

Distinguishable Actor-Partner Models

In close relationships research, it has been common for covariance matrices to be structured by the gender of each participant in the format of distinguishable dyads (Iida, Seidman, Shrout, Fujita, & Bolger, 2008). However, when no gender differences are observed in the processes of interest, it is more parsimonious to treat partners as indistinguishable. This approach is also more inclusive of a diversity of relationships (see supplement section 5). As reported in the paper, no differences by gender were observed and so we tested our hypotheses with an indistinguishable actor-partner model (Kashy, Donnellan, Burt, & McGue, 2008). Below are the results of the models with the same parameters as the main text but treating the partners as distinguishable, with a gendered covariance matrix (therefore excluding the 2 gay couples). The pattern of results remains consistent, as can be seen by comparing Table 1 in the paper to Table S6 below (for intimacy), as well as Table S2 earlier in the supplement to Table S7 (for intimacy adjusting for negative evening mood) and Table S3 to S8 (for negative evening mood).

Table S6. Fixed and random effects for the intimacy model with a distinguishable actor-partner model.

Fixed Effects (intercept, slopes)	Estimate	SE	<i>t</i> (<i>df</i>)	<i>p</i>	95% CI	
					Lower	Upper
Intercept	4.84	0.10	50.35 (74)	<.001	4.65	5.03
Time	0.08	0.02	3.28 (818)	.001	0.03	0.13
Exchange Orientation	-0.08	0.07	-1.24 (115)	.219	-0.22	0.05
Partner Exchange Orientation	-0.03	0.07	-0.40 (115)	.690	-0.16	0.11
Communal Orientation	0.19	0.07	2.57 (102)	.012	0.04	0.34
Partner Communal Orientation	0.19	0.07	2.52 (102)	.013	0.04	0.33
Within-Couple Level Conflict	-0.67	0.12	-5.44 (45)	<.001	-0.92	-0.42
Between-Couple Level Conflict	2.19	0.81	2.69 (115)	.008	0.58	3.81
Within Conflict * Exchange Orientation	-0.23	0.10	-2.33 (92)	.022	-0.43	-0.03
Within Conflict * Partner Exchange Orientation	-0.09	0.10	-0.88 (91)	.383	-0.28	0.11
Within Conflict * Communal Orientation	0.09	0.10	0.86 (73)	.391	-0.12	0.30
Within Conflict * Partner Communal Orientation	0.17	0.10	1.60 (72)	.114	-0.04	0.37
Between Conflict * Exchange Orientation	0.53	0.69	0.76 (156)	.448	-0.84	1.90
Between Conflict * Partner Exchange Orientation	-0.09	0.69	-0.13 (156)	.894	-1.46	1.28
Between Conflict * Communal Orientation	-1.20	0.90	-1.34 (103)	.183	-2.99	0.58
Between Conflict * Partner Communal Orientation	-2.08	0.90	-2.31 (103)	.023	-3.86	-0.29

Random Effects ([co-]variances)	Estimate	SE	Wald Z	<i>p</i>	95% CI	
					Lower	Upper
Level 2 (between-person)						
Couple-level Intercept	0.14	0.05	3.14	.002	0.08	0.27
Couple-level Covariance	0.54	0.11	4.71	<.001	0.32	0.76
Conflict and Couple-level Intercept	0.08	0.11	0.73	.467	0.01	1.16
Conflict and Couple-level Covariance	0.49	0.19	2.61	.009	0.12	0.87
Level 1 (within-person)						
Residual	1.58	0.04	35.41	<.001	1.49	1.67
Autocorrelation	0.33	0.02	17.91	<.001	0.29	0.36

Note: Degrees of freedom were estimated using the Satterthwaite method.

Table S7. Fixed and random effects for the intimacy model controlling for negative evening mood with a distinguishable actor-partner model.

Fixed Effects (intercept, slopes)	Estimate	SE	<i>t</i> (<i>df</i>)	<i>p</i>	95% CI	
					Lower	Upper
Intercept	5.05	0.10	51.75 (80)	<.001	4.85	5.24
Time	0.07	0.02	2.70 (811)	.007	0.02	0.11
Negative Evening Mood	-0.06	0.01	-12.09 (3455)	<.001	-0.07	-0.05
Exchange Orientation	-0.06	0.07	-0.80 (120)	.424	-0.19	0.08
Partner Exchange Orientation	-0.004	0.07	-0.05 (120)	.957	-0.14	0.13
Communal Orientation	0.17	0.07	2.27 (106)	.025	0.02	0.32
Partner Communal Orientation	0.18	0.07	2.38 (106)	.019	0.03	0.32
Within-Couple Level Conflict	-0.50	0.12	-4.13 (47)	<.001	-0.75	-0.26
Between-Couple Level Conflict	1.58	0.81	1.95 (117)	.054	-0.03	3.19
Within Conflict * Exchange Orientation	-0.22	0.10	-2.31 (91)	.023	-0.41	-0.03
Within Conflict * Partner Exchange Orientation	-0.08	0.10	-0.83 (91)	.411	-0.27	0.11
Within Conflict * Communal Orientation	0.03	0.10	0.28 (72)	.777	-0.17	0.23
Within Conflict * Partner Communal Orientation	0.12	0.10	1.21 (72)	.230	-0.08	0.32
Between Conflict * Exchange Orientation	0.55	0.70	0.78 (161)	.436	-0.84	1.94
Between Conflict * Partner Exchange Orientation	0.14	0.70	0.20 (162)	.839	-1.25	1.53
Between Conflict * Communal Orientation	-1.03	0.90	-1.14 (107)	.259	-2.82	0.77
Between Conflict * Partner Communal Orientation	-1.72	0.90	-1.90 (107)	.060	-3.51	0.07
Random Effects	Estimate	SE	Wald Z	<i>p</i>	95% CI	
Level 2 (between-person)						
Couple-level Intercept	0.17	0.05	3.48	.001	0.10	0.31
Couple-level Covariance	0.52	0.11	4.60	<.001	0.30	0.75
Conflict and Couple-level Intercept	0.03	0.09	0.31	.753	<.001	14.32
Conflict and Couple-level Covariance	0.50	0.18	2.79	.005	0.15	0.84
Level 1 (within-person)						
Residual	1.52	0.04	35.22	<.001	1.44	1.61
Autocorrelation	0.33	0.02	18.30	<.001	0.30	0.37

Note: Degrees of freedom were estimated using the Satterthwaite method.

Table S8. Fixed and random effects for the negative evening mood model with a distinguishable actor-partner model.

Fixed Effects (intercept, slopes)	Estimate	SE	<i>t</i> (<i>df</i>)	<i>p</i>	95% CI	
					Lower	Upper
Intercept	3.40	0.32	10.73 (66)	<.001	2.76	4.03
Time	-0.25	0.08	-3.24 (864)	.001	-0.40	-0.10
Exchange Orientation	0.46	0.25	1.83 (130)	.070	-0.04	0.96
Partner Exchange Orientation	0.36	0.25	1.41 (130)	.160	-0.14	0.86
Communal Orientation	-0.33	0.26	-1.24 (114)	.217	-0.85	0.19
Partner Communal Orientation	-0.22	0.26	-0.82 (114)	.415	-0.74	0.31
Within-Couple Level Conflict	2.85	0.40	7.17 (49)	<.001	2.05	3.64
Between-Couple Level Conflict	-10.31	2.67	-3.87 (102)	<.001	-15.60	-5.03
Within Conflict * Exchange Orientation	-0.05	0.36	-0.15 (92)	.880	-0.77	0.66
Within Conflict * Partner Exchange Orientation	0.55	0.36	1.52 (92)	.133	-0.17	1.26
Within Conflict * Communal Orientation	-0.92	0.36	-2.54 (87)	.013	-1.64	-0.20
Within Conflict * Partner Communal Orientation	-0.40	0.36	-1.10 (88)	.276	-1.12	0.32
Between Conflict * Exchange Orientation	0.50	2.59	0.19 (171)	.848	-4.62	5.61
Between Conflict * Partner Exchange Orientation	3.85	2.59	1.49 (171)	.139	-1.26	8.97
Between Conflict * Communal Orientation	3.02	3.14	0.96 (111)	.338	-3.20	9.24
Between Conflict * Partner Communal Orientation	6.38	3.14	2.03 (111)	.045	0.16	12.61
Random Effects	Estimate	SE	<i>Wald Z</i>	<i>p</i>	95% CI	
Level 2 (between-person)						
Couple-level Intercept	4.76	0.97	4.90	<.001	3.19	7.10
Couple-level Covariance	4.36	1.38	3.16	.002	1.66	7.07
Conflict and Couple-level Intercept	5.48	2.54	2.16	.031	2.21	13.59
Conflict and Couple-level Covariance	2.68	2.19	1.23	.220	-1.60	6.96
Level 1 (within-person)						
Residual	15.85	0.44	36.31	<.001	15.02	16.73
Autocorrelation	0.29	0.02	15.80	<.001	0.25	0.32

Note: Degrees of freedom were estimated using the Satterthwaite method.

References

- Iida, M., Seidman, G., Shrout, P. E., Fujita, K., & Bolger, N. (2008). Modeling support provision in intimate relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 94*(3), 460.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.94.3.460>
- Kashy, D. A., Donnellan, M. B., Burt, S. A., & McGue, M. (2008). Growth curve models for indistinguishable dyads using multilevel modeling and structural equation modeling: The case of adolescent twins' conflict with their mothers. *Developmental Psychology, 44*(2), 316–329.