character • Robert case study • Knowledge Check 4	Knowledge Check 4 • Reflection 4.2
8	Unit 5Mortar	Six mortar compounds • Six bond types • Trust as system output • Volunteered Reliability Principle	Discussion 5A, 5B • Reflection 5.1
9	Unit 5 cont.	Apology vs. structural repair • Mortar repair sequencing • Alex & Priya case	Reflection 5.2
10	Unit 5 cont.	Knowledge Check 5 • Mortar assessment practice • Midterm review	Knowledge Check 5 • Midterm Exam
11	Unit 6Reciprocity & Time	Reciprocity mechanics • Balanced Load Shift vs. Chronic Load Accumulation • Enabling threshold • Four failure indicators • Time as amplifier • Three repair windows • Linda & Paul case • Knowledge Check 6	Knowledge Check 6 • Reflection 6.1, 6.2
12	Unit 7Diagnostics	Integrated diagnostic sequence • Five diagnostic steps • Common errors • Carrier Wave Mapping • Sarah & Marcus case	Reflection 7.1, 7.2
13	Unit 7 cont.	Full case diagnostic practice • Knowledge Check 7 • Capstone introduction and topic selection	Knowledge Check 7 • Capstone topic approved
14	Unit 8Triage & Repair	Repair vs. triage • Stage 1–2 repair sequence • Stage 3 triage protocol • Separation as Structural Intervention • Knowledge Check 8	Knowledge Check 8 • Reflection 8.1, 8.2

Week (s)	Unit	Topics	Assessment
15	Unit 9Application & Ethics	What the framework is and is not • Referral triggers • Ethical application • Certification pathway • Capstone workshop	Capstone draft due • Peer review
16	Capstone & Closing	Capstone presentations or submissions • Personal Honeycomb submission • Course closing	Final Capstone submitted • Personal Honeycomb submitted

SECTION 5 — REQUIRED TEXTBOOKS AND MATERIALS

5. Required Textbooks and Materials

Required Texts

Text	Details	Notes
Relational Physics: Engineering Human Connection — Student Edition	Author: Shawn RousePublisher: Rouse OS Enterprises (2026)ISBN: Pending	Required. Contains all course readings, case studies, reflection exercises, knowledge checks, and capstone assignment.
Rouse Relational OS™ Reflection Assessment	Free at RouseOS.comNo account required	Required completion by Week 4. Paper version available from instructor for students without internet access.

Recommended Supplemental Text

Text	Details	Notes
The Unwritten Syllabus: Hidden Blueprints of Healthy Relationships	Author: Shawn RousePublisher: Rouse OS Enterprises (2026)Retail: $24.99	Recommended companion reading. The lay-reader narrative version of the framework. Provides accessible prose context for students who want deeper engagement beyond the textbook.

No Additional Materials Required

No clicker, no lab fee, no software subscription. All assessments, reflections, and the capstone project are completed using the student textbook and submitted per instructor preference (digital or print).

SECTION 6 — ASSESSMENT AND GRADING STRUCTURE

6. Assessment and Grading Structure

Assessment Component	Weight	Description
Knowledge Checks (9 units × 5 pts each)	45 pts	Short-answer questions at the end of each unit. Completed in-class or as take-home. Graded for accuracy and structural reasoning.
Reflection Exercises (18 exercises × 5 pts each)	90 pts	Personal application exercises submitted digitally or on printed handouts. Graded for engagement, application of framework concepts, and structural thinking (not personal disclosure).
Discussion Participation	50 pts	Participation in structured classroom discussions. Graded for engagement, constructive contribution, and demonstrated structural thinking.
Midterm Exam	75 pts	Unit 1–5 content. Mix of multiple choice, short answer, and one case study diagnostic question.
Personal Honeycomb Submission	40 pts	Complete personal Honeycomb map with NLI calculation. Submitted as capstone attachment. Graded for completeness and structural accuracy.
Capstone: Integrated Structural Case Analysis	100 pts	800–1,200 word full diagnostic report using the five-step sequence. Graded using the

Assessment Component	Weight	Description
		ROS™ Capstone Scoring Rubric (included in Instructor Edition).
TOTAL	400 pts	

Grading Scale

Grade	Points	Percentage	Description
A	360–400	90–100%	Demonstrates structural thinking throughout; correct diagnostic sequence; strong application.
B	320–359	80–89%	Solid framework application; minor sequencing gaps; good reflective engagement.
C	280–319	70–79%	Basic framework comprehension demonstrated; inconsistent application.
D	240–279	60–69%	Partial comprehension; significant structural gaps in application.
F	Below 240	Below 60%	Does not demonstrate sufficient framework competency.

NOTE Capstone Override Rule

Consistent with the ROS™ Tier 1 Certification standard: a Capstone demonstrating wrong fracture origin, incorrect diagnostic sequence, or flawed intervention logic cannot receive full

credit regardless of score on individual components. Structural thinking must be correct throughout.

SECTION 7 — BLOOM'S TAXONOMY ALIGNMENT

7. Bloom's Taxonomy Alignment

This course addresses all six cognitive levels of Bloom's revised taxonomy. The progression from Remember through Create mirrors the course arc: students build foundational knowledge in Units 1–2, apply it in Units 3–6, analyze and evaluate in Units 7–8, and create in the Unit 9 capstone.

Level	Evidence in Course	Assessment Alignment
Remember	Glossary terms, framework components, 12 Self domains, 6 mortar compounds, 11 Laws of Relational Physics	Knowledge Checks (recall questions)
Understand	Conceptual explanations of each regulator; structural vs. emotional thinking tables; case study narratives	Knowledge Checks (explanation questions) • Discussion participation
Apply	ROSE™ equation calculation; personal Honeycomb mapping; unit application exercises; NLI interpretation	Reflection exercises • Midterm case question
Analyze	Integrated structural scans; Carrier Wave Mapping; cascade identification; origin vs. symptom differentiation	Knowledge Checks (analysis questions) • Capstone sections 1–5
Evaluate	Ethical boundary assessments; repair vs. triage determinations; referral trigger identification; Capacity ≠ Character judgments	Capstone section 6 • Discussion participation • Midterm

Level	Evidence in Course	Assessment Alignment
Create	Capstone Integrated Structural Case Analysis • Personal structural action plan • Personal Honeycomb with NLI	Capstone (100 pts) • Personal Honeycomb submission (40 pts)

SECTION 8 — GENERAL EDUCATION COMPETENCIES ALIGNMENT

8. General Education Competencies Alignment

Gen Ed Competency	How This Course Addresses It	Specific Course Evidence
Critical Thinking	Students learn to distinguish structural origins from symptomatic presentations, test capacity vs. character hypotheses, and sequence diagnostic reasoning correctly	Integrated diagnostic sequence • Origin vs. symptom differentiation • Capacity ≠ Character reframe • Capstone rubric
Communication	Students engage in structured case discussions, written reflections, and a formal written capstone analysis	18 reflection exercises • 9 unit discussions • 800–1,200-word capstone report
Quantitative Reasoning	Students apply the ROSE™ equation to calculate Net Load Index scores and interpret load state ranges	ROSE™ equation: Base Pressure − Resource Absorption − Stabilizer Dampening = NLI • Load state ranges (0–20, 21–40, 41–60, 61+)
Ethical Reasoning	Unit 9 addresses the scope of practice, referral triggers, ethical application of diagnostic frameworks, and the limits of non-clinical practice	Six clinical escalation triggers • Scope of practice boundary • Structural neutrality principle
Information Literacy	Course integrates peer-reviewed research throughout; students engage with an APA bibliography organized by framework component	14+ peer-reviewed sources • APA bibliography • Convergence data tables by framework component

Gen Ed Competency	How This Course Addresses It	Specific Course Evidence
Lifelong Learning	Personal Honeycomb and NLI assessments provide tools students can apply independently beyond the course. Course pedagogy mirrors experiential learning principles — students discover structural concepts through personal application, not abstract memorization.	RouseOS.com free Reflection Assessment • Personal Honeycomb submission • Self-reinforcement tools in each unit • Nabiyev (2026): experiential learning framework corroboration

SECTION 9 — SOCIAL & BEHAVIORAL SCIENCES STANDARDS ALIGNMENT

9. Social & Behavioral Sciences Standards Alignment

This course satisfies common Social and Behavioral Sciences requirements at the community college level. The following table maps each standard requirement to its supporting peer-reviewed source and the specific ROS™ course component that addresses it.

S&BS Requirement	Supporting Research	ROS™ Course Component
Human Behavior Analysis	Bronfenbrenner's Ecological Systems Theory (1979)	Environment regulator • Honeycomb Model • Spillover mechanics • Unit 3
Stress and Family Dynamics	Conger et al.'s Family Stress Model (2002)	ROSE™ equation • Load states • Environmental Cascade • Units 2–3
Attachment and Relationships	Hazan & Shaver (1987)	Mortar compounds • Bond types • Safety Bond • Trust as structural output • Unit 5
Social Support and Health	Cundiff & Matthews (2018)	Reciprocity mechanics • Load distribution • Support Fatigue indicators • Unit 6
Emotion Regulation	Gross (1998); Gratz & Roemer (2004)	12 Self domains • Center-cell capacity • Structural Saturation • Units 4, 7
Dyadic Coping	Falconier & Bodenmann (2015, 2019)	Reciprocity • Balanced Load Shift • Adaptive Support vs. Enabling • Unit 6
Systems Theory	Bronfenbrenner & Ceci (1994)	Relational Honeycomb Model • Five regulators • Cross-domain contamination • Units 2, Tier 2

SECTION 10 — ACADEMIC FOUNDATIONS AND SUPPORTING RESEARCH

10. Academic Foundations and Supporting Research

The Rouse Relational OS™ framework is not a standalone model. Every core component is corroborated by published, peer-reviewed research. The following table organizes supporting sources by the framework component they most directly validate.

ROS™ Component	Supporting Source(s)	Corroborated Element
Environment / Pressure Field	Bronfenbrenner (1979); Conger et al. (2002); French et al. (2018); Huang et al. (2023)	Layered environmental systems; economic pressure in family functioning; work-family spillover
Self / Center-Cell Capacity	Gross (1998) × 2; Gratz & Roemer (2004); Hallion et al. (2018)	Emotion regulation under pressure; multidimensional capacity measurement
Mortar / Bonding Layer	Hazan & Shaver (1987); Gottman & Levenson (1992, 1999); Camanto & Campbell (2025)	Attachment as bonding system; behavioral predictors of bond failure; trust as measurable construct
Reciprocity / Load Distribution	Falconier & Kuhn (2019); Falconier et al. (2015); Hasler & Troxel (2010)	Dyadic coping; shared stress management; load distribution across relational partners
Time / Amplification	Gottman & Levenson (1999); Camanto & Campbell (2025)	Longitudinal amplification of

ROS™ Component	Supporting Source(s)	Corroborated Element
		existing structural conditions
ROSE™ Equation / Assessment	Bossuyt et al. (2015); Cohen et al. (2016); Terwee et al. (2018)	Diagnostic reporting standards; content-valid assessment development
Integrated Structural Scan	Bronfenbrenner (1979); Falconier & Kuhn (2019)	Ecological assessment across layered contexts; dyadic coping as assessment domain
Experiential Learning Pedagogy	Nabiyev (2026) — preprint	Students who learn structural systems through personal application demonstrate deeper conceptual retention than those taught abstractly. Corroborates the reflection exercise and personal assessment design of this course.

SECTION 11 — FRAMEWORK POSITIONING: WHAT THE ROS™ IS AND IS NOT

11. Framework Positioning

What the ROS™ Is

The Rouse Relational OS™ is a structural diagnostic framework — a new academic category called Relational Systems Engineering. It functions as a structural measurement layer built on top of existing research in psychology, sociology, behavioral science, and systems theory.

Its core innovation is the transition from descriptive relational science (explaining behavior) to computable structural diagnostics (measuring structural load and sequencing repair). The ROSE™ equation is the first unifying computational model in relational science.

The ROS™ IS:	The ROS™ IS NOT:
A structural diagnostic framework for identifying relational load, capacity, and bonding integrity	A replacement for licensed clinical therapy or psychological treatment
A tool for mapping pressure, identifying displacement, and sequencing repair	A diagnostic tool for mental health conditions, trauma treatment, or clinical intervention
An evidence-based educational framework grounded in peer-reviewed research	Medical or psychiatric evaluation
A complement to licensed clinical practice when used within appropriate scope	A substitute for crisis intervention or emergency mental health services
A new academic category: Relational Systems Engineering	Communication training, love languages instruction, or attachment style coaching

How It Relates to Existing Academic Disciplines

Discipline	What It Does	What the ROS™ Adds
Psychology	Explains why behavior occurs	Determines how the structural system is functioning and where it is failing
Sociology	Maps social patterns and influences	Measures load distribution and structural integrity within those patterns
Behavioral Science	Identifies behavioral variables	Organizes variables into a computable diagnostic sequence with measurable output
Systems Theory	Describes relational systems conceptually	Applies physical structural mechanics to relational systems — load, capacity, transfer, failure

POSITIONING STATEMENT For Curriculum Committees

The ROS™ should not be positioned as a replacement for psychology, sociology, or behavioral science. It is a structural measurement layer built on top of existing knowledge — an evolution of existing research, not a contradiction of it. This positions the course as a genuine curricular addition, not a duplication of existing offerings.

SECTION 12 — INSTRUCTOR QUALIFICATIONS AND SUPPORT

12. Instructor Qualifications and Support

Minimum Instructor Qualifications

This course can be taught by instructors with any of the following backgrounds:

- Bachelor's degree or higher in Psychology, Sociology, Behavioral Science, Social Work, Counseling, Communication, or related field
- Licensed clinical practitioners (therapists, counselors, social workers) at any licensure level
- Certified Life Coaches or Relationship Coaches with demonstrated applied experience
- Rouse OS™ Tier 1 Certified Practitioners (certification through RouseOS.com)

Instructor Training and Support

Rouse OS Enterprises provides the following support to all instructors adopting this course:

- **Instructor Edition Textbook:** Complete teaching notes, answer keys, case study analyses, discussion facilitation guides, and assessment rubrics for all 9 units and Tier 2 content.
- **Quick-Start Guide for Adjuncts:** A dedicated one-page guide in the Instructor Edition covering the first 10 minutes of class, how to handle emotional disclosures, framework cheat sheet, and compressed course options for time-constrained instructors.
- **Instructor Orientation:** Available via email at info@RouseOS.com. Remote orientation for new instructors provided upon course adoption.
- **Framework Assessment Tool:** Free student access to the ROS™ Reflection Assessment at RouseOS.com generates a Net Load Index for each student. Paper version available for students without internet access.
- **Ongoing Support:** Instructor feedback and questions addressed at Feedback@RouseOS.com.

No Clinical Training Required

This course does not require instructors to provide clinical counseling or therapy. The framework's scope of practice boundaries are explicitly taught in Unit 9 and modeled throughout the Instructor Edition. The Quick-Start Guide includes specific guidance for handling emotional disclosures and referring students to campus counseling when appropriate.

SECTION 13 — CURRICULUM COMMITTEE STATEMENT

13. Curriculum Committee Statement

READY-TO-USE STATEMENT FOR COMMITTEE SUBMISSION

The Rouse Relational Operating System™ aligns with Bloom's Taxonomy, General Education competencies, and Social and Behavioral Sciences standards. Supported by interdisciplinary research in psychology, sociology, systems theory, and behavioral science, the framework integrates evidence-based scholarship with a structural diagnostic methodology. This approach enables students to analyze, measure, and apply relational principles in real-world contexts.

Summary of Evidence for Approval

Requirement	Status
Student Learning Outcomes defined and measurable	Complete — 10 SLOs with Bloom's level alignment
Bloom's Taxonomy alignment	Complete — all six levels addressed
Gen Ed competencies alignment	Complete — six competencies mapped with specific course evidence
Social & Behavioral Sciences standards alignment	Complete — seven requirements mapped to peer-reviewed sources
Peer-reviewed academic foundation	Complete — 14+ sources organized by framework component
Instructor Edition with full teaching support	Complete — 1,700+ paragraphs across 9 units + Tier 2 + 3 appendices
Student Edition with assessments and reflections	Complete — 16-week student-facing textbook

Requirement	Status
Assessment structure with rubrics	Complete — 400-point course with capstone scoring guide
Framework scope and clinical boundary documentation	Complete — Section 11 and Unit 9 of both textbooks
Instructor support materials	Complete — Quick-Start Guide, teaching notes, answer keys
Curriculum approval readiness	HIGH

SECTION 14 — APA REFERENCE LIST

14. APA Reference List

All sources listed below are peer-reviewed or published by established academic presses. Sources are organized by the framework component they most directly corroborate.

Environment / Pressure Field

Bronfenbrenner, U. (1979). The ecology of human development: Experiments by nature and design. Harvard University Press.

Bronfenbrenner, U., & Ceci, S. J. (1994). Nature-nurture reconceptualized in developmental perspective: A bioecological model. Psychological Review, 101(4), 568–586.

Conger, R. D., Wallace, L. E., Sun, Y., Simons, R. L., McLoyd, V. C., & Brody, G. H. (2002). Economic pressure in African American families: A replication and extension of the family stress model. Developmental Psychology, 38(2), 179–193.

French, K. A., Dumani, S., Allen, T. D., & Shockley, K. M. (2018). A meta-analysis of work-family conflict and social support. Psychological Bulletin, 144(3), 284–314.

Huang, Y., Mao, Y., & Zhan, Y. (2023). Spillover and crossover from work overload to spouse-rated work-to-family conflict. Family Relations.

Kavanaugh, S. A., Neppl, T. K., & Melby, J. N. (2018). Economic pressure and depressive symptoms: Testing the family stress model from adolescence to adulthood. Journal of Family Psychology, 32(7), 957–965.

Self / Center-Cell Capacity

Gratz, K. L., & Roemer, L. (2004). Multidimensional assessment of emotion regulation and dysregulation: Development, factor structure, and initial validation of the Difficulties in Emotion Regulation Scale. Journal of Psychopathology and Behavioral Assessment, 26(1), 41–54.

Gross, J. J. (1998). Antecedent- and response-focused emotion regulation: Divergent consequences for experience, expression, and physiology. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 74(1), 224–237.

Gross, J. J. (1998). The emerging field of emotion regulation: An integrative review. Review of General Psychology, 2(3), 271–299.

Hallion, L. S., Steinman, S. A., Tolin, D. F., & Diefenbach, G. J. (2018). Psychometric properties of the Difficulties in Emotion Regulation Scale and its short forms in adults with emotional disorders. Frontiers in Psychology, 9, 539.

Mortar / Bonding Layer

Camanto, O. J., & Campbell, L. (2025). Trust as a measurable relational construct linked to stability. Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 42(9), 2516–2544.

Gottman, J. M., & Levenson, R. W. (1992). Marital processes predictive of later dissolution: Behavior, physiology, and health. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 63(2), 221–233.

Gottman, J. M., & Levenson, R. W. (1999). What predicts change in marital interaction over time? A study of alternative models. Family Process, 38(2), 143–158.

Hazan, C., & Shaver, P. (1987). Romantic love conceptualized as an attachment process. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 52(3), 511–524.

Reciprocity / Load Distribution

Cundiff, J. M., & Matthews, K. A. (2018). Friends with health benefits: A longitudinal study. Psychological Bulletin, 144(3), 284–314.

Falconier, M. K., Jackson, J. B., Hilpert, P., & Bodenmann, G. (2015). Dyadic coping and relationship satisfaction: A meta-analysis. Clinical Psychology Review, 42, 28–46.

Falconier, M. K., & Kuhn, R. (2019). Dyadic coping in couples: A conceptual integration and a review of the empirical literature. Frontiers in Psychology, 10, 571.

Hasler, B. P., & Troxel, W. M. (2010). Couples' nighttime sleep efficiency and concordance: Evidence for bidirectional associations with daytime relationship functioning. Psychosomatic Medicine, 72(8), 794–801.

Assessment and Diagnostic Methodology

Bossuyt, P. M., Reitsma, J. B., Bruns, D. E., Gatsonis, C. A., Glasziou, P. P., Irwig, L., ... & Cohen, J. F. (2015). STARD 2015: An updated list of essential items for reporting diagnostic accuracy studies. BMJ, 351, h5527.

Cohen, J. F., Korevaar, D. A., Altman, D. G., Bruns, D. E., Gatsonis, C. A., Hooft, L., ... & Bossuyt, P. M. (2016). STARD 2015 guidelines for reporting diagnostic accuracy studies: Explanation and elaboration. BMJ Open, 6(11), e012799.

Terwee, C. B., Prinsen, C. A. C., Chiarotto, A., Westerman, M. J., Patrick, D. L., Alonso, J., ... & Mokkink, L. B. (2018). COSMIN methodology for evaluating the content validity of patient-reported outcome measures: A Delphi study. Quality of Life Research, 27(5), 1159–1170.

Experiential Learning and Engineering Pedagogy

Nabiyev, A. K. (2026). An experiential framework for integrating engineering principles into secondary education. Research Square. https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-9094966/v1

Note: *This is a preprint that has not yet completed formal peer review. It is cited to corroborate the experiential learning design of this course — specifically the use of personal structural assessments, reflection exercises, and applied case diagnostics as the primary vehicle for student learning. Nabiyev's central finding — that students who encounter abstract systems through physical*

discovery and personal application demonstrate deeper conceptual retention — directly supports the pedagogical architecture of the Relational Physics course.

Love places people next to each other. Behavior holds them together.

— Shawn Rouse • Rouse OS Enterprises • www.RouseOS.com