

Supplemental

Although our key focus and contribution was on the daily associations (i.e., within-person differences), we also explored the role of between-person differences in two ways: 1) as an aggregate of daily measures of approach relationship goals and 2) with a background version of approach relationship goals. To test the first way, the analyses were guided by the Actor Partner Interdependence Model (APIM) to account for the dyadic nature of the data (Kenny et al., 2006). We tested a two-level cross model with random intercepts in which persons are nested within dyads, and person and days are crossed to account for the fact that both partners completed the daily surveys on the same days (Kenny et al., 2006). We used techniques to partition all the level-1 predictors (i.e., daily goals) into their within- and between-variance components, which were person-mean centered and aggregated respectively (Raudenbush, Bryk, Cheong, & Congdon, 2004; Zhang, Zyphur & Preacher, 2009). Thus, our results represent within-person differences such that coefficients for the daily analyses represent changes in the dependent variable for every one-unit deviation from the person's own mean. Additionally, we assessed between-person differences for daily relationship goals (approach and avoidance) by creating aggregates for each type of goal across the 21 days (see Table 1 for results). Actor and partner within- and between-person effects were entered simultaneously. For analyses with a dichotomous outcome (i.e., engaging in a self-expanding activity with the partner or not), we used the GENLINMIXED models in SPSS 20.0.

Table 1
Daily Approach and Avoidance Goals Predicting Daily Outcomes

	Occurrence of Exciting activity (logistic)	Daily Self- expansion	Daily Relationship Satisfaction
Actor Effects (within-person)			
Approach	1.52***	.28***	.19***
Avoidance	.91**	-.02	-.03**
Actor Effects (between-person)			
Approach	1.47***	.63***	.44***
Avoidance	.86*	-.24***	-.23***
Partner Effects (within-person)			
Approach	1.31***	.13***	.10***
Avoidance	1.02	-.01	-.02 $p = .10$
Partner Effects (between-person)			
Approach	1.28**	.22**	.21***
Avoidance	.91	-.07	-.09**

Note. All predictors (i.e., within- and between-person daily relationship goals) were included in the same model. Daily predictors (within-person) are person-mean centered. Between-person predictors represent the mean of daily level goals across the 21 days. For the logistic regression coefficients (i.e., exciting activities), values below 1 signify a negative relation; values above 1 signify a positive relation.

To assess the second way to address between-person differences in approach relationship goals, we used the background measure of approach and avoidance relationship goals (at the intake survey). The analyses were also guided by the Actor Partner Interdependence Model (APIM) to account for the dyadic nature of the data (Kenny et al., 2006).

Table 2**Background Approach and Avoidance Goals Predicting Daily Outcomes**

	Occurrence of Exciting Activity Logistic regression	Daily Self- Expansion (6-item measure)	Daily Relationship Satisfaction
Predictors Background			
Actor Approach	1.19*	.27**	.43***
Partner Approach	1.14t	.24**	.15**
Actor Avoidance	1.00	-.07	-.10**
Partner Avoidance	1.07	.004	-.07*

Note. All Background level predictors (i.e., actor and partner daily relationship goals for approach and avoidance) were included in the same APIM model. For the logistic regression coefficients (i.e., exciting activities), values below 1 signify a negative relation; values above 1 signify a positive relation.

Across both methods of assessing between-person differences in relationship goals, the between-person effects largely mirror the within-person findings.