

Supplemental Material

Sections

I. Description of Measures

II. Table S1: Verification of Randomization Equivalence

III. References for Supplemental Material

I. Description of Measures

Relationship satisfaction. Relationship satisfaction was measured with one item from the Couples Satisfaction Index (Funk & Rogge, 2007): “Please indicate the degree of happiness, all things considered, of your relationship.” Response options ranged from 0 = *extremely unhappy* to 6 = *perfectly happy* (observed range: 0 – 6). This is a commonly used single-indicator of relationship satisfaction in couple research (e.g., Rhoades, Stanley, & Markman, 2012a).

Personal and Partner Commitment. Individuals’ commitment to their relationship was assessed using a single-item measure that asked “How committed are you to your relationship?”. Individuals’ perception of their partner’s commitment to their relationship was assessed using a similar single-item measure that asked “How committed is your partner to your relationship?”. Response options ranged from 1 = *not at all committed* to 7 = *very committed* (observed range: 1 – 7 for personal and for partner commitment). The personal commitment measure was highly correlated ($r = .70$, $p < .001$) with a standard, multi-item measure of dedication commitment (Owen, Rhoades, Stanley, & Markman, 2011) and was selected given its similarity to the assessment of perceived partner commitment.

Psychological and physical aggression. Perpetration of psychological and physical aggression by oneself and one's partner were assessed using items from the Revised Conflict Tactics Scales (Straus, Hamby, Boney-McCoy, & Sugarman, 1996). Individuals were asked how many times they did each of these things in the past year, and how many times their partner did them in the past year. Response options were along an eight-point scale (0 = *This has never happened*; 7 = *More than 20 times in the past year*) such that higher scores reflected higher levels of aggression. Self-initiated psychological aggression was assessed using 4 items (e.g., "I insulted or swore at my partner, I did something to spite my partner). Self-initiated physical aggression was assessed using 5 items (e.g., I threw something at my partner that could hurt; I pushed or shoved my partner). Partner-initiated psychological aggression and partner-initiated physical aggression were assessed using items as self-initiated (i.e., "my partner did this to me" [with "this" referencing to previous statement about self-initiated psychological or physical aggression]). Given the strong correlation between self and partner initiated psychological aggression ($r = .88$) and between self and partner initiated physical aggression ($r = .73$), they were averaged together. Observed ranges of both psychological and physical aggression were the full range of response options (0 to 7). Coefficient alpha was .91 for psychological aggression and .90 for physical aggression.

Communication danger signs. Negative interactions were assessed with the six-item Communication Danger Signs Scale (Stanley & Markman, 1997). This measure assesses common negative communication patterns, such as withdrawal ("When we argue, one of us withdraws, doesn't want to talk about it anymore or leaves the scene") and negative escalation ("Little arguments escalate into ugly fights with accusations, name-calling, or bringing up past

hurts”). Response options were 1 = *never or almost never*, 2 = *once in a while*, and 3 = *frequently* and mean scores were computed (observed range: 1 – 3). Reliability was $\alpha = .81$.

Perceived likelihood of dissolution. The relationship instability item from the National Survey of Families and Households was used to measure participants’ predictions about future relationship dissolution. The item asked respondents to assess the probability that the relationship would dissolve on a 5-point Likert scale (i.e., “What is the likelihood that you and your partner will break-up within the next year?”). Test-retest reliability has been shown to be high in other research with a similar sample (Rhoades, Stanley, & Markman, 2012b). Scores could range from 1 (*very unlikely*) to 5 (*very likely*) (observed range: 1 – 5).

Financial hardship. Individuals’ level of financial hardship was assessed using a composite of four items (cf. Masarik et al., 2016). Two items gauged levels of agreement with respect to statements of “I often worry about my poor financial situation” and “I do not know how I will be able to support myself this next year.” Response options ranged from 1 = *strongly disagree* to 7 = *strongly agree*. A third item asked “How much difficulty have you had paying your bills?” (1 = *No difficulty at all*; 5 = *A great deal of difficulty*). A final item asked “At the end of each month did you end up with...to make ends meet” (1 = *More than enough*; 4 = *Not enough to money left over left over*). Observed responses ranged the complete range of possible responses for all items. Items were standardized and a mean composite computed, with higher scores indicating more financial distress. Cronbach’s α was .80.

General psychological distress. Twelve items from the longer Mood and Anxiety Symptom Questionnaire (Watson & Clark, 1991) were used to assess general psychological distress. Example items are “During the last week, I felt dissatisfied with everything” and “During the last week, I felt tense or ‘high strung.’” Each item was measured on a 1 (*not at all*) to

5 (*extremely*) scale (observed range: 1 – 5). This measure was scored by averaging the items; higher scores indicate more distress. Cronbach's α was .92.

Anxious and avoidant attachment. Items from the Adult Attachment Scale (Collins & Read, 1990) were used to measure anxious and avoidant attachment. Four items from the anxiety subscale (e.g., “I often worry that my partner does not love me”) examined anxious attachment and six items from the close subscale (e.g., “I am nervous when anyone gets too close”) assessed avoidant attachment. Respondents indicated the degree to which each statement characterized them ranging from 1 = *not at all characteristic* to 5 = *very characteristic* and mean scores were computed (observed range: 1 – 5). Internal consistency was $\alpha = .61$ for anxious attachment and $\alpha = .64$ for avoidant attachment.

Childhood exposure to interparental conflict. Individuals' exposure to interparental conflict during childhood was assessed using four items (Grych, Seid, & Fincham, 1992). Participants responded with how frequently, for their primary interparental relationship during childhood, they observed their parents engaging in destructive conflict patterns (e.g., “My parents pushed or shoved each other during arguments. My parents nagged and complained about each other.”). The response scale ranged from 1 (*never*) to 5 (*All of the time*). The mean score was used in analyses and higher scores reflect more exposure to interparental conflict (observed range: 1 – 5). For this sample, $\alpha = .73$.

Religiosity. Religiosity was assessed using a single item that asked “All things considered, how religious would you say you are?”. Response options ranged from 1 = not at all to 7 = *very religious* (observed range: 1 – 7).

Health. Participants' overall health was assessed with a single item that asked “In general, would you say your health is.” Response options ranged from 1 = *poor* to 5 = *excellent*.

II. Table S1: Verification of Randomization Equivalence

Variable	Asked to Invite Partner (n=642)			Self-participation only (n=652)			Test Statistic ^a	p-value
	n	M	SD	n	M	SD		
Relationship characteristics								
Relationship satisfaction	581	4.09	1.36	590	4.16	1.31	0.86	.39
Commitment - self	639	6.31	1.10	651	6.33	1.08	0.31	.76
Commitment - partner	638	6.27	1.15	650	6.25	1.20	0.29	.77
Break-up likelihood	640	1.95	1.05	649	1.94	1.05	0.17	.86
Psychological aggression	638	2.24	1.66	650	2.35	1.74	1.13	.26
Physical aggression	638	0.43	0.85	652	0.47	0.90	0.75	.46
Communication danger signs	640	1.67	0.51	651	1.67	0.51	1.05	.29
Individual characteristics								
Anxious attachment	640	2.32	0.74	652	2.38	0.75	1.58	.12
Avoidance attachment	640	2.42	0.74	651	2.43	0.68	0.20	.84
General psychological distress	640	2.28	0.91	651	2.26	0.94	0.34	.73
Health	639	3.70	0.90	651	3.69	0.88	0.77	.77
Financial hardship	636	-0.02	0.75	645	0.02	0.83	0.85	.40
Religiosity	638	4.03	1.68	650	3.90	1.77	1.35	.18
Childhood conflict	639	2.59	0.74	643	2.62	0.82	0.60	.55
Demographic characteristics								
Gender (1=female)	642	0.63	n/a	652	0.63	n/a	0.05	.83
Race (1=white)	632	0.77	n/a	645	0.76	n/a	0.44	.55
Cohabitation status (1=yes)	642	0.32	n/a	652	0.32	n/a	0.03	.91
Engaged (1=yes)	638	0.19	n/a	651	0.19	n/a	0.00	1.00
Length of relationship	638	34.85	34.34	645	34.13	31.78	.39	.70
Years of schooling	640	8.38	2.22	651	8.28	2.20	0.76	.45
Age	637	25.38	4.70	652	25.76	4.92	1.40	.16
Children in home (1=yes)	642	0.32	n/a	652	0.37	n/a	3.60	.06
Employed (1=yes)	638	0.78	n/a	650	0.75	n/a	1.12	.29
Income – self	619	4.02	2.53	634	4.25	2.69	1.57	.12

^a *T*-test for continuous and ordinal variables; chi-square cross-tab statistic for binary variables.

III. References for Supplemental Material

- Collins, N. L., & Read, S. J. (1990). Adult attachment, working models, and relationship quality in dating couples. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 58(4), 644-663. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.58.4.644
- Funk, J. L., & Rogge, R. D. (2007). Testing the ruler with item response theory: Increasing precision of measurement for relationship satisfaction with the Couples Satisfaction Index. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 21(4), 572-583. doi: 10.1037/0893-3200.21.4.572
- Grych, J. H., Seid, M., & Fincham, F. D. (1992). Assessing marital conflict from the child's perspective: The children's perception of interparental conflict scale. *Child Development*, 63(3), 558-572. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-8624.1992.tb01646.x
- Masarik, A. S., Martin, M. J., Ferrer, E., Lorenz, F. O., Conger, K. J., & Conger, R. D. (2016). Couple resilience to economic pressure over time and across generations. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 78(2), 326-345. doi: 10.1111/jomf.12284
- Owen, J., Rhoades, G. K., Stanley, S. M., & Markman, H. J. (2011). The Revised Commitment Inventory: Psychometrics and Use With Unmarried Couples. 32(6), 820-841. doi: 10.1177/0192513x10385788
- Rhoades, G. K., Stanley, S. M., & Markman, H. J. (2012a). The impact of the transition to cohabitation on relationship functioning: cross-sectional and longitudinal findings. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 26(3), 348-358. doi: 10.1037/a0028316
- Rhoades, G. K., Stanley, S. M., & Markman, H. J. (2012b). A Longitudinal Investigation of Commitment Dynamics in Cohabiting Relationships. *Journal of Family Issues*, 33(3), 369-390. doi: 10.1177/0192513X11420940

Stanley, S. M., & Markman, H. J. (1997). *The Communication Danger Signs Scale*. Unpublished manuscript, University of Denver, Colorado.

Straus, M. A., Hamby, S. L., Boney-McCoy, S., & Sugarman, D. B. (1996). The Revised Conflict Tactics Scales (CTS2): Development and preliminary psychometric data. *Journal of Family Issues*, 17(3), 283-316. doi: 10.1177/019251396017003001

Watson, D., & Clark, L. A. (1991). *The mood and anxiety symptom questionnaire*. Unpublished manuscript, University of Iowa, Iowa City, IA.