PNAS
www.pnas.org

Supplementary Information for:

Machine Learning Uncovers the Most Robust Predictors of Relationship Quality Across 43 Longitudinal Couples Studies

Samantha Joel, Paul W. Eastwick, Colleen J. Allison, Ximena B. Arriaga, Zachary G. Baker, Eran Bar-Kalifa, Sophie Bergeron, Gurit Birnbaum, Rebecca L. Brock, Claudia C. Brumbaugh, Cheryl L. Carmichael, Serena Chen, Jennifer Clarke, Rebecca J. Cobb, Michael K. Coolsen, Jody Davis, David C. de Jong, Anik Debrot, Eva C. DeHaas, Jaye L. Derrick, Jamie Eller, Marie-Joelle Estrada, Ruddy Faure, Eli J. Finkel, R. Chris Fraley, Shelly L. Gable, Reuma Gadassi-Polack, Yuthika U. Girme, Amie M. Gordon, Courtney L. Gosnell, Matthew D. Hammond, Peggy A. Hannon, Cheryl Harasymchuk, Wilhelm Hofmann, Andrea B. Horn, Emily A. Impett, Jeremy P. Jamieson, Dacher Keltner, James J. Kim, Jeff L. Kirchner, Esther S. Kluwer, Madoka Kumashiro, Grace Larson, Gal Lazarus, Jill M. Logan, Laura B. Luchies, Geoff MacDonald, Laura V. Machia, Michael R. Maniaci, Jessica A. Maxwell, Moran Mizrahi, Amy Muise, Sylvia Niehuis, Brian G. Ogolsky, C. Rebecca Oldham, Nickola C. Overall, Meinrad Perrez, Brett J. Peters, Paula R. Pietromonaco, Sally I. Powers, Thery Prok, Rony Pshedetzky-Shochat, Eshkol Rafaeli, Erin Ramsdell, Maija Reblin, Michael Reicherts, Alan Reifman, Harry T. Reis, Galena Rhoades, William S. Rholes, Francesca Righetti, Lindsey M. Rodriguez, Ron Rogge, Natalie O. Rosen, Darby Saxbe, Haran Sened, Jeffry A. Simpson, Erica B. Slotter, Scott Stanley, Shevaun Stocker, Cathy Surra, Hagar Ter Kuile, Allison A. Vaughn, Amanda M. Vicary, Mariko L. Visserman, Scott Wolf.

Corresponding author: Samantha Joel
Email: samantha.joel@uwo.ca

This PDF file includes:

Supplementary text
Tables S1 to S8
SI References

Other supplementary materials for this manuscript include the following:

Preregistration documents, syntax and other materials can be found on OSF: https://osf.io/d6ykr/.

www.pnas.org/cgi/doi/10.1073/pnas.1917036117

Supplementary Information Text

Other Levels of Predictor Restriction

In the analyses presented in the main text, trust, intimacy, love, and passion were removed as potential predictors (predictor restriction level: moderate). However, we had originally conducted these analyses with those four variables retained as potential predictors, consistent with our preregistered analysis plan (predictor restriction level: none). The results of these models are presented in Figures S1 (Satisfaction) and S2 (Commitment) in the present document. At the suggestion of a reviewer, we also conducted a version of the analyses in which eight additional variables were removed as potential predictors (affection, appreciation, conflict, empathy, investment, perceived partner responsiveness, sacrifice motives, and sexual satisfaction). The results to these models (predictor restriction level: stringent) are presented in Figures S3 (Satisfaction) and S4 (Commitment). As discussed in the main text, the analyses produce highly similar results regardless of which variables are removed or retained as potential predictors.

Other Preregistration Deviations

All other substantive deviations (i.e., those that have the potential to change the results of the analyses) are reported in detail in a preregistration change document written for each individual dataset, all of which can be found in the relevant dataset's OSF folder. Below, we provide a summary of the substantive changes that were made.

Removing unsupported predictors. Some analysis plans included variables in the predictor list that produced errors when trying to run the models, either because they were missing from the datafile, because they included all or mostly missing values, or because they were in an unsupported format (e.g., open-ended written responses). Such variables were removed as predictors.

Removing commitment and satisfaction as predictors. In some analysis plans, baseline satisfaction and/or commitment were included in the list of relationship-level predictors. As these variables are also the dependent measures, including them as predictors would lead to an artificially high amount of variance predicted. These variables were always removed as predictors.

Reclassifying integer variables as numeric. Partway through analyzing the datasets, it came to our attention that continuous variables without decimal places (e.g., scores on raw items rather than composites) were being read in by R as integers, which the randomforests package treats as categorical variables. From Dataset 14 and onward, we added a reclassification step to the analysis procedure, with new code to change these integer variables into numeric variables so that the randomforests package would treat them as continuous. In December 2018, we went back and also added this reclassification step to Dataset 1-13. Differences in the results were minimal. Original, non-updated syntax and results tables are still available on OSF, in addition to the updated versions used in the meta-analysis.

Addressing errors in the original data. Two authorship teams identified errors in their datafiles after their data had been analyzed. In each case, upon receipt of the updated datafile, we re-analyzed the data and updated the results. The patterns of results were largely unchanged. For each dataset, both versions of the results are available on OSF.

Reclassifying trait and relationship variables. On April 16, 2019, after all of the datasets were analyzed, we scanned through a complete list of all predictors tested to ensure that

variables were categorized as traits versus relationship variables consistently across datasets and in a manner consistent with relationship theory. We identified 89 relationship variables across nine datasets that had been miscategorized as trait variables (e.g., relationship goals, relationship length, relationship conflict). We further identified 52 trait variables across seven datasets that had been miscategorized as relationship variables (e.g., sexual orientation, ratings of own personality, ideal partner preferences, destiny and growth beliefs). We identified 23 relationship predictors across 10 datasets that were conceptually too close to either satisfaction or commitment and should therefore not be included as predictors at all (e.g., the commitment facet of the Triangular Theory of Love Scale). Finally, we noticed that three predictors across two datasets were missing a partner version (i.e., only the actor versions had been entered as predictors). We added the matching partner variables to the relevant models. All these changes were made in April 2019. Specific changes for each dataset are described in the relevant preregistration change document under the "Post-Meta-Analytic Changes" subheading.

Fixing change score generation code. In April 2019, we also compiled metadata on the 43 datasets (e.g., sample sizes, number of predictors, number of waves). This is when we noticed that four datasets had a very low n used for the change analyses. For example, Dataset 17 had a baseline sample size of 345 and a follow-up sample size of 120, but the change analyses only used an n of 43. Checking the code revealed that in these datasets, missing baseline satisfaction and commitment scores had caused a glitch in the calculation of the change score, resulting in many NA values. For each dataset, code was added to remove any participants with no baseline satisfaction or commitment scores, which fixed the glitch.

Reclassifying children variables. While drafting the manuscript in July 2019, we noticed that "children" was included as both an individual difference and as a relationship variable. For consistency, a total of 20 "children" variables across nine datasets were reclassified as relationship variables rather than individual differences, and the affected models were conducted again. The meta-analytic and theoretical results were also updated accordingly.

Non-substantive changes. In addition to the substantive changes made above, several non-substantive changes were made in most or all syntax files and are not noted explicitly in the dataset-specific preregistration change documents. These included replace the stand-in name of the dataset ("nameofdataset.csv") with the real dataset name, replacing the stand-in names of the couple and participant ID columns ("COUPLEID" and "PARTID") with the real variable names, updating the dates in the files to reflect the current date, and matching the capitalization in the code to the capitalization used in the dataset so that variables could be read in (R is case-sensitive).

Moderation Analyses

We examined 12 possible meta-analytic moderators, the results of which are briefly summarized in the main text. Below, we provide more details on these analyses for the interested reader.

Ten of the tested moderators were features of the datasets: total study length, length between time points, number of time points, average relationship length of the sample, average age of the sample, the year data collection began, country, publication status (≥ 1 publication vs. not previously published), sample type (community vs. college student), and relationship status (dating vs. married). We also examined two features that were specific to each meta-analytic datum: number of predictors used in the Random Forests model and number of predictors selected in the final model by VSURF. We used David Wilson's SPSS macros

(http://mason.gmu.edu/~dwilsonb/ma.html) to perform the moderator analyses (i.e., ANOVA for country, regression for the other 11 moderators).

Each of the 12 moderators was examined across each of the 21 meta-analytic models for satisfaction and the 21 meta-analytic models for commitment (12 × (21 + 21) = 504 total tests; Tables S6 and S7). We only interpret a moderator substantively if four or more of a set of 21 tests achieved significance: The binomial probability of at least four out of 21 tests achieving significance under the null is $p = .019$.

According to this criterion, three moderators exhibited meaningful effects. First, the models tended to account for more variance in satisfaction at baseline and at follow-up to the extent that the dataset included older (vs. younger) couples; average baseline $\beta = .24$, average follow-up $\beta = .26$. In other words, the satisfaction of older couples may be more predictable from individual difference and relationship-specific variables than the satisfaction of younger couples. (The median age was 27 years.) Second, the models tended to account for more variance in commitment at baseline to the extent that the dataset had shorter (rather than longer) time lags between follow-ups; average baseline $\beta = -.36$. This moderation is hard to explain, because follow-up lag should presumably not affect what can be predicted in the baseline measure of the DV; this result may be a Type-I error. (Indeed, the average moderational effect size for satisfaction was half as large.)

Third, the models tended to account for more variance in satisfaction and commitment with individual difference variables to the extent that the study began recently; average actor individual difference $\beta = .28$, average partner individual difference $\beta = .28$. It is possible that individual difference measures developed and implemented in recent years are better able to account for satisfaction and commitment than older individual difference variables.

The remaining nine moderators generally exhibited small, nonsignificant effects. Importantly, the inability of the models to account for change in satisfaction and change in commitment could not readily be explained by any of the 12 moderators, including features that might intuitively seem relevant (e.g., study length, number of time points). Also, the number of predictors used in the analysis and the number of predictors selected for the final model were generally unrelated to the percentage of variance explained, which is consistent with the goals of Random Forests approach and of the VSURF method of variable selection (i.e., to build parsimonious models that explain as much variance as possible while using only the predictors that meaningfully contribute to the model).

An exploratory re-analysis of the meta-analytic effects of change in satisfaction for datasets that lasted 6 months or longer ($k = 30$) revealed similar conclusions to the overall analysis. If anything, the datasets that encompassed shorter time frames (fewer than 6 months, $k = 13$) successfully predicted change at 8.1% with all variables included in the analysis—the highest value we observed in any of the meta-analytic tests of change. Change in satisfaction may become exceptionally difficult to predict as the change becomes further removed in time from the original baseline predictors.

Perceived Partner Subset Analyses

Within the category of relationship-specific predictors, there is a theoretically important distinction between *own* reports about the relationship versus *perceptions of the partner's* reports about the relationship (e.g., perceived partner commitment: "My partner is committed to maintaining our relationship"; *1,2*). Of the 43 datasets in this study, 8 included at least two "perceived partner" measures, defined as measures which ask the participant to estimate what

rating the partner will provide (22 measures total). We therefore conducted new analyses on these datasets (i.e., 1, 2, 13, 14, 21, 25, 31, and 37) that examined the "perceived partner" predictors subset separately from "other" relationship-specific predictors.

Results are included in Table S8. Perceptions of the partner's reports about the relationship accounted for 43% of satisfaction at baseline. This performance is surprisingly good; indeed, this small subset of variables was just as powerful as all the remaining actor relationship variables (also 43%), and they outperformed any of the *partners' actual* reports about the relationship (i.e., at best 19% when predicting baseline satisfaction). These results are consistent with the idea that people project their own relationship perceptions and behaviors onto their partners (*3*). However, relationship quality is not solely predicted by perceptions of the partner's reports, as the models that used only one's own reports of the relationship performed a bit better at follow-up (20% vs. 5%). Also, the models that performed best included both sets of predictors (54% at baseline and 23% at follow-up). Consistent with our original analyses, the partner versions of the predictors performed much worse than the actor versions, and no set of predictors could meaningfully predict change.

Additional Funding Information

Collection of the 43 datasets was supported by many separate funding sources. Datasets 1 and 2 were funded by the National Science Foundation (NSF) Grant BCS-719780 awarded to Eli J. Finkel. Dataset 3 was partially supported by a National Research Service Predoctoral Training Grant to Shelly Gable. Dataset 4 was supported by a SSHRC Predoctoral Fellowship to David de Jong. Dataset 5 was funded by a grant from the Fetzer Institute to Harry Reis. Datasets 8 and 9 were supported by a Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC) Banting postdoctoral fellowship, and Dataset 10 was supported by a SSHRC doctoral fellowship awarded to Amy Muise. Dataset 13 was funded by University of Auckland Doctoral Research Funds awarded to Yuthika U. Girme and Matthew D. Hammond. Dataset 14 was funded by University of Auckland grants (3626244, 3607021) awarded to Nickola C. Overall. Dataset 15 was funded by the National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism under award number F31AA020442 awarded to Lindsey Rodriguez. Dataset 16 was funded by National Cancer Institute grant R01CA133908 awarded to Paula R. Pietromonaco and Sally I Powers. Dataset 17 was funded by the National Science Foundation (NSF) Grant BCS-0443783 awarded to R. Chris Fraley. Dataset 18 was funded by NIMH grant BSR–R01-MH-45417 awarded to Caryl E. Rusbult. Dataset 19 was funded by the Clayton Award for Excellence in Graduate Research from the University of Utah awarded to Allison A. Vaughn and Maija Reblin. Dataset 20 was funded by NIMH grant MH49599 awarded to Jeffry A. Simpson and W. Steven Rholes. Dataset 22 was funded by a joint ORA grant from the Dutch Science Foundation to Francesca Righetti (464-15-093) and from the German Science Foundation to Wilhelm Hofmann (HO4175/6-1). Dataset 24 was funded by a Utrecht University High Potential grant awarded to Esther S. Kluwer. Dataset 25 was funded by an Israel Science Foundation Grant (#615/10) awarded to Eshkol Rafaeli and work on its adaptation to this study was supported by Azrieli Foundation Fellowships awarded to Gal Lazarus and Haran Sened. Datasets 27 and 28 were funded by Texas Tech University's Office of the Vice President for Research, Office of Institutional Diversity, Equity, and Community Engagement, and College of Human Sciences awarded to Sylvia Niehuis. Dataset 29 was funded by the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development under award HD047564 to Scott M. Stanley. Dataset 30 was funded by a SSHRC Insight Development Grant 430-2016-00422 awarded to Cheryl Harasymchuk, Amy Muise, and Emily A. Impett. Dataset 31

was funded by the Swiss National Science Foundation and was part of the National Center of Competence in Research of Affective Sciences, Grant 51A24-104897 to Meinrad Perrez and Michael Reicherts. Dataset 32 was funded by the National Research University Fund, Division of Research, University of Houston and a University of Houston CLASS Research Progress Grant awarded to Jaye L. Derrick and National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism (NIAAA) of the National Institutes of Health under award number F31AA026195 awarded to Zachary G. Baker. Dataset 33 was funded by a Canadian Institutes of Health Research (CIHR) postdoctoral fellowship to Natalie O. Rosen and a CIHR grant to Sophie Bergeron. Dataset 34 was funded by a CIHR grant to Natalie O. Rosen. Dataset 37 was funded by the National Science Foundation (NSF) Grant BCS-1050875 awarded to Shelly L. Gable. Dataset 39 was funded by the National Science Foundation (Grant BCS-0132398) to Caryl E. Rusbult. Dataset 40 was funded by the Templeton Foundation (Grant 5158) to Caryl E. Rusbult. Dataset 41 was funded by a SSHRC Canadian Graduate Scholarship awarded to Jessica A. Maxwell and a SSHRC Insight Grant awarded to Geoff MacDonald. Dataset 42 was funded by a Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council Research Grant 410-2005-0829 awarded to Rebecca J. Cobb.

Figure S1.
Meta-Analytic Results Predicting Relationship Satisfaction with All Predictors Retained.



Figure S2.
Meta-Analytic Results Predicting Relationship Commitment with All Predictors Retained.



Figure S3.
Meta-Analytic Results Predicting Relationship Satisfaction with Twelve Potential Predictors Removed ("Stringent").



Figure S4.
Meta-Analytic Results Predicting Relationship Commitment with Twelve Potential Predictors Removed ("Stringent").



Figure S5.
Results for Dataset 38.



Table S1.
Demographic and other design features of the 43 Datasets.

Dataset	Total Study Length	Length Between Time-Points	Number of Time-Points	Rel. Length	Age	Year Start	Country	Pub	Sample Type	Rel. Status
Dataset 1	36	6	7	16.9	20.5	2009	US	1	-1	-1
Dataset 2	36	6	7	165.5	39.7	2009	US	1	1	1
Dataset 3	24	24	2	122.3	38.3	1999	US	1	1	1
Dataset 4	12	12	2	61.7	29.3	2011	US	1	1	0
Dataset 5	18	6	4	55.6	28.2	2009	US/Canada	1	1	1
Dataset 6	3	3	2	14.9	20.6	2012	US	1	0	-1
Dataset 7	3	3	2	14.0	20.2	2013	US	1	0	-1
Dataset 8	3	3	2	53.4	26.0	2012	Canada	1	0	0
Dataset 9	3.5	3.5	2	58.8	31.5	2012	US	1	1	0
Dataset 10	3.5	3.5	2	133.2	36.0	2010	Canada	1	1	0
Dataset 11	3.5	3.5	2	29.2	23.8	2007	US	1	1	-1
Dataset 12	8	4	3	3.1	25.8	2009	Israel	1	0	-1
Dataset 13	6	1	7	39.3	22.6	2012	New Zealand	1	0	-1
Dataset 14	9	9	2	33.3	22.8	2011	New Zealand	1	0	-1
Dataset 15	6	3	3	51.1	29.7	2013	US	1	0	1

Dataset 16	37.1	18.5	3	59.7	28.4	2008	US	1	1	1
Dataset 17	10	2.5	5	5.0	20.4	2005	US	1	0	0
Dataset 18	35	7	6	37.9	31.2	1987	US	1	1	1
Dataset 19	27	9	4	13.3	24.4	2005	US	0	1	1
Dataset 20	25.5	6.4	5	39.3	27.6	2002	US	1	1	0
Dataset 21	12	12	2	33.9	23.3	2014	Netherlands	1	1	-1
Dataset 22	12	4	4	45.1	24.7	2017	Netherlands	0	1	-1
Dataset 23	10	5	3	81.9	29.6	2015	US	1	1	1
Dataset 24	16	5.3	4	77.5	30.7	2011	Netherlands	0	1	0
Dataset 25	12	4.3	4	58.5	28.3	2012	Israel	1	1	0
Dataset 26	9	9	2	26.2	23.6	1992	US	1	1	-1
Dataset 27	30	30	2	31.7	25.1	2009	US	1	0	1
Dataset 28	2	1	3	22.0	21.9	2014	US	0	0	-1
Dataset 29	48	4.9	11	37.2	25.9	2007	US	1	1	-1
Dataset 30	3	3	2	98.5	32.1	2016	Canada	1	1	0
Dataset 31	6	6	2	35.5	25.4	2008	Switzerland	1	0	-1
Dataset 32	5	1	6	23.1	21.3	2015	US	0	-1	-1
Dataset 33	2	2	2	79.1	29.7	2010	Canada	1	1	0
Dataset 34	2	2	2	52.9	27.0	2014	Canada	1	1	0

Dataset 35	3	3	2	92.4	33.0	2016	Canada	1	1	1
Dataset 36	15	5	4		32.6	2014	US	1	1	0
Dataset 37	24	6	5		28.9	2009	US	0	1	0
Dataset 38	30	15	3	90.8	30.6	2003	US	1	1	0
Dataset 39	24	6	5	37.6	25.0	2002	US	1	0	0
Dataset 40	8	4	3	100.3	33.7	2000	US	1	1	1
Dataset 41	4	4	2	24.6	21.8	2013	Canada	1	0	-1
Dataset 42	24	3	9	48.8	28.3	2005	Canada	1	1	-1
Dataset 43	6	6	2	21.3	21.8	2010	US	1	0	-1

Note: Relationship length, study length, and length between timepoints are all reported in months. For relationship length, if only marriage length was provided, we added 30 months to that value (see Eastwick, Luchies, Finkel, & Hunt, 2014, for a similar adjustment). Pub column: 1 = published; 0 = not previously published. Sample type column: -1 = college student sample; 0 = blended sample (i.e., neither college student nor community participants comprise more than 85% of the sample); 1 = community sample. Relationship status column: -1 = dating, 0 = blended (i.e., neither dating nor married participants comprise more than 85% of the sample); 1 = married.

Table S2.
Analytic features of the 43 Datasets.

	At Baseline			At Follow-Up			Change	
Dataset	N	Satisfaction (*M*, *SD*)	Commitment (*M*, *SD*)	N	Satisfaction (*M*, *SD*)	Commitment (*M*, *SD*)	N	Satisfaction (*M*, *SD*)	Commitment (*M*, *SD*)
Dataset 1	148	6.01 (0.89)	5.88 (1.25)	133	5.56 (1.53)	5.63 (1.59)	146	-0.09 (0.28)	-0.07 (0.28)
Dataset 2	240	5.84 (1.21)	6.77 (0.54)	228	5.59 (1.58)	6.49 (1.05)	240	-0.06 (0.20)	-0.05 (0.17)
Dataset 3	176	6.05 (1.02)	NA	156	6.00 (1.09)	NA	154	-0.04 (1.09)	NA
Dataset 4	166	5.31 (0.69)	NA	166	5.01 (1.02)	NA	166	-0.30 (0.87)	NA
Dataset 5	350	69.59 (9.49)	6.87 (0.43)	316	66.18 (13.87)	6.71 (0.72)	343	-1.65 (4.99)	-0.09 (0.31)
Dataset 6	172	131.20 (21.04)	NA	90	121.48 (31.16)	NA	90	-12.79 (24.27)	NA
Dataset 7	201	132.05 (21.00)	NA	119	122.84 (30.67)	NA	116	-12.26 (23.97)	NA
Dataset 8	194	5.86 (1.19)	6.19 (1.04)	157	5.74 (1.27)	6.11 (1.10)	155	-0.11 (1.05)	-0.15 (0.93)
Dataset 9	129	6.03 (1.05)	6.59 (0.77)	126	5.93 (1.25)	6.38 (1.07)	126	-0.09 (1.12)	-0.21 (0.88)
Dataset 10	88	7.96 (0.99)	6.72 (0.57)	61	7.79 (1.38)	8.26 (1.03)	61	-0.02 (0.99)	1.59 (0.96)
Dataset 11	159	6.01 (0.88)	6.13 (0.91)	117	5.68 (1.22)	5.98 (1.05)	115	-0.38 (1.05)	-0.22 (0.76)
Dataset 12	124	6.03 (0.72)	NA	124	6.02 (0.80)	NA	124	0.01 (0.41)	NA
Dataset 13	200	5.92 (0.76)	6.48 (0.65)	145	5.97 (1.00)	6.39 (0.90)	192	-0.01 (0.35)	-0.02 (0.26)
Dataset 14	122	5.97 (0.85)	6.34 (0.84)	106	5.93 (1.07)	6.26 (1.05)	106	-0.15 (0.97)	-0.19 (1.01)
Dataset 15	239	6.84 (1.60)	7.48 (0.93)	158	6.82 (1.65)	7.39 (1.10)	206	-0.07 (0.81)	-0.13 (0.83)
Dataset 16	450	6.45 (0.68)	6.81 (0.45)	365	6.09 (0.96)	6.62 (0.75)	410	-0.24 (0.57)	-0.13 (0.49)

Dataset 17	345	5.98 (0.91)	6.11 (1.05)	120	5.55 (1.38)	5.93 (1.29)	195	-0.20 (0.72)	-0.15 (0.58)
Dataset 18	245	6.78 (1.21)	6.75 (1.17)	107	6.71 (1.08)	6.85 (0.96)	192	-0.15 (0.38)	-0.02 (0.46)
Dataset 19	80	28.95 (4.61)	NA	32	27.44 (5.46)	NA	51	0.24 (4.07)	NA
Dataset 20	386	42.65 (5.14)	NA	278	41.26 (6.81)	NA	343	-0.55 (1.89)	NA
Dataset 21	255	5.97 (0.83)	6.47 (0.73)	189	5.93 (0.84)	6.34 (1.04)	189	-0.10 (0.90)	-0.20 (1.05)
Dataset 22	347	6.02 (0.76)	6.48 (0.67)	216	5.82 (0.93)	6.23 (1.08)	283	-0.11 (0.49)	-0.18 (0.69)
Dataset 23	318	41.89 (4.56)	NA	258	41.21 (5.83)	NA	289	-0.34 (3.28)	NA
Dataset 24	394	4.52 (0.49)	4.87 (0.25)	230	4.50 (0.55)	4.86 (0.36)	372	-0.02 (0.32)	-0.04 (0.35)
Dataset 25	172	70.69 (9.06)	6.53 (0.65)	118	76.63 (7.78)	6.44 (0.69)	144	1.12 (2.91)	-0.25 (0.54)
Dataset 26	464	-0.00 (0.97)	6.53 (1.68)	322	-0.00 (1.02)	6.58 (1.94)	322	-0.10 (1.07)	-0.12 (1.69)
Dataset 27	254	6.16 (0.89)	5.45 (0.63)	247	5.95 (1.14)	5.37 (0.59)	247	-0.22 (1.16)	-0.09 (0.69)
Dataset 28	206	4.45 (0.70)	5.98 (0.88)	130	4.48 (0.70)	5.88 (0.90)	158	-0.00 (0.33)	-0.06 (0.37)
Dataset 29	564	4.46 (1.21)	5.61 (1.08)	261	4.34 (1.36)	6.00 (1.07)	478	-0.12 (0.47)	-0.04 (0.32)
Dataset 30	237	6.11 (1.02)	6.64 (0.80)	208	5.92 (1.31)	6.46 (1.01)	205	-0.21 (1.29)	-0.23 (0.77)
Dataset 31	203	31.23 (2.69)	NA	167	31.24 (3.27)	NA	167	-0.27 (2.30)	NA
Dataset 32	196	5.96 (1.13)	6.33 (1.00)	136	5.85 (1.23)	6.19 (1.08)	196	-0.04 (0.53)	-0.06 (0.44)
Dataset	156	17.65 (3.63)	NA	156	17.99 (3.76)	NA	156	0.34 (4.17)	NA

33 Dataset									
34 Dataset	323	16.90 (2.93)	NA	316	16.95 (3.37)	NA	316	0.05 (3.85)	NA
35 Dataset	192	5.89 (1.06)	6.41 (0.88)	161	5.74 (1.38)	6.29 (1.14)	161	-0.14 (1.11)	-0.15 (1.02)
36 Dataset	111	117.86 (22.45)	NA	139	123.06 (19.42)	NA	111	-6.31 (15.21)	NA
37 Dataset	97	5.22 (1.50)	6.19 (0.96)	31	5.35 (1.33)	6.45 (0.95)	72	-0.06 (1.15)	-0.19 (0.89)
38 Dataset	12200	5.54 (0.93)	6.80 (0.90)	7731	5.49 (0.97)	6.84 (0.87)	9886	0.19 (1.10)	0.09 (0.73)
39 Dataset	373	6.66 (1.61)	6.75 (1.08)	190	7.00 (1.16)	6.74 (0.90)	322	-0.10 (0.51)	-0.09 (0.51)
40 Dataset	151	7.63 (1.16)	7.79 (1.30)	109	5.92 (1.10)	6.05 (1.02)	133	-0.05 (0.57)	-0.10 (0.41)
41 Dataset	240	41.39 (4.65)	6.55 (0.56)	181	39.98 (6.19)	5.14 (0.49)	181	-0.10 (1.00)	-0.16 (0.96)
42 Dataset	390	5.09 (0.72)	7.83 (1.25)	351	5.09 (0.83)	7.95 (1.26)	327	-0.26 (0.72)	-0.78 (0.42)
43	144	31.23 (2.69)	NA	73	31.24 (3.27)	NA	73	-0.14 (0.82)	-0.12 (1.15)

Table S3.
Scholars and citations associated with the 43 Datasets.

Dataset	Collaborators	Citations
Dataset 1	Laura B. Luchies, Erica B. Slotter, Eli J. Finkel	1-5
Dataset 2	Laura B. Luchies, Erica B. Slotter, Eli J. Finkel	1-3, 6
Dataset 3	Cheryl L. Carmichael, Shelly L. Gable, Harry Reis	7-10
Dataset 4	David C. de Jong, Harry Reis	11
Dataset 5	Michael Maniaci, Harry Reis, Ron Rogge	8, 12, 13
Dataset 6	Brett J. Peters, Jeremy P. Jamieson, Harry T. Reis	14-16
Dataset 7	Brett J. Peters, Jeremy P. Jamieson, Harry T. Reis	17
Dataset 8	Amy Muise, Emily A. Impett	18-20
Dataset 9	Emily A. Impett, Amy Muise	21, 22
Dataset 10	Amy Muise	23-26
Dataset 11	Emily A. Impett, Dacher Keltner	27-39
Dataset 12	Moran Mizrahi, Gurit Birnbaum	40-43
Dataset 13	Nickola C. Overall, Matthew D. Hammond, Yuthika U. Girme, Phoebe R. Molloy	44-51
Dataset 14	Nickola C. Overall and Matthew D. Hammond	52-57
Dataset 15	Lindsey M. Rodriguez	58-61
Dataset 16	Paula R. Pietromonaco, Sally I. Powers	62-67
Dataset 17	R. Chris Fraley, Claudia C. Brumbaugh, Amanda M. Vicary	68-70
Dataset 18	Laura V. Machia, Ximena Arriaga	71-80
Dataset 19	Allison A. Vaughn, Maija Reblin	
Dataset 20	Jeffry A. Simpson, William S. Rholes, Jami Eller	81-84
Dataset 21	Francesca Righetti, Mariko L. Visserman, Ruddy Faure	2, 85-91
Dataset 22	Francesca Righetti, Ruddy Faure, Grace Larson, Wilhelm Hofmann	
Dataset 23	Rebecca L. Brock, Erin Ramsdell	92
Dataset 24	Esther S. Kluwer, Hagar Ter Kuile	
Dataset 25	Eshkol Rafaeli, Eran Bar-Kalifa, Reuma Gadassi-Polack, Gal Lazarus, Rony Pshedetzky-Shochat, Haran Sened	93-101
Dataset 26	Brian G. Ogolsky, Cathy Surra	102, 103
Dataset 27	Sylvia Niehuis, C. Rebecca Oldham, Alan Reifman	104

Dataset 28	Silvia Niehuis, C. Rebecca Oldham, Alan Reifman	105
Dataset 29	Scott Stanley, Galena Rhoades	106-111
Dataset 30	Cheryl Harasymchuk, Amy Muise, Emily A. Impett	21, 112
Dataset 31	Anik Debrot, Meinrad Perrez, Michael Reicherts, Andrea B. Horn	113-116
Dataset 32	Jaye L. Derrick, Zachary G. Baker	117-119
Dataset 33	Natalie O. Rosen, Sophie Bergeron	120-128
Dataset 34	Natalie O. Rosen, Sophie Bergeron	129-136
Dataset 35	James J. Kim, Anik Debrot, Amy Muise, Emily Impett	137
Dataset 36	Darby Saxbe	138
Dataset 37	Courtney L. Gosnell, Shelly L. Gable, Thery Prok	
Dataset 38	ICPSR (publicly available dataset)	139-155
Dataset 39	Madoka Kumashiro, Michael K. Coolsen, Shevaun Stocker, Jeff L. Kirchner, Marie-Joelle Estrada, Scott Wolf, Jennifer Clarke	2, 88, 156-167
Dataset 40	Madoka Kumashiro, Eli J. Finkel, Michael K. Coolsen, Jeff L. Kirshner, Peggy A. Hannon, Jody Davis, Jennifer Clarke	156, 168-174
Dataset 41	Jessica A. Maxwell, Geoff MacDonald	175
Dataset 42	Rebecca J. Cobb, Jill M. Logan, Colleen J. Allison, Eva C. DeHaas	176-179
Dataset 43	Amie M. Gordon, Serena Chen	180-183

Table S4.
Success rates of less common relationship-specific constructs across datasets.

Construct	Number of Predictors Tested		% of Actor Versions Successful		% of Partner Versions Successful		Overall Success Rate
	Predicting Satisfaction	Predicting Commitment	Predicting Satisfaction	Predicting Commitment	Predicting Satisfaction	Predicting Commitment	
ambivalence	3	3	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
avoidant attachment - relationship specific	5	3	100%	80%	100%	33%	81%
SDT needs - relatedness	4	4	100%	50%	100%	75%	81%
communal strength	6	6	67%	67%	100%	67%	75%
communication	5	3	80%	60%	100%	67%	75%
support - informational	3	3	67%	100%	67%	67%	75%
dyadic consensus	4	3	100%	50%	100%	33%	71%
accommodation	4	4	75%	75%	50%	75%	69%
dyadic cohesion	5	3	80%	60%	67%	67%	69%
goal compatibility	4	4	100%	75%	50%	50%	69%
relationship approach goals	9	7	78%	67%	86%	29%	66%
anxious attachment - relationship specific	5	3	60%	100%	0%	67%	62%
support - emotional	4	4	75%	100%	75%	0%	62%
jealousy	5	4	60%	60%	75%	50%	61%

high maintenance interaction	3	3	100%	67%	67%	0%	58%
maintenance behaviors	3	3	100%	33%	67%	33%	58%
support - physical	3	3	67%	67%	67%	33%	58%
relationship length - known	4	3	75%	75%	0%	67%	57%
relationship centrality	5	4	40%	40%	75%	75%	56%
sexual approach goals	3	1	67%	33%	100%	0%	50%
time with partner	3	0	100%	0%	NaN%	NaN%	50%
forgiveness	8	8	50%	38%	50%	38%	44%
SDT needs- autonomy	3	3	100%	0%	33%	33%	42%
sexual frequency preferences	9	8	33%	44%	62%	25%	41%
sexual communal strength	6	5	17%	33%	40%	80%	41%
long distance	3	2	67%	67%	0%	0%	40%
support - tangible	5	5	40%	40%	40%	40%	40%
partner's attractiveness	4	4	75%	25%	25%	25%	38%
sexual avoidance goals	3	1	33%	33%	0%	100%	38%
sexually active	4	3	25%	50%	33%	33%	36%
relationship avoidance goals	9	7	22%	33%	43%	29%	31%
sexual desire	8	7	25%	25%	29%	43%	30%

unmitigated communion	3	2	33%	33%	50%	0%	30%
willingness to sacrifice	5	5	0%	20%	40%	40%	25%
respect	4	4	50%	0%	0%	0%	12%
sacrifice frequency	5	5	20%	0%	20%	0%	10%

Note: Whereas relationship-specific constructs measured at least 10 times across datasets are reported in Table 1 of the main text, constructs measured at least 3 times but fewer than 10 times across datasets are reported here.

Table S5.
Success rates of less common individual difference constructs across datasets.

Construct	Number of Predictors Tested		% of Actor Versions Successful		% of Partner Versions Successful		Overall Success Rate
	Predicting Satisfaction	Predicting Commitment	Predicting Satisfaction	Predicting Commitment	Predicting Satisfaction	Predicting Commitment	
communal orientation	3	3	100%	100%	100%	33%	83%
destiny beliefs	7	7	43%	71%	71%	71%	64%
self-control	7	7	71%	57%	71%	57%	64%
prevention focus	8	6	62%	62%	67%	33%	57%
promotion focus	7	7	43%	57%	71%	43%	54%
gender roles	8	3	25%	75%	67%	33%	50%
growth beliefs	7	7	57%	43%	57%	43%	50%
weight	5	3	60%	40%	33%	67%	50%
emotion regulation - suppression	4	3	75%	25%	0%	67%	43%
self-respect	3	3	67%	67%	0%	33%	42%
prior partners	5	4	20%	40%	50%	50%	39%
emotion regulation - reappraisal	4	3	25%	50%	33%	33%	36%
first language	5	4	40%	40%	25%	25%	33%
self-concept clarity	3	3	33%	33%	33%	33%	33%
behavioral inhibition	3	2	33%	33%	0%	50%	30%

sexual orientation	4	3	0%	0%	67%	67%	29%
socioeconomic status	7	7	29%	43%	29%	14%	29%
weight attitudes	4	2	50%	25%	0%	0%	25%
height	7	5	29%	14%	20%	20%	21%
behavioral activation	3	2	67%	0%	0%	0%	20%
occupation	3	2	33%	33%	0%	0%	20%
married previously	6	6	33%	17%	17%	0%	17%
social desirability	6	6	17%	17%	17%	17%	17%
forgiveness	5	5	40%	20%	0%	0%	15%
own physical attractiveness	6	6	0%	33%	17%	0%	12%
narcissism	3	3	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Note: Whereas individual difference constructs measured at least 10 times across datasets are reported in Table 2 of the main text, constructs measured at least 3 times but fewer than 10 times across datasets are reported here.

Table S6.
Moderator tests for satisfaction (k = 43)

	Total Study Length	Length Between Time-Points	Number of Time-Points	Rel. Length	Age	Year Start	Country	Pub-lished	Sample Type	Rel. Status	# Predictors (Used)	# Predictors (Final)
Baseline: Actor Individual	.03	-.11	.10	.30	.24	.31*	2.52	.10	.05	.21	.24	.15
Baseline: Partner Individual	-.11	-.07	-.05	.21	.16	.33*	0.62	.00	.05	.04	.12	.35*
Baseline: A&P Individual	-.16	-.17	-.03	.24	.17	.48***	3.84	.11	.00	.05	.12	.24
Baseline: Actor Relationship	.11	-.24	.27	.21	.21	-.10	3.71	.31*	.08	.17	.25	.14
Baseline: Partner Relationship	.04	-.12	.13	.38*	.45**	-.01	0.76	.22	.16	.24	.18	.14
Baseline: A&P Relationship	.09	-.23	.27	.26	.25	-.11	3.04	.36*	.09	.13	.22	.04
Baseline: All Predictors	.00	-.30*	.27	.25	.20	.20	4.03	.28	.03	-.04	.12	.12
Follow-up: Actor Individual	.10	-.14	.15	.27	.30*	.12	3.77	-.25	.22	.13	.06	.05
Follow-up: Partner Individual	-.13	-.31*	.02	.21	.15	.39**	3.23	-.08	-.10	.05	.18	-.14
Follow-up: A&P Individual	-.10	-.17	-.04	.21	.23	.39**	5.37	-.25	.13	.09	-.08	.08
Follow-up: Actor Relationship	.06	.09	-.11	.27	.30*	.02	2.60	-.03	.08	.28	.32*	.18
Follow-up: Partner Relationship	-.09	.01	-.18	.22	.16	.14	3.27	.10	-.06	.22	.38*	.15
Follow-up: A&P Relationship	.01	.03	-.18	.27	.36*	-.08	6.26	.12	.12	.31*	.24	.15
Follow-up: All Predictors	-.25	-.11	-.21	.32*	.29*	.52***	2.89	-.11	.17	.11	-.06	.35*
Change: Actor Individual	.05	-.06	.06	.27	.19	-.01	9.11	.06	.04	.19	.18	-.06
Change: Partner Individual	-.12	-.15	-.12	.08	.02	-.06	0.80	.24	-.03	-.06	.11	-.04
Change: A&P Individual	-.19	-.24	-.08	.16	.02	.20	4.16	-.05	.05	-.11	-.02	-.07
Change: Actor Relationship	.17	.19	-.12	.01	.10	-.18	1.54	.04	.26	.18	.09	.12
Change: Partner Relationship	.27	.24	-.05	.04	.16	-.23	5.65	.15	.07	.24	.23	.12
Change: A&P Relationship	-.15	-.14	-.24	-.08	-.04	.03	1.25	.00	.17	-.09	.04	.17
Change: All Predictors	-.15	-.19	-.16	-.13	.00	-.15	8.41	.05	.13	.02	-.22	.13

Note: All statistics are regression βs except for Country (which are meta-analytic Qs for the categorical test). Pub coded: 1 = published; 0 = not previously published. Sample type coded: -1 = college student sample; 0 = blended sample (i.e., neither college student nor community participants comprise more than 85% of the sample); 1 = community sample. Relationship status coded: -1 = dating, 0 = blended (i.e., neither dating nor married participants comprise more than 85% of the sample); 1 = married.

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$.

Table S7.
Moderator tests for commitment (k = 31).

	Total Study Length	Length Between Time-Points	Number of Time-Points	Rel. Length	Age	Year Start	Country	Pub-lished	Sample Type	Rel. Status	# Predictors (Used)	# Predictors (Final)
Baseline: Actor Individual	-.21	-.16	-.16	.06	-.01	.34*	1.48	-.03	.07	.15	-.07	.31
Baseline: Partner Individual	-.33	-.18	-.13	-.25	-.31	.28	3.09	-.06	-.27	-.06	-.16	.17
Baseline: A&P Individual	-.26	-.26	-.11	.01	-.10	.56***	1.91	-.12	-.17	.08	-.10	.18
Baseline: Actor Relationship	-.12	-.57***	.19	-.04	-.09	.03	1.71	.20	-.11	-.14	.13	.19
Baseline: Partner Relationship	-.23	-.35*	-.07	-.35*	-.38*	-.03	3.91	.00	-.36*	-.33	.12	.31
Baseline: A&P Relationship	-.09	-.56***	.22	-.08	-.13	-.01	1.18	.18	-.16	-.16	.17	.13
Baseline: All Predictors	-.20	-.41*	.09	.00	-.13	.42*	1.23	-.03	-.17	-.13	.04	.42*
Follow-up: Actor Individual	-.15	.09	-.17	.04	.00	.43*	5.82	.15	-.02	.01	-.10	.26
Follow-up: Partner Individual	-.19	.00	-.10	-.04	-.14	.16	0.50	-.10	-.16	-.02	.05	.00
Follow-up: A&P Individual	-.24	.03	-.23	.25	.16	.43**	3.07	-.06	.03	.16	-.05	.15
Follow-up: Actor Relationship	.00	-.30	.04	.23	.27	-.16	1.03	.10	.25	.05	.19	.15
Follow-up: Partner Relationship	-.14	-.08	-.15	.00	-.04	-.11	4.51	.27	-.03	-.07	.17	.08
Follow-up: A&P Relationship	-.05	-.15	-.03	.11	.11	-.19	2.66	.27	.17	-.03	.21	.10
Follow-up: All Predictors	-.35*	-.18	-.22	.23	.18	.27	3.68	.06	.10	.09	-.06	.27
Change: Actor Individual	-.22	-.09	-.24	.34*	.21	-.04	3.42	.14	.05	-.04	-.01	.04
Change: Partner Individual	-.28	.00	-.31	.11	-.02	.16	2.09	.09	.09	-.02	.11	.18
Change: A&P Individual	-.34*	-.26	-.26	.43*	.30	.27	6.99	-.09	.12	.05	-.10	.10
Change: Actor Relationship	-.20	-.11	-.15	.18	.10	.16	3.88	-.04	.27	-.05	-.08	.07
Change: Partner Relationship	-.12	-.08	-.10	.17	.18	-.12	7.57	-.34	.19	.03	-.07	-.06
Change: A&P Relationship	-.23	-.06	-.25	.11	.00	.11	9.15	.11	.07	-.18	-.01	.22
Change: All Predictors	-.32	-.20	-.24	.19	.10	.16	5.67	-.06	.08	-.07	-.14	.13

Note: All statistics are regression βs except for Country (which are meta-analytic Qs for the categorical test). Pub coded: 1 = published; 0 = not previously published. Sample type coded: -1 = college student sample; 0 = blended sample (i.e., neither college student nor community participants comprise more than 85% of the sample); 1 = community sample. Relationship status coded: -1 = dating, 0 = blended (i.e., neither dating nor married participants comprise more than 85% of the sample); 1 = married.

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$.

Table S8.
Perceived partner subset analyses.

Predictors Used	Version Used	Variance in Actor Satisfaction Explained		
		Baseline	Follow-Up	Change
"Perceived Partner" Subset Only	Actor	43%	5%	0%
Relationship with "Perceived Partner" Subset Removed	Actor	43%	20%	2%
All Relationship (Original Model)	Actor	54%	23%	1%
"Perceived Partner" Subset Only	Partner	13%	2%	0%
Relationship with "Perceived Partner" Subset Removed	Partner	13%	10%	1%
All Relationship (Original Model)	Partner	19%	15%	1%

Note: "Original Model" results differ from Table 2 "Actor relationship" and "Partner Relationship" because these analyses are conducted on Datasets 1, 2, 13, 14, 21, 25, 31, and 37 alone.

Supplementary References

1. Arriaga, X. B., Reed, J. T., Goodfriend, W., & Agnew, C. R. (2006). Relationship perceptions and persistence: Do fluctuations in perceived partner commitment undermine dating relationships? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 91*, 1045-1065.
2. Joel, S., Impett, E.A., Spielmann, S., & MacDonald, G. How interdependent are stay/leave decisions? On staying in the relationship for the sake of the romantic partner. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 115*, 805-824.
3. Lemay Jr, E. P., Clark, M. S., & Feeney, B. C. (2007). Projection of responsiveness to needs and the construction of satisfying communal relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 92*, 834-853.
4. Fletcher, G. J., Simpson, J. A., & Thomas, G. (2000). The measurement of perceived relationship quality components: A confirmatory factor analytic approach. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 26*, 340-354.

Dataset References

Publications in which the current datasets were previously published are listed below. They are referenced by number next to their corresponding datasets in Table S4.

1. DeWall, C. N., Lambert, N. M., Slotter, E. B., Deckman, T., Pond, R. S., Finkel, E. J., Luchies, L. B., & Fincham, F. D. (2011). So far away from one's partner, yet so close to romantic alternatives: Avoidant attachment, interest in alternatives, and infidelity. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 101, 1302-1316.
2. Righetti, F., Luchies, L. B., van Gils, S., Witcher, B. S., Slotter, E. B., & Kumashiro, M. (2015). The prosocial vs. proself power holder: How power influences sacrifice in romantic relationships. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 41, 779-790.
3. Richman, S. B., Pond, R. S., DeWall, C. N., Kumashiro, M., Slotter, E. B., & Luchies, L. B. (2016). An unclear self leads to poor mental health: Self-concept confusion mediates the association of loneliness with depression. Journal of Clinical and Social Psychology, 35, 525-550.
4. Slotter, E. B., Emery, L. F., & Luchies, L. B. (2014). Me after you: Partner influence and individual effort predict rejection of self-aspects and self-concept clarity after relationship dissolution. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 40, 831-844.
5. Slotter, E. B., & Luchies, L. B. (2014). Relationship quality promotes the desire for closeness among distressed avoidantly attached individuals. Personal Relationships, 21, 22-34.
6. Finkel, E. J., Slotter, E. B., Luchies, L. B., Walton, G. M., & Gross, J. J. (2013). A brief intervention to promote conflict reappraisal preserves marital quality over time. Psychological Science, 24, 1595-1601.
7. Gable, S.L, Reis, H.T., Impett, E.A., & Asher, E.R. (2004). What do you do when things go right? The intrapersonal and interpersonal benefits of sharing positive events. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 87, 228-245.
8. Girme, Y. U., Maniaci, M. R., Reis, H. T., McNulty, J. K., Carmichael, C. L., Gable, S. L., Baker, L. R., & Overall, N. C. (2018). Does support need to be seen? Daily invisible support promotes next day relationship well-being. Journal of Family Psychology, 32, 882-893.
9. Tomlinson, J.M., Aron. A., Carmichael, C.L., Reis, H.T., & Holmes, J.G. (2014). The costs of being put on a pedestal: The effects of feeling over-idealized in marriage and dating relationships. Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 31, 384-409.
10. Carmichael, C.L., & Reis, H.T. (2005). Attachment, sleep quality, and depressed affect. Health Psychology, 24, 526-531.
11. de Jong, D. C., & Reis, H. T. (2014). Sexual kindred spirits: Actual and overperceived similarity, complementarity, and accuracy in heterosexual couples. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 40, 1316-1329.
12. Reis, H. T., Maniaci, M. R., & Rogge, R. D. (2014). The expression of compassionate love in everyday compassionate acts. Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 31, 652-677.

13. Reis, H. T., Maniaci, M. R., & Rogge, R. D. (2017). Compassionate acts and everyday emotional well-being among newlyweds. Emotion, 17, 751-763.
14. Peters, B. J., Overall, N. C., Girme, Y. U., & Jamieson, J. P. (2017). Partners' attachment insecurity predicts greater physiological threat in anticipation of attachment-relevant interactions. Journal of Social and Personal Relationships. https://doi.org/10.1177/0265407517734655
15. Peters, B. J., Hammond, M.D., Reis, H.T., & Jamieson, J.P. (2016). The consequences of having a dominant romantic partner on testosterone responses during a social interaction. Psychoneuroendocrinology, 74, 308-315. doi: 10.1016/j.psyneuen.2016.09.024
16. Peters, B. J., & Jamieson, J. P. (2016). The consequences of suppressing affective displays in romantic relationships: A challenge and threat perspective. Emotion, 16(7), 1050–1066. http://doi.org/10.1037/emo0000202
17. Peters, B. J., Reis, H. T., & Jamieson, J. P. (2018). Cardiovascular indexes of threat impair responsiveness in situations of conflicting interests. International Journal of Psychophysiology, 123, 1–7. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijpsycho.2017.12.005
18. Muise, A., Giang, E., Impett, E. A. (2014). Post sex affectionate exchanges promote sexual and relationship satisfaction. Archives of Sexual Behavior, 43, 1391-1402.
19. Muise, A., Stanton, S. C. E., Kim, J. J., & Impett, E. A. (2016). Not in the mood? Men under (not over) perceive their partner's sexual desire in established relationships. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 110, 725-742.
20. Day, L. C., Muise, A., Joel, S. & Impett E. A. (2015). To do it or not to do it? How communally motivated people navigate sexual interdependence dilemmas. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 41, 791-804
21. Muise, A., Harasymchuk, C., Day, L. C., Bacev-Giles, C., Gere, J., & Impett, E. A. (2019). Broadening your horizons: Self-expanding activities promote desire and satisfaction in established romantic relationships. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 116, 237-258.
22. Muise, A., & Impett, E. A. (2015). Good, giving, and game: The relationship benefits of sexual communal motivation. Social Psychological and Personality Science, 6, 164-172.
23. Muise, A., Impett, E. A., & Desmarais, S. (2013). Getting it on vs. getting it over with: Approach-avoidance sexual motivation, desire and satisfaction in intimate bonds. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 39, 1320-1332.
24. Muise, A., Impett, E. A., Kogan, A., & Desmarais, S. (2013). Keeping the spark alive: Being motivated to meet a partner's sexual needs sustains sexual desire in long-term romantic relationships. Social Psychological and Personality Science, 4, 267-273.
25. Muise, A., & Impett, E. A. (2015). Good, giving, and game: The relationship benefits of sexual communal motivation. Social Psychological and Personality Science, 6, 164-172.
26. Muise, A., Stanton, S. C. E., Kim, J. J., & Impett, E. A. (2016). Not in the mood? Men under (not over) perceive their partner's sexual desire in established relationships. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 110, 725-742.

27. Kogan, A., Impett, E. A., Oveis, C., Hui, B., Gordon, A., & Keltner, D. (2010). When giving feels good: The intrinsic benefits of sacrifice in romantic relationships for the communally motivated. Psychological Science, 21, 1918-1924.
28. Impett, E. A., Gordon, A., Kogan, A., Oveis, C., Gable, S. L., & Keltner, D. (2010). Moving toward more perfect unions: Daily and long-term consequences of approach and avoidance goals in romantic relationships. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 99, 948-963.
29. Impett, E. A., Kogan, A., English, T., John O., Oveis, C., Gordon, A., & Keltner, D. (2012). Suppression sours sacrifice: Emotional and relational costs of suppressing emotions in romantic relationships. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 38, 707-720.
30. Gordon, A., Impett, E. A., Kogan, A., Oveis, C., & Keltner, D. (2012). To have and to hold: Gratitude promotes relationship maintenance in intimate bonds. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 103, 257-274.
31. Joel, S., Gordon, A., Impett, E. A., MacDonald, G., & Keltner, D. (2013). The things you do for me: Perceptions of a romantic partner's investments promote gratitude and commitment. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 39, 1333-1345.
32. Impett, E. A., Le, B. M., Kogan, A., Oveis, C., & Keltner, D. (2014). When you think your partner is holding back: The costs of perceived partner suppression during relationship sacrifice. Social Psychological and Personality Science, 5, 542-549.
33. Impett, E. A., Gere, J., Kogan, A., Gordon, A. M., & Keltner, D. (2014). How sacrifice impacts the giver and the recipient: Insights from approach-avoidance motivational theory. Journal of Personality, 82, 390-401.
34. Dutra, S., West, T., Impett, E. A., Oveis, C., Kogan, A., Keltner, D, & Gruber, J. (2014). Rose-colored glasses gone too far? Mania predicts biased emotion experience and empathic inaccuracy in couples. Motivation and Emotion, 38, 157-165.
35. Debrot, A., Meuwly, N., Muise, A., Impett, E. A., & Schoebi, D. (2017). More than just sex: Affection accounts for the association between sex and well-being. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 43, 1-13.
36. Visserman, M. L., Righetti, F., Impett, E. A., Keltner, D., & Van Lange, P. (2018). It's the perceived motive that counts! Perceptions of a romantic partner's sacrifice motives and the emergence of gratitude. Emotion, 18, 625-637.
37. Visserman, M. L., Impett, E. A., Righetti, F., Muise, A., Keltner, D., & Van Lange, P. A. M. (2018). To "see" is to feel grateful? A quasi-signal detection analysis of romantic partners' sacrifices. Social Psychological and Personality Science. Advance online publication.
38. Tan, J. J. X., Kraus, M. W., Impett, E. A., & Keltner, D. (in press). Partner commitment in interpersonal relationships mitigates social-class differences in subjective well-being. Social Psychological and Personality Science.
39. Park, Y., Impett, E. A., MacDonald, G., & Lemay, E. P. (in press). Saying "thank you": Partners' expressions of gratitude protect relationship satisfaction and commitment from the harmful effects of attachment insecurity. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology.

40. Birnbaum, G. E., Mikulincer, M., Szepsenwol, O., Shaver, P. R., & Mizrahi, M. (2014). When sex goes wrong: A behavioral systems perspective on individual differences in sexual attitudes, motives, feelings, and behaviors. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 106, 822-842.
41. Szepsenwol, O., Mizrahi, M., & Birnbaum, G. E. (2015). Fatal suppression: The detrimental effect of sexual deactivation within romantic relationships. Social Psychological and Personality Science, 6, 504-512.
42. Mizrahi, M., Birnbaum, G. E., Hirschberger, G., Mikulincer, M., & Szepsenwol, O. (2016). Reassuring sex: Can sexual desire and intimacy repair relationship-specific attachment insecurities? European Journal of Social Psychology, 46, 473-480.
43. Mizrahi, M., Reis, H. T., Maniaci, M. R., & Birnbaum, G. E. (in press). When insecurity dampens desire: Attachment anxiety in men amplifies the decline in sexual desire during the early years of romantic relationships. European Journal of Social Psychology.
44. Overall, N. C., Hammond, M. D., McNulty, J. K., & Finkel, E. J. (2016). When power shapes interpersonal behavior: Low relationship power predicts men's aggressive responses to low situational power. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 111, 195-217.
45. Jayamaha, S. D., Girme, Y. U., & Overall, N. C. (2017). When attachment anxiety impedes support provision: The role of feeling unvalued and unappreciated. Journal of Family Psychology, 31, 181-191.
46. Hammond, M. D., & Overall, N. C. (2015). Benevolent Sexism and Support of Romantic Partner's Goals: Undermining Women's Competence While Fulfilling Men's Intimacy Needs. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 41, 1180-1194.
47. Girme, Y. U., Molloy, P. R., & Overall, N. C. (2016). Repairing Distance and Facilitating Support Reassurance Seeking by Highly Avoidant Individuals Is Associated With Greater Closeness and Partner Support. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 42, 645-661.
48. Girme, Y, U., Overall, N. C., Simpson, J. A., & Fletcher, G. J. O. (2015). "All or nothing": Attachment avoidance and the curvilinear effects of partner support. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 108, 450-475.
49. Don, B. P., Girme, Y. U., Hammond, M. D. (2018). Low Self-Esteem Predicts Indirect Support Seeking and Its Relationship Consequences in Intimate Relationships. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin. Advanced online publication.
50. Girme, Y. U., Overall, N. C., & Hammond, M. D. (2019). Facilitating Autonomy in Interdependent Relationships: Invisible Support Facilitates Highly Avoidant Individuals' Autonomy. Journal of Family Psychology, 33, 154-165.
51. Low, R. S. T., Overall, N. C., Hammond, M. D., Girme, Y. U. (2017). Emotional suppression during personal goal pursuit impedes goal strivings and achievement. Emotion, 17, 208-223.
52. Overall, N. C., Girme, Y.U., Lemay, E. P. Jr., & Hammond, M.T. (2014). Attachment anxiety and reactions to relationship threat: The benefits and costs of inducing guilt in romantic partners. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 106, 235-256.

53. Overall, N. C., & Hammond, M. D. (2013). Biased and accurate: Depressive symptoms and daily perceptions within intimate relationships. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 39, 636-650.
54. Hammond, M.D., & Overall, N.C. (2013). When relationships do not live up to benevolent ideals: Women's benevolent sexism and sensitivity to relationship problems. European Journal of Social Psychology, 43, 212-223.
55. Hammond, M.D., & Overall, N.C. (2013). Men's hostile sexism and biased perceptions of intimate partners: Fostering dissatisfaction and negative behavior in close relationships. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 39, 1585-1599.
56. Overall, N.C., Fletcher, G.J.O., Simpson, J.A., & Filo, J. (2015). Attachment avoidance, biased perceptions of negative emotions, and behavioral hostility. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 108, 730-749.
57. Cross, E.J., Overall, N.C., Low, R.S.T., & McNulty, J.K. (online advance). Men's hostile sexism, biased perceptions of low power, and aggression toward intimate partners. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology.
58. Rodriguez, L. M. & Webster, G. D. (in press). The three-item Thinking about Your Partner's Drinking Scale (TPD-3): Item response theory, reliability, and validity. *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy.* doi:10.1111/jmft.12399
59. Rodriguez, L. M., Fillo, J., Hadden, B. W., Øverup, C. S., Baker, Z. G., & DiBello, A. M. (2019). Do you see what I see? Actor and partner attachment shape biased perceptions of partners. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 45*(4), 587-602. doi: 10.1177/01461672187917821.
60. Rodriguez, L. M. (2016). A dyadic growth approach to partner regulation attempts on changes in drinking and negative alcohol-related consequences. *Substance Use and Misuse, 51,* 1870-1880. doi: 10.1080/10826084.2016.1200621 [PMCID: 5065013] [PMID: 27607244]
61. Rodriguez, L. M., DiBello, A., & Wickham, R. (2016). Regulation strategies mediate associations between heavy drinking and relationship outcomes in married couples. *Addictive Behaviors, 54,* 64-69. doi: 10.1016/j.addbeh.2015.12.002 [PMCID: 4714601] [PMID: 26722992]
62. Beck, L. A., Pietromonaco, P. R., DeBuse, C. J., Powers, S. I., & Sayer, A. G. (2013). Spouses' attachment pairings predict neuroendocrine, behavioral, and psychological responses to marital conflict. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 105(3), 388-424.
63. Beck, L. A., Pietromonaco, P. R., DeVito, C., Powers, S. I., & Boyle, A. (2014). Congruence between spouses' perceptions and observers' ratings of responsiveness: The role of attachment avoidance.Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 40, 164-174.
64. Laws, H., Sayer, A., Pietromonaco, P. R., & Powers, S. I. (2015). Longitudinal changes in spouses' HPA responses: Convergence in cortisol patterns during the early years of marriage. Health Psychology, 34 (11),1076-1089.

65. Ge, F., Pietromonaco, P. R., DeBuse, C. J., Powers, S. I, & Granger, D. A. (2016). Concurrent and prospective associations between HPA axis activity and depression symptoms in newlywed women.Psychoneuroendocrinology, 73, 125-132.
66. Winer, J. P., Powers, S. I., & Pietromonaco, P. R. (2017). Early pubertal timing and childhood family adversity interact to predict newlywed women's anxiety symptoms. Journal of Child and Family Studies, 26, 591–602.
67. Winer, J. P., Powers, S.I, & Pietromonaco, P. R., & Schreck, M. C. (2018). Childhood family adversity and adult cortisol response: The role of observed marital conflict behavior. Journal of Family Psychology, 32, 793-803.
68. Holland, A. S., Fraley, R. C., & Roisman, G. I. (2012). Attachment styles in dating couples: Predicting relationship functioning over time. Personal Relationships, 19, 234-246.
69. Hudson, N. W., Fraley, R. C., Vicary, A. M., & Brumbaugh, C. C. (2014). Coregulation in romantic partners' attachment styles: A longitudinal investigation. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 40, 845-857.
70. Hudson, N. W., & Fraley, R. C. (2014). Partner similarity matters for the insecure: Attachment orientations moderate the association between similarity in partners' personality traits and relationship satisfaction. Journal of Research in Personality, 53, 112-123.
71. Arriaga, X. B. & Rusbult, C. E. (1998). Standing in my partner's shoes: Partner perspective taking and reactions to accommodative dilemmas. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 24, 927-948.
72. Bissonnette, V. L., Rusbult, C. E., & Kilpatrick, S. D. (1997). Empathic accuracy and marital conflict resolution. In W. J. Ickes (Ed.), Empathic accuracy. (pp. 251–281). New York, NY: The Guilford Press.
73. Drigotas, S. M., Rusbult, C. E., & Verette, J. (1999). Level of commitment, mutuality of commitment, and couple well-being. Personal Relationships, 6, 389-409.
74. Drigotas, S. M., Rusbult, C. E., Wieselquist, J., & Whitton, S. W. (1999). Close partner as sculptor of the ideal self: Behavioral affirmation and the Michelangelo phenomenon. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 77, 293–323.
75. Richman, S. B., Pond Jr., R. S., DeWall, C. N., Kumashiro, M., Slotter, E. B., & Luchies, L. B. (2016). An unclear self leads to poor mental health: Self-concept confusion mediates the association of loneliness with depression. Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 35, 525-550.
76. Gaines, S. O., Jr., Panter, A. T., Lyde, M. D., Steers, W. N., Rusbult, C. E., Cox, C. L., & Wexler, M. O. (1997). Evaluating the circumplexity of interpersonal traits and the manifestation of interpersonal traits in interpersonal trust. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 73, 610–623.
77. Lin, Y. H. W., & Rusbult, C. E. (1995). Commitment to dating relationships and cross-sex friendship in America and China. Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 12, 7-26.

78. Rusbult, C. E., Bissonnette, V. I., Arriaga, X. B., & Cox, C. L. (1998). Accommodation processes during the early years of marriage. In T. N. Bradbury (Ed.), The developmental course of marital dysfunction (pp. 74-113). New York: Cambridge.
79. Rusbult, C. E., Van Lange, P. A. M., Wildschut, T., Yovetich, N. A., & Verette, J. (2000). Perceived superiority in close relationships: Why it exists and persists. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 79, 521–545.
80. Van Lange, P. A. M., Rusbult, C. E., Drigotas, S. M., Arriaga, X. B., Witcher, B., & Cox, C. L. (1997). Willingness to sacrifice in close relationships. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 72, 1373-1395.
81. Wilson, C. L., Rholes, W. S., Simpson, J. A., & Tran, S. (2007). Labor, delivery, and early parenthood: An attachment theory perspective. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 33, 505-518.
82. Marshall, E., Simpson, J. A., & Rholes, W. S. (2015). Personality, communication, and depressive symptoms across the transition to parenthood: A dyadic longitudinal investigation. European Journal of Personality, 29, 216-234.
83. Wilson, C. L., & Simpson, J. A. (2016). Childbirth pain, attachment orientations, and romantic partner support during labor and delivery. Personal Relationships, 23, 622-644.
84. Eller, J., Marshall, E. M., Rholes, W. S., Vieth, G., & Simpson, J. A. (2019). Partner predictors of marital aggression across the transition to parenthood: An I3 approach. Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 35, 1491-1508
85. Righetti, F., Balliet, D., Visserman, M., & Hofmann, W. (2015). Trust and the Suppression of Emotions During Sacrifice in Close Relationships. Social Cognition, 33(5), 505–519.
86. Righetti, F., Gere, J., Hofmann, W., Visserman, M. L., & Van Lange, P. A. M. (2016). The Burden of Empathy: Partners' Responses to Divergence of Interests in Daily Life. Emotion.
87. Visserman, M. L., Righetti, F., Impett, E. A., Keltner, D., & Van Lange, P. A. M. (2017). It's the Motive That Counts: Perceived Sacrifice Motives and Gratitude in Romantic Relationships. Emotion.
88. Visserman, M. L., Righetti, F., Kumashiro, M., & Van Lange, P. A. M. (2017). Me or Us? Self- Control Promotes a Healthy Balance Between Personal and Relationship Concerns. Social Psychological and Personality Science, 8(1), 55–65.
89. Righetti, F., & Visserman, M. (2017). I Gave Too Much: Low Self-Esteem and the Regret of Sacrifices. Social Psychological and Personality Science, 9(4), 453-460.
90. Visserman, M. L., Impett, E. A., Righetti, F., Muise, A., Keltner, D., & Van Lange, P. A. (2018). To "See" Is to Feel Grateful? A Quasi-Signal Detection Analysis of Romantic Partners' Sacrifices. Social Psychological and Personality Science.
91. Faure, R., Righetti, F., Seibel, M., & Hofmann, W. (2018). Speech is Silver, Nonverbal Behavior is Gold: How Implicit Partner Evaluations Affect Dyadic Interactions in Close Relationships. Psychological Science, 29(11), 1731–1741.

92. Ramsdell, E., Franz, M., & Brock, R.L. (2019). A multifaceted and dyadic examination of intimate relationship quality during pregnancy: Implications for global relationship satisfaction. Family Process.
93. Bar-Kalifa, E., Bar-Kalifa, L., Rafaeli, E., George-Levi, S., & Vilchinsky, N. (2016). Relational entitlement moderates the associations between support matching and perceived partner responsiveness. *Journal of Research in Personality*, *65*, 1-10.
94. Bar-Kalifa, E., Hen-Weissberg, A., & Rafaeli, E. (2015). Perceived partner responsiveness mediates the association between social anxiety and relationship satisfaction in committed couples. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, *34*, 587-610.
95. Bar-Kalifa, E., Pshedetzky-Shochat, R., Rafaeli, E., & Gleason, M. E. (2018). Daily support equity in romantic couples: Response Surface Analyses of monadic and dyadic data. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, *9*, 790-801.
96. Bar-Kalifa, E., & Sened, H. (2019). Using Network Analysis for Examining Interpersonal Emotion Dynamics. *Multivariate behavioral research*, 1-20.
97. Bar-Kalifa, E., & Rafaeli, E. (2015). Above and below baselines: The nonmonotonic effects of dyadic emotional support in daily life. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, *32*, 161-179.
98. Bar-Kalifa, E., Rafaeli, E., & Sened, H. (2016). Truth and bias in daily judgments of support receipt between romantic partners. *Personal Relationships, 23*, 42-61.
99. Kordahji, H., Bar-Kalifa, E., & Rafaeli, E. (2015). Attachment insecurity as a moderator of cardiovascular arousal efects following dyadic support. *Journal of Research in Personality*, *57*, 89-99.
100. Lazarus, G., Bar-Kalifa, E., & Rafaeli, E. (2018). Accurate where it counts: Empathic accuracy on conflict and no-conflict days. *Emotion*, *18*, 212.
101. Sened, H., Lazarus, G., Gleason, M. E., Rafaeli, E., & Fleeson, W. (2018). The use of intensive longitudinal methods in explanatory personality research. *European Journal of Personality*, *32*, 269-285.
102. Ogolsky, B., & Surra, C. (2014). A comparison of concurrent and retrospective trajectories of commitment to wed. Personal Relationships, 21, 620-639.
103. Ogolsky, B., Surra, C., & Monk, J. (2016). Pathways of commitment to wed: The development and dissolution of romantic relationships. Journal of Marriage and Family, 78, 293-310.
104. Wood, W. I., Oldham, C. R., Reifman, A., & Niehuis, S. (2017). Accuracy and bias in newlywed spouses' perceptions of each other's personalities. Personal Relationships, 24, 886–901.
105. Niehuis, S., Reifman, A., & Oldham, C. R. (in press). Effects of relationship transgressions on idealization of and disillusionment with one's romantic partner: A three-wave longitudinal study. Personal Relationships.
106. Rhoades, G. K., Stanley, S. M., & Markman, H. J. (2010). Should I stay or should I go? Predicting dating relationship stability from four aspects of commitment. Journal of Family Psychology, 24(5), 543-550.

107. 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.
108. Rhoades, G. K., Stanley, S. M., Kelmer, G., & Markman, H. J. (2010). Physical aggression in unmarried relationships: The roles of commitment and constraints. Journal of Family Psychology, 24, 678-687.
109. Stanley, S. M., Rhoades, G. K., Scott, S. B., Kelmer, G., Markman, H. J., & Fincham, F. D. (2017). Asymmetrically committed relationships. Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 34, 1241–1259 .
110. Stanley, S. M., Rhoades, G. K., Kelmer, G., Scott, S. B., Markman, H. J., & Fincham, F. D. (2019). Unequally into “Us”: Characteristics of individuals in asymmetrically committed relationships. Family Process, 58, 214-231.
111. Barton, A. W., Lavner, J. A., Stanley, S. M., Johnson, M. D., & Rhoades, G. K. (in press). “Will you complete this survey too?" Differences between individual versus dyadic samples in romantic relationship research. Journal of Family Psychology.
112. Impett, E. A., Muise, A., & Harasymchuk, C. (2019). Giving in the bedroom: The costs and benefits of responding to a partner’s sexual needs in daily life. Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 36 (8), 2455-2473 DOI: 0265407518787349.
113. Debrot, A., Cook, W. L., Perrez, M., & Horn, A. B. (2012). Deeds matter: Daily enacted responsiveness and intimacy in couples' daily lives. Journal of Family Psychology, 26, 617–627. doi:10.1037/a0028666
114. Debrot, A., Schoebi, D., Perrez, M., & Horn, A. (2013). Touch as an interpersonal emotion regulation process in couples' daily lives: The mediating role of psychological intimacy. Personality & Social Psychology Bulletin, 39(10), 1373–1385.
115. Debrot, A., Schoebi, D., Perrez, M., & Horn, A. (2014). Stroking Your Beloved One’s White Bear: Responsive Touch by the Romantic Partner Buffers the Negative Effect of Thought Suppression on Daily Mood. J Soc Clin Psychol, 33.
116. Horn, A. B., Samson, A. C., Debrot, A., & Perrez, M. (2019). Positive humor in couples as interpersonal emotion regulation: A dyadic study in everyday life on the mediating role of psychological intimacy. Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 36, 2376–2396. doi:10.1177/0265407518788197
117. Baker, Z. G., Derrick, J. L., Petit, W. E., & Knee, C. R. (February, 2019). Fixing insecure attachment’s harms in 10 minutes per month. Data blitz presented at the annual meeting of the Society for Personality and Social Psychology, Portland, OR.
118. Petit, W. E., Baker, Z. G., Knee, C. R., Derrick, J. L., Hadden, B. W. (July, 2018). How attachment style predicts passion in romantic relationships. In C. R. Knee (Chair), Motivation and pro-relationship behaviors. Symposium presented at the Biennial Meeting of the International Association for Relationship Research, Fort Collins, CO.
119. Derrick, J. L., Baker, Z. G., & Britton, M. (June, 2019). A longitudinal study of race/ethnicity, alcohol, and college dating violence. In C. Champion (Chair), Disentangling alcohol use and relationship aggression among romantic partners: Who, when, and why? Symposium to be presented at the annual meeting of the Research Society on Alcoholism, Minneapolis, MN.

120. Rosen, N. O., Bergeron, S., Glowacka, M., Delisle, I., & Baxter, ML. (2012). Harmful or helpful: Perceived solicitous and facilitative partner responses differentially predict pain and sexual satisfaction in women with provoked vestibulodynia. Journal of Sexual Medicine, 9, 2351-2360.
121. Rosen, N. O., Bergeron, S., Sadikaj, G., Glowacka, M., Baxter, ML., & Delisle, I. (2014). Impact of partner responses on sexual function in women with vulvodynia and their partners: A dyadic daily experience study. Health Psychology, 33, 823-831.
122. Rosen, N. O., Bergeron, S., Sadikaj, G., Glowacka, M., Baxter, ML., & Delisle, I. (2014).Relationship satisfaction moderates the associations between male partner responses and depression in women with vulvodynia: A dyadic daily experience study. Pain. 155, 1374-1383.
123. Rosen, N. O., Sadikaj, G. & Bergeron, S. (2015). Within-person variability in relationship satisfaction moderates pain estimation among couples with vulvodynia. Pain, 156, 703-710.
124. Rosen, N. O., Muise, A., Bergeron, S., Impett, E. & Boudreau, G. (2015). Approach and avoidance sexual goals in women with provoked vestibulodynia and their partners: Associations with sexual, relationship and psychological well-being. The Journal of Sexual Medicine, 12, 1781-1790.
125. Rosen, N. O., Bergeron, S., Sadikaj, G., & Delisle, I. (2015). Daily associations between male partner responses, pain during intercourse, and anxiety in women with vulvodynia and their partners. The Journal of Pain, 16, 1312-1320.
126. Anderson, A., Rosen, N. O., Price, L., & Bergeron, S. (2016). Associations between penetration cognitions and the experience of genital pain and sexual well-being in women with provoked vestibulodynia. Journal of Sexual Medicine, 13, 444-452.
127. Vannier, S., Rosen, N. O., MacKinnon, S., & Bergeron, S. (2016). Maintaining affection despite pain: Daily associations between physical affection and sexual and relationship well-being in women with genito-pelvic pain. Archives of Sexual Behavior.
128. Rosen, N. O., Dewitte, M., Merwin, K., & Bergeron, S. (2016). Interpersonal goals and wellbeing in couples coping with provoked vestibulodynia. Archives of Sexual Behavior.
129. Rosen, N. O., Santos-Iglesias, P., & Byers, S. (2016). Understanding the sexual satisfaction of women with provoked vestibulodynia and their partners: Comparison with matched controls.Journal of Sex & Marital Therapy.
130. Muise, A., Bergeron, S., Impett, E. A., & Rosen, N. O. (2017). The costs and benefits of sexual communal motivation for couples coping with vulvodynia. Health Psychology, 36, 819-827.
131. Dubé, J., Bergeron, S., Muise, A., Impett, E. A., & Rosen, N. O. (2017). A Comparison of Approach and Avoidance Sexual Goals in Couples with Provoked Vestibulodynia and Community Controls. The Journal of Sexual Medicine.
132. Glowacka, M., Bergeron, S., Dubé, J., & Rosen, N. O. (2018). When self-worth is tied to the sexual and romantic relationship: Associations with well-being in couples coping with vulvodynia. Archives of Sexual Behavior, 47, 1649-1661.

133. Muise, A., Bergeron, S. Impett, E. A., Delisle, I., & Rosen, N. O. (2018). Sexual motivation, sexual distress, and general distress, and women's pain in couples coping with vulvodynia. Journal of Psychosomatic Research, 106, 34-40
134. Rosen, N. O., Muise, A., Impett, E. A., Delisle, I., Baxter, M.L., & Bergeron, S. (2018). Sexual cues mediate the daily relations between interpersonal goals, pain, and wellbeing in couples coping with vulvodynia. Annals of Behavioral Medicine.
135. Pâquet, M., Rosen, N. O., Steben, M., Mayrand, M.H., Santerre-Baillargeon, M., & Bergeron, S. (2018). How do you feel? Daily anxiety and depressive symptoms are associated with pain, sexual function and sexual distress among couples coping with vulvodynia. The Journal of Pain.
136. Glowacka, M., Bergeron, S., Delisle, I., & Rosen, N. O. (2018). Sexual distress mediates the associations between sexual contingent self-worth and well-being in couples coping with genito-pelvic pain: A daily experience study. The Journal of Sex Research.
137. Kim, J., Muise, A., & Impett, E. A. (2018). The relationship implications of rejecting a partner for sex kindly versus having sex reluctantly. Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 35(4), 485-508.
138. Saxbe, D.E., Horton, K., & Tsai, B.A., (2018). The Birth Experiences Questionnaire: A brief measure assessing psychosocial dimensions of childbirth. Journal of Family Psychology, 32 (2), 262-268
139. Hsueh, JoAnn, and Knox, Virginia. Supporting Healthy Marriage Evaluation: Eight Sites within the United States, 2003-2013. Ann Arbor, MI: Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [distributor], 2014-12-19.
140. Kahn, Nicole F., Halpern, Carolyn T. Associations between patterns of sexual initiation, sexual partnering, and sexual health outcomes from adolescence to early adulthood. Archives of Sexual Behavior.
141. Merrilees, Christine E., Geneseo, Suny, McCormick, Meghan P., Hsueh, JoAnn, Chou, Patricia, Cummings, E. Mark Interparental interactions and adolescent mood: A daily diary approach. Journal of Child and Family Studies.
142. Moulton, S.R., Peck, L.R., Greeney, A. Analyzing the influence of dosage in social experiments with application to the Supporting Healthy Marriage Program. American Journal of Evaluation. 39, (2), 257-277.
143. Ramos-Olazagasti, Maria A., Guzman, Lina Hispanic Couples in the Supporting Healthy Marriage Evaluation: How Representative Are They of Low-Income Hispanic Couples in the United States?. National Research Center on Hispanic Children and Families.
144. Shamblen, Stephen R., Gluck, Andrew, Wubbenhorst, William, Collins, David A. The economic benefits of marriage and family strengthening programs. Journal of Family and Economic Issues. 39, (3), 386-404.
145. McCormick, Meghan P., Hsueh, JoAnn, Merrilees, Christine, Chou, Patricia, Mark Cummings, E. Moods, stressors, and severity of marital conflict: A daily diary study of low-income families. Family Relations. 66, (3), 425-440.

146. Lavner, Justin A., Karney, Benjamin R., Bradbury, Thomas N. Does couples' communication predict marital satisfaction, or does marital satisfaction predict communication?. Journal of Marriage and Family. 78, (3), 680-694.
147. McKay, Tasseli, Cohen, Julia, Kan, Marni, Bir, Anupa, Grove, Lexie, Cutbush, Stacey Prevalence and Experiences: Intimate Partner Violence Prevalence and Experiences among Healthy Relationship Program Participants. RIViR Paper #1. OPRE Report 2016-40, Washington, DC: United States Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation.
148. Williamson, Hannah C., Altman, Noemi, Hsueh, JoAnn, Bradbury, Thomas N. Effects of relationship education on couple communication and satisfaction: A randomized controlled trial with low-income couples. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology. 84, (2), 156-166.
149. Gubits, Daniel, Lowenstein, Amy E., Harris, Jorgen, Hsueh, JoAnn Do the Effects of a Relationship Education Program Vary for Different Types of Couples? Exploratory Subgroup Analysis in the Supporting Healthy Marriage Evaluation. OPRE Report 2014-22. New York, NY: MDRC.
150. Lundquist, Erica: JoAnn, Hsueh, Lowenstein, Amy E., Faucetta, Kristen, Gubits, Daniel, Michalopoulos, Charles, Knox, Virginia A family-strengthening program for low-income families: Final impacts from the Supporting Healthy Marriage Evaluation. OPRE Report 2014-09A . Washington, DC: Administration for Children and Families, Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation.
151. Hsueh, JoAnn, Alderson, Desiree Principe, Lundquist, Erika, Michalopoulos, Charles, Gubits, Daniel, Fein, David, Knox, Virginia The Supporting Healthy Marriage Evaluation: Early Impacts on Low-Income Families. OPRE Report 2012-11. Washington, DC: Administration for Children and Families, Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation.
152. Miller Gaubert, Jennifer, Gubits, Daniel, Principe Alderson, Desiree, Knox, Virginia The Supporting Healthy Marriage Evaluation: Final Implementation Findings. OPRE Report 2012-12. Washington, DC: United States Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation.
153. Gaubert, Jennifer Miller, Knox, Virginia, Alderson, Desiree Principe, Dalton, Christopher, Fletcher, Kate, McCormick, Meghan, MDRC Early Lessons from the Implementation of a Relationship and Marriage Skills Program for Low-Income Married Couples. New York, NY: Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation (MDRC); Administration for Children and Families, Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation.
154. Knox, Virginia, Fein, David Supporting healthy marriage: Designing a marriage education demonstration and evaluation for low-income married couples. Marriage and Family: Perspectives and Complexities. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.
155. Dion, M.R. Healthy marriage programs: Learning what works. The Future of Children. 15, (2), 139-156.

156. Finkel, E. J., Campbell, K. W., Buffardi, L. E., Kumashiro, M., & Rusbult, C. E. (2009). The metamorphosis of Narcissus: Communal activation promotes relationship commitment among narcissists. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 35, 1271-1284.
157. Kumashiro, M., Rusbult, C. E., Finkenauer, C, & Stocker, S. (2007). To think or to do: Assessment orientation, locomotion orientation, and the Michelangelo Phenomenon. Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 24, 591-611.
158. Kumashiro, M., Rusbult, C. E., & Finkel, E. J. (2008). Navigating personal and relational concerns: The quest for equilibrium. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 95, 94-110.
159. Rusbult, C. E., Kumashiro, M., Kubacka, K. K., & Finkel, E. J. (2009). The part of me that you bring out: Ideal similarity and the Michelangelo Phenomenon. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 96, 61-82.
160. Righetti, F., Rusbult, C. E., & Finkenauer, C. (2010). Regulatory focus and the Michelangelo phenomenon: How close partners promote one another's ideal selves. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 46, 972-985.
161. Schneider, I. K., Konijn, E. A. Righetti, F., & Rusbult, C. E. (2011). A healthy dose of trust: The relationship between interpersonal trust and health. Personal Relationships, 18, 668-676.
162. Arriaga, X. B., Kumashiro, M., Finkel, E. J., VanderDrift, L. E., & Luchies, L. B. (2014). Filling the void: Bolstering attachment security in committed relationships. Social Psychological and Personality Science, 5, 398-406.
163. Righetti, F., Kumashiro, M., & Campbell, S. B (2014). Goal difficulty and openness to interpersonal goal support. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 40, 1107-1118.
164. Weinstein, N., Legate, N., Kumashiro, M., & Ryan, R. M. (2016). Autonomy support and diastolic blood pressure: Long term effects and conflict navigation in romantic relationships. Motivation and Emotion, 40, 212-225.
165. Richman, S. B., Pond Jr, R. S., Dewall, C. N., Kumashiro, M., Slotter, E. B., & Luchies, L. B. (2016). An unclear self leads to poor mental health: Self-concept confusion mediates the association of loneliness with depression. Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 35, 525-550.
166. Weinstein, N., Rodrigues, L. M., Knee, C. R., & Kumashiro, M. (2016). Self-determined self-other overlap: Interacting effects on partners' perceptions of support and well-being in close relationships. Journal of Research in Personality, 65, 130-139.
167. Carswell, K. L., Finkel, E. J., & Kumashiro, M. (2019). Creativity and romantic passion. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology.
168. Kumashiro, M., Finkel, E. J., & Rusbult, C. E. (2002). Self-respect and pro-relationship behavior in marital relationships. Journal of Personality, 70, 1009-1049.
169. Sedikides, C., Rudich, E. A., Gregg, A. P., Kumashiro, M., & Rusbult, C. (2004). Are normal narcissists psychologically healthy?: Self-esteem matters. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 87, 400-416.
170. Neiss, M. B., Stevenson. J., Sedikides, C., Kumashiro, M., Finkel, E. J., & Caryl E. Rusbult, C. E. (2005). Executive self, self-esteem, and negative affectivity: Relations at

the phenotypic and genotypic level. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 89, 593-606.
171. Molden, D. C., Lucas, G., Finkel, E. J., Kumashiro, M., & Rusbult, C. E. (2009). Perceived support for promotion-focused and prevention-focused goals: Associations with well-being in unmarried and married couples. Psychological Science, 20, 787-793.
172. Hannon, P. A., Finkel, E. J., Kumashiro, M., & Rusbult, C. E. (2012). The soothing effects of forgiveness on victims' and perpetrators' blood pressure. Personal Relationships, 19, 279-289.
173. Hannon, P., Rusbult, C. E., Finkel, E. J., & Kumashiro, M. (2010). In the wake of betrayal: Amends, forgiveness, and the resolution of betrayal. Personal Relationships, 17, 253-278.
174. Coy, A. E., Davis, J. L., Green, J. D., & Etcheverry, P. E. (in press). A dyadic model of investments: Partner effects on commitment. Journal of Social and Personal Relationships.
175. Maxwell, J. A., Muise, A., MacDonald, G., Day, L. C., Rosen, N. O. & Impett, E. A. (2017) How implicit theories of sexuality shape sexual and relationship well-Being. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 112, 238-279.
176. Poyner-Del Vento, P. W., & Cobb, R. J. (2011). The association between depressive symptoms and marital satisfaction and the moderating role of chronic stress. Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 30, 905-936.
177. Logan, J., & Cobb, R. J. (2016). Benefits of capitalization in newlyweds: Predicting marital satisfaction and depression symptoms. Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 35, 87-106.
178. Cobb, R. J., & Sullivan, K. (2015). Relationship education and marital satisfaction in newlywed couples: A propensity score analysis. Journal of Family Psychology, 29, 667-678.
179. Burrus, K. J., & Cobb, R. J. (2011). Spouses' perceptions of aggression and associations with relationship satisfaction. Partner Abuse, 2, 189-207.
180. Gordon, A. M., Tuskeviciute, R., & Chen, S. (2013). A multi-method investigation of depressive symptoms, perceived understanding, and relationship quality. Personal Relationships, 20, 635-654.
181. Gordon, A. M. & Chen, S. (2013). Does power help or hurt? The moderating role of self-other focus on power and perspective taking in romantic relationships. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 39, 1097-1110.
182. Gordon, A. M. & Chen, S. (2014). The role of sleep in interpersonal conflict: Do sleepless nights mean worse fights? Social Psychological and Personality Science, 5, 168-175.
183. Gordon, A. M. & Chen, S. (2016). Do you get where I'm coming from?: Perceived understanding buffers against reduced relationship satisfaction after conflict. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 110, 239-26.