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**1. Further Information on Study Sample**

Dyadic longitudinal studies are time and resource intensive, which have two important implications. First, sample sizes are necessarily constrained by funding and participant attrition, although the studies here were designed or combined to overcome this limitation in prior research. Second, these studies are designed to examine multiple, independent processes. As outlined below, the aims, results and analyses presented in the current paper are independent of any reported in prior publications.

* 1. **Consideration of Power**

Our samples are larger than most prior studies using similar methods, and provide ample power to detect small actor and partner effects as intended (Ackerman, Ledermann, & Kenny, 2016). However, the original aims of the study when funded did not specifically target actor X partner interactions. We did not conduct a priori power analyses for our investigation of actors’ negative-direct behavior X partners’ withdrawal. As outlined in the Introduction, prior research assessing similar dyadic patterns does not specify actor X partner interactions and has not examined the key outcome of perceived responsiveness. Thus, prior research provided no basis to specify effect sizes of the main or interaction effects. Moreover, in the growth curve analyses in Study 1, power analyses would require specifying random effects, which we had no basis for. Finally, applying the effect sizes from Study 1 to the daily analyses in Study 2 would not be sensible given the different measurement, context and analytic strategies across and within studies. As outlined in the limitations section of the paper, we recognize the possibility that some effects may not have emerged due to limited power and base our conclusions on the pattern of effects across studies.

* 1. **Sample Size and Composition in Study 1**

Study 1 was designed to redress the small samples typical of dyadic behavioral observation and longitudinal studies by gathering a large sample of 180 heterosexual couples. Nineteen couples did not provide longitudinal data (see 1.3 below). The resulting sample of 161 couples for the longitudinal analyses is considerably larger than most prior longitudinal behavioral observation studies, especially considering we modeled data from 322 discussions. To illustrate, the table below displays the *N* of prior studies examining longitudinal effects of demand/withdraw patterns (as reviewed in the introduction). Apart from the work by Kurdek (1995) and Donato et al., (2014) who examined self-reports, and Ross et al. (2019) who examined single composite behavioral assessments for each participant, the majority involved small sample sizes.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Longitudinal Studies** | **N couples** |
| *Behavioral Observation Longitudinal Studies* |  |
| Caughlin, J. P. (2002). The demand/withdraw pattern of communication as a predictor of marital satisfaction over time: Unresolved issues and future directions. *Human Communication Research*, *28*, 49–85 | 46 |
| Gottman, J. M., & Levenson, R. W. (2000). The timing of divorce: Predicting when a couple will divorce over a 14-year period. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, *62*, 737–745. | 22 |
| Heavey, C.L., Christensen, A., & Malamuth, N.M. (1995). The longitudinal impact of demand and withdrawal during marital conflict. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 63,* 797-801. | 38 |
| Heavey, C.L., Layne, C., & Christensen, A. (1993). Gender and conflict structure in marital interaction: A replication and extension. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 61*, 16-27. | 21 |
| Noller, P., Feeney, J. A., Bonnell, D., & Callan, V. (1994). A longitudinal study of conflict in early marriage. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, *11*, 233–252. | 33 |
| Ross, J. M., Karney, B. R., Nguyen, T. P., & Bradbury, T. N. (2019). Communication that is maladaptive for middle-class couples is adaptive for socioeconomically disadvantaged couples. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *116*, 582-597. | 515 for Study 1, 414 for Study 2 |
| *Self-report Longitudinal Studies* |  |
| Caughlin, J. P. (2002). The demand/withdraw pattern of communication as a predictor of marital satisfaction over time: Unresolved issues and future directions. *Human Communication Research*, *28*, 49–85 | 46 |
| Donato, S., Parise, M., Pagani, A. F., Bertoni, A., & Iafrate, R. (2014). Demand-withdraw, couple satisfaction and relationship duration. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *140*, 200–206. | 176 |
| Kurdek, L. A. (1995). Predicting change in marital satisfaction from husbands’ and wives’ conflict resolution styles. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, *57*, 153–164. | 155 |
| Noller, P., Feeney, J. A., Bonnell, D., & Callan, V. (1994). A longitudinal study of conflict in early marriage. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, *11*, 233–252. | 33 |

**1.3 Prior Use of Sample in Study 1**

The original sample of 180 couples in Study 1 has been used previously to examine behavioral and emotional dynamics within couples’ conflict discussions (Lemay, Overall & Clark, 2012; Jayamaha, Antonellis & Overall, 2016; Overall, 2018; Overall, 2020; Overall, Girme, Lemay & Hammond, 2014; Overall, Simpson & Struthers, 2013). The longitudinal data has also been used to examine the effects of negative-direct behavior on *partners’* perceived commitment across time (Overall, 2018) and how the variability of *partners’* negative-direct behavior affects the severity of relationship problems and relationship satisfaction (Overall, 2020). However, the longitudinal data presented here assessing the main and interaction effects of *actors’* negative-direct behavior and *partners’* withdrawal on *actors’* perceived partner responsiveness and relationship satisfaction across time have not been examined previously. The questions, measures, analyses and results presented in this paper are completely novel and independent of the prior papers.

**1.4 Differences in the Initial versus Longitudinal Sample in Study 1**

Of the original sample of 180 couples in Study 1, 19 couples did not provide any longitudinal data. Couples who did not provide any longitudinal data were younger (*M* = 21.84 versus 23.21 years of age, *t* = -1.92, *p* = .056) and less likely to be in married or cohabiting relationships (*t* = -2.19, *p* = .029), but they did not differ from couples who provided longitudinal data on perceived partner responsiveness (*t* = -1.30, *p* = .201), relationship satisfaction (*t* = -1.37, *p* = .178), or any of the observed communication variables (*ts* ranged from -.28 to .22, *ps* > .780).

**1.5 Prior Use of Samples in Study 2**

Prior papers using the data from Sample 1 have focused on examining the degree to which individual factors entering the study, such as attachment insecurity and sexist attitudes, predict daily emotional and behavioral dynamics, including the daily negative-direct behavior reported in the current study (Cross, Overall, Low & McNulty, 2019; Hammond & Overall, 2013; Overall et al., 2014, 2015, 2016, 2020). One prior study has examined the longitudinal data to test the degree to which attachment anxiety and daily *partner* guilt predict relationship satisfaction across time (Overall et al., 2014; Study 1), and another study has examined the extent to which the variability of *partners’* negative-direct behavior predict problem severity and relationship satisfaction across time (Overall, 2020). None of these prior studies have examined the degree to which actors’ negative-direct behavior and partners’ withdrawal are associated with perceived partner responsiveness and relationship satisfaction within daily life or across time. Thus, all of the data and results presented in this paper are completely novel and independent of these prior papers.

 Sample 2 was specifically designed to replicate the design and procedure of Sample 1. As in Sample 1, prior papers using the data from Sample 2 have focused on examining the degree to which individual factors entering the study, such as attachment insecurity and sexist attitudes, predict daily emotional and behavioral dynamics (Cross, Overall, Hammond & Fletcher, 2017; Girme, Overall, Simpson & Fletcher, 2015; Overall et al., 2015). One study has examined the extent to which the variability of *partners’* negative-direct behavior predicts problem severity and relationship satisfaction across time (Overall, 2020). None of these prior studies have examined the degree to which actors’ negative-direct behavior and partners’ withdrawal are associated with perceived partner responsiveness and relationship satisfaction within daily life or across time. Thus, the aims and the results of the current daily and longitudinal analyses are completely separate and offer unique advances beyond any prior studies.

**1.6 Differences in the Initial versus Longitudinal Sample in Study 2**

Of the original sample of 151 couples in Study 2, 44 couples did not provide any longitudinal data. Couples who did not provide any longitudinal data did not differ from couples who provided longitudinal data on their age (*M* = 21.74 versus 23.53 years of age, *t* = -1.76, *p* = .081) or relationship status (*t* = -1.34, *p* = .182). However, couples who did not provide any longitudinal data were less likely to perceive their partner as responsive (*t* = -3.57, *p* = .001) and reported poorer relationship satisfaction (*t* = -3.47, *p* = .001) at the initial session, and were on average more likely to engage in negative-direct behavior (*t* = 2.88, *p* = .005) and had partners who were more likely to exhibit withdrawal (*t* = 4.75, *p* < .001) across the 21-day diary period.

**1.7 Descriptive Statistics for Each Sample in Study 2**

 The descriptive statistics for each sample in Study 2 are presented in Table SM 1.

Table SM 1. Descriptive Statistics of all Measures in Study 2

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Measures** | **Sample 1** | **Sample 2** |
|  | ***Initial Session***  | ***9-month*** | ***Initial Session***  | ***9-month*** |
|  | *Mean* | *(SD)* | *Mean* | *(SD)* | *Mean* | *(SD)* | *Mean* | *(SD)* |
| *Questionnaire-Measures* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Perceived Partner Responsiveness | 6.08 | (0.77) | 6.05 | (0.80) | 6.19 | (0.61) | 6.21 | (0.73) |
| Relationship Satisfaction | 6.11 | (0.69) | 5.92 | (1.09) | 6.21 | (0.60) | 6.22 | (0.65) |
| *Daily Measures*  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Perceived Partner Responsiveness | 5.91 | (1.33) |  |  | 6.24 | (1.07) |  |  |
| Relationship Satisfaction | 5.88 | (1.47) |  |  | 5.89 | (1.29) |  |  |
| Actor Negative-Direct behavior | 2.00 | (1.34) |  |  | 1.52 | (1.05) |  |  |
| Partner Withdrawal | 2.15 | (1.43) |  |  | 1.82 | (1.30) |  |  |

*Note.* Questionnaire and daily measures represent averages across items on 1-7 likert-type scales. Daily measures represent averages of daily assessments across the 21-day diary period. Thus, the highest scores in represent consistently high levels of each type of behavior across days.

**2 Further Information on Study 1 Method**

**2.1 Additional Procedural Information**

The procedures and instructions are similar to those used in hundreds of observational studies that generate conflict behavior that is (a) similar to that observed within the home, (b) rated as realistic and typical by participants, (c) relatively stable across time, (d) associated with key relationship and personal outcomes over time, and (e) related to core social and personality constructs in theoretically relevant ways (Gottman, 1998; Heyman, 2001; Karney & Bradbury, 1995b). An important component of the current procedure is that couples were video-recording having two discussions about relationship problems that involved one partner (the agent) wanting change in the other (the target). This procedural element is necessary for the current research questions to examine partners’ withdrawal when individuals engaged in critical and blaming behavior, but also recommended in order to overcome ambiguities in effects when only one discussion of an agreed-upon problem is assessed and the role of the partner desiring change (the agent) and the partner who is responding to desired change (the target) is unclear (Heyman & Hunt, 2007; Klinetob & Smith, 1996).

To ensure that discussed problems were characterized by one partner wanting change (agent) in the other who was responding to change attempts (target), the most important ranked problem identified by the male and female were selected for discussion. The only exception to that rule occurred if the targeted partner also listed the same issue as a problem that they also desired partner change. This exception occurred very rarely (4.65%) which illustrates that couples can easily identify serious problems that involve one partner wanting the other to change their thoughts, feelings and behavior in relation to a personally important issue. In those rare cases where both partners identified the same or similar feature, the next highest ranked issue that was not identified by the targeted partner as something he or she also desired to change was selected for discussion.

Prior research has also shown that this procedure reliably differentiates topics in which agents report more desired change than targets (Overall, Fletcher, Simpson & Sibley, 2009). Independent researchers have also evaluated that this procedure identifies “particularly severe problems” (McNulty & Russell, 2010, p. 589), which is consistent with relatively high average ratings of topic severity in this study (*M* = 5.44 out of 7) and in prior studies using this procedure (Overall et al., 2009). Finally, as shown by the descriptive information that follows (see section 2.2), the problems identified reflecting ongoing issues that couples had already discussed, and were consistent with issues that prior research has established as common relationship problems.

**2.2 Descriptive Information Regarding Problems Discussed**

The problems discussed were also representative of common issues couples confront. In particular, categorization of relationship problems by two independent coders (98% agreement) revealed that over half of the problems (56.5%) involved key interpersonal elements of relationships, including issues of commitment, trust, and intimacy (16%), being understanding and equitable (16%), reactions to stress or conflict (17.5%), and managing the balance between dependence and autonomy (7%). Individual attributes that caused problems were also commonly targeted, including mood, self-esteem, and confidence (15%), bad habits and health behaviors (11%), and motivation and finances (7.5%). Less common issues involved family (3%), religion (1%), and other idiosyncratic difficulties (6%). These issues are representative of the problems couples commonly face (Whisman, Dixon, & Johnson, 1997), as well as measures assessing common relationship problems (e.g., Martial Problem Inventory; Geiss & O’Leary, 1981) and serious problems discussed (Overall et al., 2009) in prior research examining the longitudinal effects of actors’ negative-direct communication behavior.

Finally, the problems discussed reflected ongoing issues that couples had already discussed, and couples’ discussions were rated as typical of the way couples normally discussed these similar issues. Prior to couples’ video-recorded discussions, participants rated the degree to which they had discussed the problem with their partner prior to the research session (1 = *not discussed at all*, 7 = *discussed a great deal*). Average ratings by agents (*M* = 5.45, *SD* = 1.46) and targets (*M* = 5.49, *SD* = 1.59) indicated that these issues were not new to couples. After couples’ discussions, participants also rated the degree to which the discussion was realistic and reflected how they normally discussed this kind of issue (1 = *not at all realistic*, 7 = *extremely realistic*). Average ratings by agents (*M* = 5.40, *SD* = 1.44) and targets (*M* = 5.43, *SD* = 1.46) suggested couples’ discussion were realistic and typical of the way they discussed relationship problems.

**3. Behavioral Observation Coding Procedure and Descriptions**

**3.1 Foundation of Observational Coding Scheme**

The categories of communication coded were developed from the coding scheme by Overall et al. (2009). Overall et al. (2009) identified communication behaviors that were consistent across the most commonly-used coding schemes according to Heyman’s (2001) review of the reliability and validity of coding systems used in 178 observational studies of couple conflict. These included: the Martial Interaction Coding Scheme (MICS) and revised versions (see Heyman, 2004); the Specific Affect Coding System (SPAFF; see Shapiro & Gottman, 2004), the Couples Interaction Scoring System (CISS) and Rapid Couples Interaction Scoring System (RCISS; see Julien, Markman & Lindahl, 1989; Krokoff, Gottman & Hass, 1989); the Kategoriensystem fur Partnerschaftliche Interaktion (KPI) and Rapid KPI (RKPI; see Hahlweg, 2004), the Conflict Rating System (CRS) and Rapid CRS (RCRS; see Christensen & Heavey, 1990, Heavey et al., 1993, 1995); the Verbal Tactics Coding Scheme (VTCS; Sillars, Coletti, Parry & Rogers, 1982); and the Interactional Dimensions Coding Scheme (IDCS; Julien, Markman, & Lindahl, 1989). Also see Weiss and Heyman (2004) for a summary of codes consistent across studies using these coding schedules. These communication codes were supplemented by incorporating responses to relationship conflict and influence tactics that have been empirically identified within the relationship context (see Overall et al., 2009). This included the influential typology developed by Rusbult and colleagues (see Rusbult, Verette, Whitney, Slovik & Lipkus, 1991) which distinguishes similar types of behaviors. Both negative-direct behavior behavior and withdrawal are central to all of the coding schemes and typologies listed above, and the coding descriptions for both were based on communication behaviors consistent across these schemes.

**3.2 Communication Descriptions Provided to Coders**

**NEGATIVE-DIRECT BEHAVIOR CODING DESCRIPTION**

Negative-direct behavior behaviors are *active and aggressive*, including derogating and blaming the partner, demanding change, using threats, and invalidating the partner’s point of view. Behaviors that fit into this category include:

* using threats, criticism, insults, expressions of anger and irritation, blaming and ridiculing or putting the partner down
* insisting, demanding or commanding the partner changes
* invalidating the partner using sarcasm, being patronizing or condescending, and rejecting or denying the validity of their partners’ arguments
* being domineering (e.g., controlling the discussion, interrupting), rigid and taking a non-negotiable stance.

In sum, ratings of this category represent the degree to which the individual displayed *active and direct aggressive behavior* (e.g., getting frustrated, defensive and/or angry with partner, using condescending words or tone, blaming/criticizing the partner, dismissing/rejecting the partner, verbal aggression).

**WITHDRAWAL CODING DESCRIPTION**

Withdrawal behaviors are *passive and dismissing*, including avoiding discussing the problem, ignoring or refusing to acknowledge the problem, dismissing the importance of the issue or the partner’s concerns, disengaging from the partner and withdrawing from the discussion. Behaviors that fit into this category include:

* avoiding discussing the problem by hesitating, changing topics, diverting attention, or delaying the discussion
* ignoring or refusing to acknowledge the problem or dismissing its importance or necessity for change
* communicating little concern about the problem or the partner’s desires for change, point of view, concerns or hurt feelings
* disengaging from the partner (e.g., no, reduced or glazed eye contact, physical distancing, closing off) and withdrawing from the discussion (e.g., becomes silent)

In sum, ratings of this category represent the degree to which the individual displayed *passive dismissal behaviors* (e.g., avoiding discussing the problem, refusing to acknowledge the issue and dismissing its importance, disengaging from the partner and withdrawing from the conversation).

**3.3 Coding Training and Procedure**

Coders were extensively trained on identifying and distinguishing the behavioral categories above. Training typically involved over 20 hours of reviewing and applying the descriptions to recordings of couples’ conflict discussions. The summary descriptions above were supplemented with verbal descriptions and clarifications and a series of example discussions from prior samples that demonstrated low, medium and high levels of each distinct category. After training, coder drift was minimized via regular meetings across the coding team to provide discussion and reflection regarding areas of uncertainty, and clarify discrepancies across coders. See Sillars and Overall (2016) for more information regarding the coding approach and procedures applied to enhance reliability and validity.

Coders were blind to all research aims and hypotheses and blind to all other participant data. Coders independently rated each behavioral category taking into consideration the variety of behaviors falling within each category. Each couple member was rated on 7-pt scales according to the extent to which he or she exhibited any of the behaviors within each category (1 = *low*, 7 = *high*). Coding was conducted separately for each partner. Thus, each interaction was viewed once to code the female partner, and then a second time to code the male partner. In half the couples, female partners were coded first, and in half the couples, males were coded first. Coders watched the entire interaction in 30-second blocks, taking into account the frequency, intensity and duration of behaviors associated with each communication category within each 30-second segment of the interaction. At each 30-second interval, coders stopped the recording and provided a rating for each of the behavioral categories for the segment just reviewed.

**4. Dyadic Growth Curve Analyses in Study 1**

**4.1 Overview of Growth Curve Analysis for Assessing Longitudinal Change**

Growth curve analysis is the analytic technique required to assess longitudinal change in relationships by using the repeated assessments of relationship evaluations to assess the trajectory of measured evaluations across time (see Karney & Bradbury, 1995a). As outlined in the paper, growth curve analyses involve two steps. The first step is to specify the trajectory of change by regressing the multiple ratings of the dependent variable, in this case actors’ perceived partner responsiveness and relationship satisfaction, as a function of an intercept and a slope representing time point across the year. Time was coded 0 at the initial session through to 4 for the final 12-month follow-up. This procedure means that the intercept represents initial levels of actors’ perceived partner responsiveness and relationship satisfaction and the slope of time represents whether actors’ perceived partner responsiveness and relationship satisfaction increased, decreased, or remained stable across the year.

The second step of growth curve analysis involves assessing whether independent variables, in this case actors’ and their partners’ communication, predict the trajectory of change across time. The main effects of each independent variable assess whether that variable significantly predicts the intercept or initial levels of actors’ perceived partner responsiveness and relationship satisfaction. The effects of each independent variable on the slope of time (an interaction between the independent variable and time) tests whether the independent variable significantly predicts change in actors’ perceived partner responsiveness and relationship satisfaction across time.

Further details for conducting growth curve analyses, and in particular dyadic growth curve analyses, are provided in accessible articles and books (e.g., Karney & Bradbury, 1995a; Kenny, Kashy & Cook, 2006). We provide the specific SPSS syntax used in the current analyses below with additional annotation to aid readers’ understanding and interpretation.

**4.2 SPSS Syntax of Primary Analyses**

 We used SPSS 22 to estimate the model, but any other multilevel modeling program (e.g., SAS or HLM) could be used. Each record is for each longitudinal assessment provided by each participant. The syntax follows that provided by Kenny et al. (2006). Upper case words in bold are required SPSS syntax, and the remaining represent variables and specifications that need to be selected.

**MIXED** PPR **WITH** woman man gender time AG\_NDirect pTG\_Withdraw

 **/FIXED=** gender time AG\_NDirect AG\_NDirect\*time pTG\_Withdraw pTG\_Withdraw\*time AG\_NDirect\*pTG\_Withdraw AG\_NDirect\*pTG\_Withdraw\*time

 **/RANDOM=** woman man woman\*time man\*time **| SUBJECT**(dyadid) **COVTYPE**(UN)

 **/REPEATED=**obs **| SUBJECT**(dyadid\*time) **COVTYPE**(CSH).

This syntax specifies analyses for examining the couple as the unit of analysis or subject (DyadID). The model estimates the equations pooled across men and women, but distinguishes couple members by specifying that each unit is made up of two sets of observations (the REPEATED statement *obs* variable distinguishes the couple members) that is also crossed with repeated measures of time (*dyadid\*time*). This REPEATED statement treats each individual score as repeated measures in the dyad, which accounts for within-couple dependence of observations and accounts for non-independence by modeling a heterogenous compound symmetry error structure (CSH). The effect of gender is also included in the FIXED line as gender in the case of heterosexual couples distinguishes across couple members. Additional analyses including all interaction effects with gender revealed no gender differences in the longitudinal effects of actors’ negative-direct behavior and partners’ withdrawal interaction (see Section 6.1).

The MIXED line specifies the structure of the multilevel model. PerResp represents actors’ perceived partner responsiveness at each time point and is the dependent variable. All of the remaining variables on the first line (following WITH) are those included in the model to specify the fixed effects of predictors and the modelling of the random effects. AG is agent, TG is target, NDirect is negative-direct, Withdraw is withdrawal. Variables starting with *p* (i.e., *pTG\_Withdraw*) represent the values of individuals’ partners and thus partner effects. Variables that do not start with *p* (i.e., *AG\_NDirect*) represent the values for each individual and thus actor effects.

The FIXED line models all of the effects reported in Table 2. The variable *time* represents the time of assessment of each participant record. Time was coded 0 at the initial session through to 4 for the final 12-month follow-up. This means that the intercept from this model represents initial levels of actors’ perceived partner responsiveness and the effect (or slope) of time represents whether actors’ perceived partner responsiveness increased, decreased, or remained stable across the year. This characterizes the average trajectory of actors’ perceived partner responsiveness (controlling for all other variables) as shown in Table 2.

The remaining predictor variables were all mean-centered and represent the effects of communication on the intercept (initial levels of actors’ perceived partner responsivenes) and the slope of time (change in actors’ perceived partner responsiveness over time). For example, *AG\_NDirect* is the effect of actors’ negative-direct behavior as agent of change on the intercept (a main effect of agent negative-direct behavior on initial levels of actors’ perceived partner responsiveness). *AG\_NDirect\*time* is the effect of actors’ negative-direct behavior as agent of change on how actors’ perceived partner responsiveness changes as a function of time (an interaction representing the effect of *AG\_ NDirect* on the slope of time on actors’ perceived partner responsiveness). The model also included the interaction of actors’ negative-direct behavior as agent of change and their partners’ withdrawal as targets of change (*AG\_NDirect\*pTG\_Withdraw*) on both the intercept and slope of time of actors’ perceived partner responsiveness.

The RANDOM line specifies that the intercept (initial level of actors’ perceived partner responsiveness) and slope of time (change in actors’ perceived partner responsiveness) are modeled as random effects (i.e., effects that are allowed to vary across each individual). We followed the recommendation by Kenny et al. (2006) to model these random effects separately for each couple member in order to account for the association between the initial level and change of perceived partner responsiveness within and across partners. To do this, the data for the female dyad member (woman) and the male dyad member (man) are represented using two dummy coded variables. *Woman* and *man* represent the intercept, and *woman\*time* and *man\*time* represent the slope of time, for the female and male dyad member respectively. The UN term specifies the covariance structure of the random effects as unstructured, which allows for the intercept and slope of time to be correlated within and across partners.

The same models were run for the other discussion—when actors were targets of change and their partners were agents of change. That is, we estimated the effects of actors’ negative-direct behavior as targets of change, their partners’ withdrawal as agents of change, and the interaction of the two on both the intercept and slope of time of actors’ perceived partner responsiveness. Additional analyses modelling the two discussions simultaneously showed near identical pattern of results (see Section 4.3).

See Kenny et al. (2006) for more detailed guidance regarding this analytic approach.

**4.3 Simultaneous Modeling of Both Discussions**

Given the number of parameters in the model, we conducted separate analyses for each discussion when actors were agents versus targets of change to preserve statistical power. Nonetheless, additional analyses that simultaneously modelled the effects of (1) actors’ negative-direct behavior as agents of change and their partners’ withdrawal as targets of change, and (2) actors’ negative-direct behavior as targets of change and their partners’ withdrawal as agents of change showed similar pattern of results. As shown in Table SM 2, showing the same pattern as reported in the paper, the interactions between actors’ negative-direct behavior as agents of change and partners’ withdrawal as targets of change were not significant. However, also replicating the effects presented in the paper, the interactions between actors’ negative-direct behavior as targets of change and partners’ withdrawal as agents of change emerged. As shown in Figure SM 1, only when actors’ exhibited greater negative-direct behavior as targets (+1 SD) and partners exhibited high levels of withdrawal as agents (+1 SD) did actors experience declines in perceived partner responsiveness (Panel A; *B* = -.10, *t* = -2.62, *p* = .009, *r* = .10) and relationship satisfaction (Panel B; *B* = -.14, *t* = -3.23, *p* = .001, *r* = .12). In contrast, actors’ high negative-direct behavior when partners’ withdrawal was low (*B* = .01, *t* = 0.13, *p* = .90, *r* = .00; *B* = .07, *t* = 1.62, *p* = .105, *r* = .06) or partners’ high withdrawal when actors’ negative-direct behavior was low (-.02, *t* = -0.46, *p* = .646, *r* = .02; *B* = -.04, *t* = -0.82, *p* = .412, *r* = .03) did not predict declines in actors’ perceived partner responsiveness and relationship satisfaction as was the case when both actors’ negative-direct behavior and partners’ withdrawal was low (*B* = -.06, *t* = -1.47, *p* = .142, *r* = .06; *B* = -.04, *t* = -0.90, *p* = .370, *r* = .03).

**Table SM 2. The effects of Actor Negative-Direct Behavior/Partner Withdrawal during Couples’ Conflict Discussions on Change in Actors’ Perceived Partner Responsiveness and Relationship Satisfaction over the Following Year**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Perceived Partner Responsiveness** | **Relationship Satisfaction** |
|  |  | *95% CI* |  |  |  |  | *95% CI* |  |  |
| *B* | *t* | *Low* | *High* | *p* | *r* | *B* | *t* | *Low* | *High* | *p* | *r* |
| Intercept | 5.89 | 115.24\*\*\* | 5.78 | 5.99 | .000 | .99 | 5.85 | 95.47\*\*\* |  5.73 | 5.97 | .000 | .99 |
| Time  | -.04 | -2.90\*\* | -.070 | -.013 | .005 | .27 | -.04 | -2.07\* | -.072 | -.002 | .040 | .19 |
| ***Actor Negative-Direct Behavior as Agent of Change and Partner Withdrawal as Target of Change*** |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Actor Agent Negative-Direct  | .02 | .35 | -.105 | .151 | .727 | .02 | .03 | .36 | -.114 | .165 | .719 | .02 |
| Partner Target Withdrawal | -.04 | -.53 | -.205 | .118 | .600 | .03 | -.07 | -.73 | -.241 | .111 | .466 | .05 |
| Actor Agent Negative-Direct × Partner Target Withdrawal | -.11 | -1.49 | -.247 | .034 | .137 | .10 | .09 | 1.10 | -.068 | .241 | .271 | .07 |
| Actor Agent Negative-Direct × Time | -.02 | -1.08 | -.068 | .020 | .282 | .07 | -.02 | -.61 | -.064 | .034 | .541 | .04 |
| Partner Target Withdrawal × Time | .01 | .47 | -.041 | .067 | .641 | .03 | .05 | 1.70 | -.008 | .112 | .091 | .11 |
| Actor Agent Negative-Direct × Partner Target Withdrawal × Time | .01 | .22 | -.040 | .051 | .824 | .02 | .01 | .27 | -.046 | .061 | .790 | .02 |
| ***Actor Negative-Direct Behavior as Target of Change and Partner Withdrawal as Agent of Change*** |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Actor Target Negative-Direct  | -.10 | -1.39 | -.234 | .040 | .166 | .09 | -.05 | -.70 | -.200 | .095 | .484 | .05 |
| Partner Agent Withdrawal | -.14 | -1.37 | -.331 | .060 | .174 | .09 | .12 | 1.07 | -.098 | .329 | .288 | .07 |
| Actor Target Negative-Direct × Partner Agent Withdrawal | .00 | .01 | -.167 | .168 | .992 | .00 | -.02 | -.17 | -.198 | .166 | .863 | .01 |
| Actor Target Negative-Direct × Time | -.00 | -.17 | -.053 | .045 | .864 | .01 | .00 | .07 | -.051 | .054 | .945 | .01 |
| Partner Agent Withdrawal × Time | -.02 | -.72 | -.091 | .042 | .470 | .05 | -.08 | -2.11\* | -.158 | -.005 | .036 | .14 |
| Actor Target Negative-Direct × Partner Agent Withdrawal × Time | **-.06** | **-1.91+** | **-.128** | **.002** | **.058** | **.13** | **-.09** | **-2.49\*** | **-.167** | **-.019** | **.014** | **.16** |

*Note.* The longitudinal interaction effects presented in bold are shown in Figure 1. The effects of Actor Agent Negative-Direct Behavior X Partner Target Withdrawal and that of Actor Target Negative-Direct Behavior X Partner Agent Withdraw were modelled simultaneously. CI = confidence interval. Effect sizes (*r*) were computed using Rosenthal and Rosnow’s (2007) formula: *r* = √(*t 2* / *t 2* + *df*). Degrees of freedom ranged from 110.08 to 272.87. +*p* < .06. \**p* < .05. \*\**p* < .01. \*\*\**p* < .001.



*Figure SM 1. The effects of Actors’ Negative-Direct Behavior (as targets of change) and Partners’ Withdrawal (as agents of change) during Couples’ Conflict Discussions on Actors’ Perceived Partner Responsiveness (Panel A) and Relationship Satisfaction (Panel B) across time when both discussions were modelled simultaneously (Study 1).*

*Note*. Low and high levels of Actors’ Negative-Direct Behavior and Partners’ Withdrawal represent 1 SD below and above the mean. The slopes across the x axis represent the linear change in perceived partner responsiveness/relationship satisfaction from the initial session (time 0) to 12 months later (time 4). The slopes marked \*\* are significant at *p* < .01.

**5. Analyses in Study 2**

**5.1 SPSS Syntax**

For daily analyses, we modelled the effects of within-person variation in (a) actors’ negative-direct behavior on day *i*, (b) their partners’ withdrawal on day *i*, and the (c) interaction between actors’ negative-direct behavior and partners’ withdrawal on day *i* predicting actors’ daily perceived partner responsiveness (or satisfaction) on day *i*, controlling for gender, the passage of time across the 21-day diary period, the corresponding between-person effects, and actors’ perceived partner responsiveness (or satisfaction) on day *i*-1. An example of the SPSS syntax for daily analyses is as follows:

**MIXED** PPR **WITH** gender day\_c PPR\_PD\_c A\_NDirect\_pc P\_Withdraw\_pc A\_NDirect\_mean\_c P\_Withdraw\_mean\_c

 **/FIXED=** day\_c gender PPR\_c\_PDA\_NDirect\_pc P\_Withdraw\_pc A\_NDirect\_pc\*P\_Withdraw\_pc A\_NDirect\_mean\_c P\_Withdraw\_mean\_c A\_NDirect\_mean\_c\*P\_Withdraw\_mean\_c **| sstype (3)**

 **/PRINT=SOLUTION TESTCOV COVB**

 **/RANDOM=** woman man **| SUBJECT(**dyadid**) COVTYPE(**un**)**

 **/REPEATED**= obs **| SUBJECT(**dyadid\*day**) COVTYPE(**CSH**).**

PPR = actors’ perceived partner responsiveness

PPR \_PD\_c = actors’ perceived partner responsiveness on the previous day

Day\_c = day of diary, centered so that zero is midway through the 21-day diary period

A\_NDirect\_pc = actors’ negative-direct behavior, person-mean centered

P\_Withdraw\_pc = partners’ withdrawal, person-mean centered

A\_NDirect\_mean\_c = average actors’ negative-direct behavior across diary, grand-mean centered

P\_Withdraw\_mean\_c = average partners’ withdrawal across diary, grand-mean centered

dyadid = unique dyad identifier

obs **=** unique person identifier

For longitudinal analyses, we modelled the effects of between-person effects of (a) actors’ negative-direct behavior, (b) partners’ withdrawal, and the (c) interaction between actors’ negative-direct behavior and partners’ withdrawal across the 21-day period on actors’ perceived partner responsiveness (or satisfaction) 9 months later, controlling for gender and actors’ perceived partner responsiveness (or satisfaction) at the initial session. An example of the SPSS syntax for longitudinal analyses is as follows:

**MIXED** PPRdiff **WITH** gender PPRinitial\_c A\_NDirect\_mean\_c P\_Withdraw\_mean\_c

 **/FIXED=** gender PPRinitial\_c A\_Ndirect\_mean\_c P\_Withdraw\_mean\_c A\_NDirect\_mean\_c\*P\_Withdraw\_mean\_c

 **/PRINT=SOLUTION TESTCOV covb**

 **/REPEATED=**obs **| SUBJECT(**dyadid**) COVTYPE(**CSH**).**

PPRdiff = actors’ perceived partner responsiveness 9 months later, centered on its initial levels

PPRinitial\_c = actors’ perceived partner responsiveness assessed at the initial session, grand-mean centered

A\_NDirect\_mean\_c = average actors’ negative-direct behavior across diary, grand-mean centered

P\_Withdraw\_mean\_c = average partners’ withdrawal across diary, grand-mean centered

dyadid = unique dyad identifier

obs **=** unique person identifier

**5.2 Tests of Sample Differences in Daily Analyses**

We ran additional analyses including all main and interaction effects of study to test for sample differences in the daily analyses. Only two differences in the within-person effects emerged. First, the main within-person effect of actors’ negative-direct behavior on actors’ daily perceived partner responsiveness differed across samples (*b* = -.08, *t* = -5.64, *p* < .001, *r* = .08). Days of high actors’ negative-direct behavior was associated with lower actors’ perceived responsiveness, but these dips were stronger in Sample 1 (*b* = -.34, *t* = -22.15, *p* < .001, *r* = .30) than in Sample 2 (*b* = -.18, *t* = -7.87, *p* < .001, *r* = .11). Second, the interaction of within-person variation in actors’ negative-direct behavior and partners’ withdrawal on actors’ daily relationship satisfaction also differed (*b* = -.02, *t* = -2.35, *p* = .019, *r* = .03). Nonetheless, as shown in Table SM 3, although the interaction effect was stronger in Sample 1, the interaction effect was significant in both samples. Figure SM 2 illustrates that the same interaction pattern occurred in both samples. Days of high actors’ negative-direct behavior and high partners’ withdrawal were associated with lower actors’ relationship satisfaction compared to days of low actors’ negative-direct behavior and high partners’ withdrawal (b = -.44, t = -22.59, p < .001, r = .41 in Sample 1 and *b* = -.36, *t* = -12.81, *p* < .001, *r* = .25 in Sample 2). High actors’ negative-direct behavior and low partners’ withdrawal was also associated with lower actors’ satisfaction (b = -.25, t = -9.58, p < .001, r = .19 in Sample 1 and *b* = -.28, *t* = -7.51, *p* < .001, *r* = .15 in Sample 2) compared to days of low actors’ negative-direct behavior and low partners’ withdrawal, but these dips were not as strong as days involving high actors’ negative-direct behavior and high partners’ withdrawal. Given the effects emerged across both samples, and that integrative data analysis maximizes power, improves the stability of model estimation, and thus provides greater capacity for more complex models (see Curran & Hussong, 2009; Hussong et al., 2013), the main analyses presented in the paper were pooled across studies.

**Table SM 3. The effects of Actor Negative-Direct Behavior/Partner Withdrawal on Actors’ Daily Perceived Partner Responsiveness and Value and Relationship Satisfaction in Sample 1 and Sample 2 (Study 2)**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Perceived Partner Responsiveness** | **Relationship Satisfaction** |
|  |  | *95% CI* |  |  |  |  | *95% CI* |  |  |
| *B* | *t* | *Low* | *High* | *p* | *r* | *B* | *t* | *Low* | *High* | *p* | *r* |
| ***Sample 1*** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intercept | 5.91 | 98.10\*\*\* | 5.788 | 6.029 | .000 | 1.00 | 5.89 | 86.22\*\*\* | 5.753 | 6.026 | .000 | 1.00 |
| Within-Person Level |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Actor Negative-Direct | -.36 | -22.92\*\*\* | -.389 | -.328 | .000 | .42 | -.37 | -19.01\*\*\* | -.408 | -.332 | .000 | .36 |
| Partner Withdrawal | -.10 | -6.28\*\*\* | -.125 | -.066 | .000 | .13 | -.10 | -5.29\*\*\* | -.140 | -.064 | .000 | .11 |
| Actor Negative-Direct × Partner Withdrawal | **-.08** | **-6.63**\*\*\* | **-.104** | **-.056** | **.000** | **.14** | **-.10** | **-6.62**\*\*\* | **-.129** | **-.070** | **.000** | **.14** |
| Between-Person Level |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Actor Negative-Direct | -.52 | -8.32\*\*\* | -.648 | -.399 | .000 | .58 | -.50 | -7.36\*\*\* | -.635 | -.366 | .000 | .53 |
| Partner Withdrawal | -.05 | -.89 | -.148 | .056 | .375 | .08 | -.00 | -.07 | -.115 | .107 | .947 | .01 |
| Actor Negative-Direct × Partner Withdrawal | .03 | .52 | -.095 | .163 | .601 | .05 | .03 | .48 | -.106 | .174 | .634 | .04 |
| ***Sample 2*** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intercept | 6.30 | 139.89\*\*\* | 6.211 | 6.391 | .000 | 1.00 | 5.94 | 108.53\*\*\* | 5.831 | 6.050 | .000 | 1.00 |
| Within-Person Level |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Actor Negative-Direct  | -.20 | -8.85\*\*\* | -.244 | -.156 | .000 | .19 | -.32 | -13.06\*\*\* | -.368 | -.272 | .000 | .27 |
| Partner Withdrawal | -.07 | -4.03\*\*\* | -.104 | -.036 | .000 | .09 | -.05 | -2.81\*\* | -.090 | -.016 | .005 | .06 |
| Actor Negative-Direct × Partner Withdrawal | **-.05** | **-2.88**\*\* | **-.079** | **-.015** | **.004** | **.06** | **-.05** | **-2.95**\*\* | **-.087** | **-.018** | **.003** | **.06** |
| Between-Person Level |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Actor Negative-Direct | -.34 | -4.99\*\*\* | -.479 | -.207 | .000 | .43 | -.37 | -4.56\*\*\* | -.537 | -.211 | .000 | .40 |
| Partner Withdrawal | -.08 | -1.57 | -.180 | .021 | .119 | .14 | -.12 | -1.98\* | -.234 | .000 | .050 | .18 |
| Actor Negative-Direct × Partner Withdrawal | -.14 | -2.20\* | -.263 | -.014 | .030 | .21 | -.15 | -1.98\* | -.297 | .000 | .051 | .19 |

*Note.* The significant interaction effects presented in bold are presented in Figure SM 2. CI = confidence interval. Effect sizes (*r*) were computed using Rosenthal and Rosnow’s (2007) formula: *r* = √(*t 2* / *t 2* + *df*). Degrees of freedom ranged from 57.87 to 2467.34. \**p* < .05. \*\**p* < .01. \*\*\**p* < .001.

 

*Figure SM 2. The effects of Actors’ Negative-Direct Behavior and Partners’ Withdrawal on Actors’ Daily Perceived Partner Responsiveness (Panel A) and Daily Relationship Satisfaction (Panel B) for each sample (Study 2).*

*Note.* Low and high levels of Partner Withdrawal represent 1 SD below and above the mean. The slopes marked \*\*\* are significant at *p* < .001.

**5.3 Tests of Sample Differences in Longitudinal Analyses**

Analyses including all main and interaction effects of sample to test for sample differences in the longitudinal analyses are shown in Table SM 4. The longitudinal effects of actors’ negative-direct behavior, partners’ withdrawal, or actors’ negative-direct behavior X partners’ withdrawal on actors’ perceived partner responsiveness and relationship satisfaction did not differ across samples. The lack of differences on actors’ relationship satisfaction across samples provides support for measurement equivalence by suggesting that the different assessments of relationship satisfaction did not make a difference to the effects across studies. Given the effects did not differ across samples, and that integrative data analysis maximizes power, improves the stability of model estimation, and thus provides greater capacity for more complex models (see Curran & Hussong, 2009; Hussong et al., 2013), the main analyses presented in the paper were pooled across studies.

**Table SM 4. The effects of Actor Negative-Direct Behavior/Partner Withdrawal in Daily Lives on Actors’ Partner Perceived Responsiveness and Relationship Satisfaction at Time 2 controlling for Sample Differences (Study 2)**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Partner Perceived Responsiveness** | **Relationship Satisfaction** |
|  |  | *95% CI* |  |  |  |  | *95% CI* |  |  |
| *B* | *t* | *Low* | *High* | *p* | *r* | *B* | *t* | *Low* | *High* | *p* | *r* |
| Intercept | -.08 | -1.55 | -.172 | .021 | .123 | .14 | -.16 | -2.33\* | -.291 | -.024 | .022 | .21 |
| Actor Negative-Direct | -.26 | -4.11\*\*\* | -.386 | .135 | .000 | .28 | -.09 | -1.22 | -.242 | .058 | .226 | .09 |
| Partner Withdrawal | -.06 | -1.12 | -.163 | .045 | .264 | .08 | -.05 | -.78 | -.178 | .077 | .435 | .05 |
| Actor Negative-Direct × Partner Withdrawal | **-.17** | **-2.32\*** | **-.318** | **-.026** | **.021** | **.16** | -.08 | -.84 | -.257 | .103 | .401 | .06 |
| Sample | .07 | 1.37 | -.029 | .163 | .172 | .13 | -.05 | -.71 | -.179 | .085 | .479 | .07 |
| Sample × Actor Negative-Direct  | .08 | 1.21 | -.047 | .198 | .228 | .09 | .05 | .71 | -.094 | .198 | .481 | .05 |
| Sample × Partner Withdrawal | -.02 | -.37 | -.123 | .084 | .713 | .03 | .00 | .04 | -.125 | .130 | .965 | .00 |
| Sample × Actor Negative-Direct × Partner Withdrawal | -.09 | -1.19 | -.234 | .058 | .235 | .08 | .01 | .15 | -.165 | .193 | .880 | .01 |

*Note.* CI = confidence interval. Effect sizes (*r*) were computed using Rosenthal and Rosnow’s (2007) formula: *r* = √(*t 2* / *t 2* + *df*). Degrees of freedom ranged from 103.79 to 202.88. \**p* < .05. \*\*\**p* < .001.

**6 Additional Analyses**

**6.1 Gender Differences**

Since our investigation of actors’ negative-direct behavior X partners’ withdrawal has parallels with demand/withdraw, we refer to the demand/withdraw literature on gender differences. Past work theorizes that gender may play an important role in the demand/withdraw pattern, such as women more likely to demand change and men more likely to withdraw (Christensen & Heavey, 1990; Heavey et al., 1993). However, past studies have provided mixed evidence regarding whether the outcomes of demand/withdraw is moderated by gender. Some studies found that wife-demand/husband-withdraw is more detrimental to wives’ satisfaction while husband-demand/wife-withdraw is not damaging or even beneficial to husbands’ relationship satisfaction (Heavey et al, 1993; Kurdek, 1995), but other studies did not replicate these gender effects (Caughlin, 2002; Noller et al., 1994). Notably, most of these findings were based on dyadic indices of demand/withdraw rather than actor X partner effects (except Kurdek, 1995). In addition, we reiterate that demand/withdraw differs from our investigation of actors’ negative-direct behavior X partners’ withdrawal in that demand focuses on pushing for change, while actors’ negative-direct behavior refers to critical and hostile behavior in general. We tested whether any of the main or interaction effects differed across men and women in both studies, while recognizing that we had limited power for these additional higher-order interactions.

*Study 1*. Only one trend indicating possible gender differences in the longitudinal effects emerged. This involved the interaction of actors’ negative-direct behavior as agents of change and partners’ withdrawal as targets on change in relationship satisfaction across time, *B* = -.05, *t* = -1.71, *p* = .089, *r* = .11. However, decomposing the gender interaction revealed that, as indicated by the effects in Table 2 in the paper, the interaction was not significant for both men (*B* = -.06, *t* = -1.37, *p* = .173, *r* = .11) and women (*B* = .04, *t* = .99, *p* = .323, *r* = .10).

*Study 2*. Only one gender difference emerged for the within-person effects of partners’ withdrawal (*B* = -.02, *t* = -1.80, *p* = .072, *r* = .03). Actors perceived their partners as less responsive on days partners reported higher withdrawal, but these within-person effects were more pronounced for men (*b* = -.11, *t* = -6.31, *p* < .001, *r* = .09) than for women (*b* = -.06, *t* = -3.97, *p* < .001, *r* = .06). Of importance, there were no differences across gender for the within-person actors’ negative-direct X partners’ withdrawal on perceived responsiveness (*B* = -.00, *t* = -0.41, *p* = .685, *r* = .01) or relationship satisfaction (*B* = -.00, *t* = -0.21, *p* = .834, *r* = .00).

There was no gender differences in the longitudinal effects of actors’ negative-direct behavior (*B* = -.03, *t* = -0.59, *p* = .558, *r* = .04 and *B* = -.05, *t* = -.68, *p* = .496, *r* = .05 for perceived partner responsiveness and satisfaction respectively) or partners’ withdrawal (*B* = .01, *t* = 0.24, *p* = .812, *r* = .02 and *B* = .08, *t* = 1.34, *p* = .184, *r* = .10) on the outcomes across time. Moreover, no gender differences emerged for the actors’ negative-direct behavior X partners’ withdrawal effects on perceived partner responsiveness (*B* = .05, *t* = 0.68, *p* = .501, *r* = .05) and relationship satisfaction (*B* = .05, *t* = 0.67, *p* = .503, *r* = .05) across time.

In sum, we did not find evidence of any gender differences in the effects of actors’ negative-direct behavior X partners’ withdrawal on (a) daily or (b) longitudinal changes in actors’ perceived partner responsiveness and satisfaction. The sample size likely needed to adequately test these effects prevents us making strong conclusions about whether the actor X partner effects shown in the current research may be stronger or weaker depending on the gender of the actor or partner.

**6.2 Differences in Relationship Length**

Older couples in longer relationships, who may have established more constructive conflict resolution strategies and behavioral dynamics, may exhibit less negative-direct behavior or withdrawal and/or they may be more tolerant of these behaviors. Recognizing we had limited power for these analyses, for completeness we tested whether relationship length moderated the effects of negative-direct behavior/withdraw by rerunning our analyses including all main and interaction effects with relationship length.

In Study 1, there was no significant differences across relationship length in the effects of actors’ negative-direct behavior, partners’ withdrawal or actors’ negative-direct behavior X partners’ withdrawal on changes in actors’ perceived partner responsiveness and relationship satisfaction. Similarly, in Study 2 there were no significant differences across men and women in the within-person effects of actors’ negative-direct behavior, partners’ withdrawal or actors’ negative-direct behavior X partners’ withdrawal predicting actors’ daily perceived partner responsiveness or relationship satisfaction. For the longitudinal analyses in Study 2, relationship length did moderate the longitudinal effect of actors’ negative-direct behavior on actors’ relationship satisfaction (*b* = .01, *t* = 2.27, *p* = .025, *r* = .16). When individuals in shorter relationships exhibited greater negative-direct behavior across the 21-day diary period, they experienced lower relationship satisfaction 9 months later (*b* = -.35, *t* = 2.63, *p* = .009, *r* = .18), but this effect was not significant case for individuals in longer relationships (*b* = .25, *t* = 1.46, *p* = .146, *r* = .10). There were no differences across relationship length in the longitudinal effects of partners’ withdrawal (*b* = .00, *t* = 1.15, *p* = .251, *r* = .08 and *b* = .00, *t* = 0.86, *p* = .393, *r* = .06 for perceived partner responsiveness and satisfaction respectively) or the interaction between actors’ negative-direct behavior and partners’ withdraw on the outcomes across time (*b* = .00, *t* = 0.50, *p* = .618, *r* = .04 and *b* = .01, *t* = 1.47, *p* = .142, *r* = .10). In sum, relationship length did not moderate the associations between actors’ negative-direct behavior X partners’ withdrawal on actors’ perceived partner responsiveness and relationship satisfaction across both studies.

**6.3 Alternative Actor X Partner Effects**

We ran additional analyses to rule out alternative explanations that the interaction effects of actors’ negative-direct behavior X partners’ withdrawal were due to other dyadic patterns, such as actors’ withdrawal and partners’ negative reciprocity (actors’ negative-direct behavior X partners’ negative-direct behavior) or mutual withdrawal (actors’ withdrawal X partners’ withdrawal; Christensen & Sullaway, 1984; Kurdek, 1995). Thus, we conducted three sets of additional analyses in each study to test the alternative dyadic patterns, including: (i) actors’ withdrawal, partners’ negative-direct behavior and their interaction, (ii) actors’ negative-direct behavior, partners’ negative-direct behavior and their interaction, and (iii) actors’ withdrawal, partners’ withdrawal and their interaction.

*Study 1.* In Study 1, we first reran the analyses modeling actors’ withdrawal, partners’ negative-direct behavior and their interaction. There was no significant interaction between actors’ withdrawal X partners’ negative-direct behavior on actors’ perceived partner responsiveness and relationship satisfaction across time (Table SM 5).

Next, we ran the analyses modeling actors’ negative-direct behavior, partners’ negative-direct behavior and their interaction. Significant or marginally significant interactions emerged between actors’ and their partners’ negative-direct behavior on actors’ perceived partner responsiveness across time when individuals were both agents and targets of change (Table SM 6). Consistent with prior research showing the detrimental effects of negative reciprocity (Gottman, 1998), when both actors and partners exhibited greater negative-direct behavior, participants experienced declines in perceived partner responsiveness (Figure SM 3; -.09 < *B*s < -.06, -3.77 < *t*s < -2.82, *p* < .005, *r* < .15). In contrast, when only actors or their partners exhibited high levels of negative-direct behavior in isolation, actors showed sustained perceived partner responsiveness (-.01 < *B*s < .02, -0.10 < *t*s < 0.41, *p*s > .686, *r*s < .02). When both actors and partners exhibited low levels of negative-direct behavior, actors as agents of change reported sustained perceived partner responsiveness (Panel A; *B* = -.03, *t* = -1.27, *p* = .203, *r* = .05), while actors as targets of change experienced drops in perceived partner responsiveness (Panel B; *B* = -.06, *t* = -2.11, *p* = .035, *r* = .08), which is consistent with how negative-direct behavior that pushes for change by agents can have beneficial effects across time (Overall et al., 2009; Overall, 2018).

A marginally significant interaction between actors’ and partners’ negative-direct behavior also emerged on actors’ relationship satisfaction across time, again when actors were targets of change and their partners were agents of change (Table SM 6; Figure SM 4). Unexpectedly, when both actors as targets and partners as agents exhibited low levels of negative-direct behavior, actors reported reduced relationship satisfaction across time (*B* = -.08, *t* = -2.55, *p* = .011, *r* = .10). In contrast, when only actors as targets or partners as agents exhibited high levels of negative-direct behavior, actors showed sustained relationship satisfaction (-.03 < *B*s < .04, -0.84 < *t*s < 0.92, *p*s > .358, *r*s < .04).

Since negative reciprocity was associated with declines in perceived partner responsiveness similar to that of actors’ negative-direct behavior X partners’ withdraw, we next tested whether these dyadic patterns represented independent effects. To do that, we simultaneously modelled the interaction effects between actors’ negative-direct behavior and partners’ (a) negative-direct behavior and (b) withdrawal. When actors were targets of change and their partners were agents of change, the interactions between actors’ negative-direct behavior and partners’ negative-direct behavior and the interactions between actors’ negative-direct behavior and partners’ withdrawal on actors’ perceived partner responsiveness and relationship satisfaction were significant (analogous to the primary effects shown in Figure 1 of the paper; see Table SM 7). Hence, the effects of actors’ negative-direct behavior X partners’ withdrawal occurred independently of the effects of negative reciprocity in predicting declines in actors’ perceived partner responsiveness and relationship satisfaction across time.

Finally, we ran additional analyses estimating the effects of actors’ withdrawal, partners’ withdrawal and their interaction, which also revealed that mutual withdrawal was not driving the effects. There was no significant interaction between actors’ withdrawal X partners’ withdrawal on actors’ perceived partner responsiveness and relationship satisfaction across time (Table SM 8).

In sum, while negative reciprocity predicted drops in actors’ perceived partner responsiveness across time, the effects of actors’ negative-direct behavior X partners’ withdrawal were independent of the effects of negative reciprocity. In addition, analyses examining actors’ withdrawal X partners’ negative-direct behavior and actors’ withdrawal X partners’ withdrawal did not produce any significant interaction effects. Thus, the effects were not due to these alternative dyadic patterns.

*Study 2.* A similar approach was taken to rule out these alternative explanations for models predicting daily and longitudinal outcomes in Study 2. Daily analyses that modelled the effects of actors’ withdrawal, partners’ negative-direct behavior and their interaction revealed similar interactions between actors’ withdrawal X partners’ negative-direct behavior on actors’ daily perceived partner responsiveness and relationship satisfaction as that shown in Figure 2 (Table SM 9). Days of high actor withdrawal and high partner negative-direct behavior was associated with lower actors’ perceived partner responsiveness and relationship satisfaction (*b* = -.29, *t* = -20.86, *p* < .001, *r* = .29 and *b* = -.35, *t* = -22.29, *p* < .001, *r* = .31 respectively) compared to days of low actor withdrawal and high partner negative-direct behavior (see dashed lines). High actor withdrawal X low partner negative-direct behavior was also associated with lower actors’ perceived responsiveness and satisfaction (*b* = -.16, *t* = -9.95, *p* < .001, *r* = .15 and *b* = -.27, *t* = -15.02, *p* < .001, *r* = .22, respectively) compared to days of low actor withdrawal X low partner negative-direct behavior (see solid lines), but these dips were not as strong as days of high withdrawal X high partner negative-direct behavior. Nonetheless, additional analyses simultaneously modeling the interaction effects of actors’ negative-direct behavior and partners’ withdrawal showed that the interactions between actors’ negative-direct behavior and partners’ withdrawal reported in the paper remained significant, while the interaction effects involving actors’ withdrawal and partners’ negative-direct behavior on relationship satisfaction was no longer significant (Table SM 10). Furthermore, longitudinal analyses examining the interaction of actors’ withdrawal and partners’ negative-direct behavior did not produce any significant interaction effects (Table SM 11).

A similar pattern of results was demonstrated when modeling actors’ negative-direct behavior, partners’ negative-direct behavior and their interaction. Significant interactions between actors’ negative-direct behavior X partners’ negative-direct behavior emerged on actors’ daily perceived partner responsiveness and relationship satisfaction, similar to that shown in Figure 2 (Table SM 12). Days of high actors’ negative-direct behavior and high partners’ negative-direct behavior were associated with lower actors’ perceived partner responsiveness and relationship satisfaction (*b* = -.32, *t* = -24.53, *p* < .001, *r* = .45 and *b* = -.36, *t* = -23.38, *p* < .001, *r* = .43 respectively) compared to days of low actors’ negative-direct behavior and high partners’ negative-direct behavior (see dashed lines). High actors’ negative-direct behavior X low partners’ negative-direct behavior was also associated with lower actors’ responsiveness and satisfaction (*b* = -.24, *t* = -13.15, *p* < .001, *r* = .26 and *b* = -.32, *t* = -14.74, *p* < .001, *r* = .29, respectively) compared to days of low actors’ negative-direct behavior X low partners’ negative-direct behavior (see solid lines), but these dips were not as strong as days of high actors’ negative-direct behavior X high partners’ negative-direct behavior. Nonetheless, additional analyses simultaneously modeling the interaction effects of actors’ negative-direct behavior and partners’ withdrawal showed that the interactions between actors’ negative-direct behavior and partners’ withdrawal reported in the paper remained significant, while the interaction effects involving actors’ negative-direct behavior and partners’ negative-direct behavior on relationship satisfaction was no longer significant (Table SM 13). Furthermore, longitudinal analyses examining the interaction of actors’ negative-direct behavior and partners’ negative-direct behavior did not produce any significant interaction effects (Table SM 14).

Next, to test for the alternative explanation that the effects of actors’ negative-direct behavior X partners’ withdrawal were due to mutual withdrawal, we reran the models with actors’ withdrawal, partners’ withdrawal and their interaction. Again, daily analyses revealed similar interactions between actors’ withdrawal and partners’ withdrawal on actors’ daily perceived partner responsiveness and relationship satisfaction. However, additional analyses simultaneously modeling the main and interaction effects of actors’ negative-direct behavior and partners’ withdrawal showed that the interactions between actors’ negative-direct behavior and partners’ withdrawal remained significant, while the interaction effect involving actors’ withdrawal and partners’ withdrawal on actors’ satisfaction was no longer significant (Table SM 15). Furthermore, longitudinal analyses examining the interaction of actors’ withdrawal and partners’ withdrawal did not produce any significant interaction effects (Table SM 16).

In sum, while actors’ withdrawal X partners’ negative direct behavior, negative reciprocity, and mutual withdrawal were associated with lower actors’ daily perceived partner responsiveness and relationship satisfaction, the effects on relationship satisfaction did not continue to hold when modelled alongside actors’ negative-direct behavior X partners’ withdrawal that was the primary focus of this research. Instead, the effects of actors’ negative-direct behavior X partners’ withdrawal remained significant and occurred independently of the effects of the other dyadic patterns. In addition, longitudinal analyses revealed no effect of actors’ withdrawal X partners’ negative-direct behavior, negative reciprocity and mutual withdrawal. Thus, the effects were not due to these alternative dyadic patterns.

**Table SM 5. The effects of Actor Withdrawal/Partner Negative-Direct Behavior during Couples’ Conflict Discussions on Change in Actors’ Perceived Partner Responsiveness and Relationship Satisfaction over the Following Year**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Perceived Partner Responsiveness** | **Relationship Satisfaction** |
|  |  | *95% CI* |  |  |  |  | *95% CI* |  |  |
| *B* | *t* | *Low* | *High* | *p* | *r* | *B* | *t* | *Low* | *High* | *p* | *r* |
| ***Actor Withdrawal as Agent of Change and Partner Negative-Direct Behavior as Target of Change*** |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intercept | 5.88 | 119.47\*\*\* | 5.782 | 5.976 | .000 | 1.00 | 5.85 | 96.26\*\*\* | 5.726 | 5.965 | .000 | .99 |
| Time | -.04 | -3.07\*\* | -.072 | -.016 | .003 | .28 | -.04 | -2.07\* | -.072 | -.002 | .041 | .19 |
| Actor Agent Withdrawal  | .20 | 3.07\*\* | .073 | .336 | .002 | .20 | -.02 | -.29 | -.160 | .119 | .776 | .02 |
| Partner Target Negative-Direct | -.13 | -2.66\*\* | -.226 | -.034 | .008 | .15 | -.12 | -2.21\* | -.229 | -.013 | .028 | .12 |
| Actor Agent Withdrawal × Partner Target Negative-Direct | .04 | .56 | -.110 | .198 | .574 | .04 | .08 | .98 | -.082 | .242 | .330 | .07 |
| Actor Agent Withdrawal × Time | -.03 | -1.27 | -.072 | .016 | .207 | .09 | -.01 | -.34 | -.051 | .036 | .732 | .03 |
| Partner Target Negative-Direct × Time | -.04 | -2.26\* | -.070 | -.005 | .025 | .15 | -.01 | -.31 | -.043 | .031 | .754 | .02 |
| Actor Agent Withdrawal × Partner Target Negative-Direct × Time | -.02 | -.60 | -.081 | .043 | .549 | .04 | .02 | .58 | -.044 | .082 | .562 | .04 |
| ***Actor Withdrawal as Target of Change and Partner Negative-Direct Behavior as Agent of Change*** |  |  |  |  |
| Intercept | 5.88 | 121.54\*\*\* | 5.782 | 5.973 | .000 | 1.00 | 5.84 | 97.34\*\*\* | 5.725 | 5.963 | .000 | .99 |
| Time  | -.04 | -2.98\*\* | -.073 | -.015 | .004 | .28 | -.03 | -1.90 | -.070 | .001 | .060 | .17 |
| Actor Target Withdrawal | .15 | 2.68\*\* | .039 | .252 | .008 | .16 | .01 | .10 | -.111 | .123 | .921 | .01 |
| Partner Agent Negative-Direct | -.15 | -3.41\*\* | -.243 | -.065 | .001 | .20 | -.17 | -3.26\*\* | -.270 | -.067 | .001 | .18 |
| Actor Target Withdrawal × Partner Agent Negative-Direct | .22 | 3.37\*\* | .091 | .346 | .001 | .21 | .12 | 1.65 | -.022 | .255 | .100 | .11 |
| Actor Target Withdrawal × Time | -.02 | -.88 | -.051 | .019 | .379 | .06 | -.01 | -.42 | -.044 | .028 | .673 | .03 |
| Partner Agent Negative-Direct × Time | -.01 | -.50 | -.037 | .022 | .615 | .04 | .02 | 1.38 | -.010 | .057 | .168 | .09 |
| Actor Target Withdrawal × Partner Agent Negative-Direct × Time | -.01 | -.57 | -.056 | .031 | .573 | .04 | -.02 | -.91 | -.065 | .024 | .362 | .07 |

*Note.* CI = confidence interval. Effect sizes (*r*) were computed using Rosenthal and Rosnow’s (2007) formula: *r* = √(*t 2* / *t 2* + *df*). Degrees of freedom ranged from 106.41 to 317.67. \**p* < .05. \*\**p* < .01. \*\*\**p* < .001.

**Table SM 6. The effects of Actor Negative-Direct/Partner Negative-Direct Behavior during Couples’ Conflict Discussions on Change in Actors’ Perceived Partner Responsiveness and Relationship Satisfaction over the Following Year**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Perceived Partner Responsiveness** | **Relationship Satisfaction** |
|  |  | *95% CI* |  |  |  |  | *95% CI* |  |  |
| *B* | *t* | *Low* | *High* | *p* | *r* | *B* | *t* | *Low* | *High* | *p* | *r* |
| ***Actor Negative-Direct Behavior as Agent of Change and Partner Negative-Direct Behavior as Target of Change*** |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intercept | 5.81 | 105.92\*\*\* | 5.704 | 5.921 | .000 | .99 | 5.82 | 85.90\*\*\* | 5.684 | 5.951 | .000 | .99 |
| Time | -.03 | -1.81 | -.062 | .003 | .072 | .16 | -.03 | -1.52 | -.070 | .009 | .131 | .13 |
| Actor Agent NDirect | -.01 | -.22 | -.108 | .086 | .828 | .01 | -.01 | -.12 | -.112 | .099 | .904 | .01 |
| Partner Target NDirect | -.20 | -3.45\*\*\* | -.317 | -.087 | .001 | .20 | -.15 | -2.39\* | -.276 | -.027 | .017 | .14 |
| Actor Agent NDirect × Partner Target NDirect | .16 | 2.65\*\* | .040 | .273 | .009 | .15 | .07 | 1.06 | -.060 | .202 | .288 | .06 |
| Actor Agent NDirect × Time | -.01 | -.70 | -.043 | .020 | .486 | .05 | -.00 | -.20 | -.038 | .031 | .846 | .01 |
| Partner Target NDirect × Time | -.02 | -.94 | -.056 | .020 | .348 | .07 | -.00 | -.00 | -.043 | .042 | .997 | .00 |
| Actor Agent NDirect × Partner Target NDirect × Time | **-.04** | **-1.84** | **-.075** | **.003** | **.067** | **.13** | -.02 | -.71 | -.061 | .029 | .477 | .05 |
| ***Actor Negative-Direct Behavior as Target of Change and Partner Negative-Direct Behavior as Agent of Change*** |  |  |  |  |
| Intercept | 5.85 | 106.73\*\*\* | 5.744 | 5.961 | .000 | .99 | 5.83 | 86.49\*\*\* | 5.697 | 5.962 | .000 | .99 |
| Time  | -.03 | -1.68 | -.061 | .005 | .096 | .15 | -.02 | -1.00 | -.060 | .020 | .320 | .09 |
| Actor Target NDirect | -.04 | -.69 | -.154 | .074 | .492 | .04 | -.03 | -.43 | -.149 | .096 | .667 | .03 |
| Partner Agent NDirect | -.19 | -3.86\*\*\* | -.285 | -.092 | .000 | .22 | -.18 | -3.41\*\*\* | -.286 | -.077 | .001 | .19 |
| Actor Target NDirect × Partner Agent NDirect | .07 | 1.23 | -.043 | .187 | .218 | .07 | .04 | .60 | -.090 | .169 | .550 | .03 |
| Actor Target NDirect × Time | -.01 | -.41 | -.046 | .031 | .686 | .03 | .00 | .12 | -.038 | .043 | .903 | .01 |
| Partner Agent NDirect × Time | .00 | .15 | -.030 | .035 | .882 | .01 | .03 | 1.58 | -.007 | .063 | .116 | .11 |
| Actor Target NDirect × Partner Agent NDirect × Time | **-.04** | **-1.95\*** | **-.078** | **.000** | **.052** | **.13** | **-.04** | **-1.68** | **-.081** | **.006** | **.095** | **.11** |

*Note.* The interaction effects presented in bold are presented in Figure SM 3 and Figure SM 4.NDirect = Negative-Direct Behavior. CI = confidence interval. Effect sizes (*r*) were computed using Rosenthal and Rosnow’s (2007) formula: *r* = √(*t 2* / *t 2* + *df*). Degrees of freedom ranged from 127.65 to 316.23. \**p* < .05. \*\**p* < .01. \*\*\**p* < .001.



*Figure SM 3. The effects of Actors’ Negative-Direct Behavior and Partners’ Negative-Direct Behavior during Couples’ Conflict Discussions on Actors’ Perceived Partner Responsiveness across time.*

*Note*. Low and high levels of Actors’ Negative-Direct Behavior and Partners’ Negative-Direct Behavior represent 1 SD below and above the mean. The slopes across the x axis represent the linear change in perceived partner responsiveness from the initial session (time 0) to 12 months later (time 4). The slope marked \* is significant at *p* < .05, the slope marked \*\* is significant at *p* < .01, and the slope marked \*\*\* is significant at *p* < .001.



*Figure SM 4. The effects of Actors’ Negative-Direct Behavior (as targets of change) and Partners’ Negative-Direct Behavior (as agents of change) during Couples’ Conflict Discussions on Actors’ Relationship Satisfaction across time.*

*Note*. Low and high levels of Actor Target Negative-Direct Behavior and Partner Agent Negative-Direct Behavior represent 1 SD below and above the mean. The slopes across the x axis represent the linear change in relationship satisfaction from the initial session (time 0) to 12 months later (time 4). The slope marked \* is significant at *p* < .05.

**Table SM 7. The effects of Actor Negative-Direct Behavior, Partner Negative-Direct Behavior and Partner Withdrawal during Couples’ Conflict Discussions on Change in Actors’ Perceived Partner Responsiveness and Relationship Satisfaction over the Following Year**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Perceived Partner Responsiveness** | **Relationship Satisfaction** |
|  |  | *95% CI* |  |  |  |  | *95% CI* |  |  |
| *B* | *t* | *Low* | *High* | *p* | *r* | *B* | *t* | *Low* | *High* | *p* | *r* |
| ***Actor Negative-Direct Behavior as Agent of Change and Partner Negative-Direct Behavior as Target of Change*** |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intercept | 5.82 | 103.65\*\*\* | 5.709 | 5.931 | .000 | .99 | 5.81 | 86.06\*\*\* | 5.680 | 5.947 | .000 | .99 |
| Time | -.03 | -1.78 | -.063 | .003 | .078 | .15 | -.03 | -1.53 | -.069 | .009 | .129 | .13 |
| Actor Agent Negative-Direct | -.03 | -.54 | -.124 | .071 | .592 | .03 | .01 | .10 | -.102 | .113 | .923 | .01 |
| Partner Target Withdrawal | -.06 | -1.07 | -.179 | .053 | .285 | .07 | .04 | .63 | -.086 | .168 | .528 | .04 |
| Partner Target Negative-Direct | -.18 | -3.03\*\* | -.302 | -.064 | .003 | .18 | -.16 | -2.42\* | -.289 | -.030 | .016 | .14 |
| Actor Agent Negative-Direct × Partner Target Withdrawal | -.10 | -1.50 | -.233 | .031 | .134 | .10 | .08 | 1.11 | -.064 | .227 | .269 | .07 |
| Actor Agent Negative-Direct × Partner Target Negative-Direct | .15 | 2.39\* | .026 | .265 | .018 | .14 | .08 | 1.13 | -.057 | .211 | .261 | .06 |
| Actor Agent Negative-Direct × Time | -.01 | -.72 | -.044 | .020 | .470 | .05 | -.01 | -.34 | -.042 | .030 | .731 | .02 |
| Partner Target Withdrawal × Time | -.01 | -.33 | -.041 | .029 | .738 | .02 | -.00 | -.09 | -.044 | .040 | .925 | .01 |
| Partner Target Negative-Direct × Time | -.02 | -.86 | -.057 | .022 | .389 | .06 | -.00 | -.03 | -.045 | .043 | .973 | .00 |
| Actor Agent Negative-Direct × Partner Target Withdrawal × Time | -.01 | -.46 | -.052 | .032 | .650 | .04 | -.02 | -.72 | -.069 | .032 | .470 | .05 |
| Actor Agent Negative-Direct × Partner Target Negative-Direct × Time | -.04 | -1.78 | -.076 | .004 | .076 | .12 | -.02 | -.71 | -.062 | .029 | .476 | .05 |
| ***Actor Negative-Direct Behavior as Target of Change and Partner Negative-Direct Behavior as Agent of Change*** |  |  |  |  |
| Intercept | 5.86 | 105.60\*\*\* | 5.755 | 5.974 | .000 | .99 | 5.83 | 86.26 | 5.697\*\*\* | 5.963 | .000 | .99 |
| Time  | -.02 | -1.48 | -.057 | .008 | .141 | .13 | -.02 | -.90 | -.057 | .021 | .368 | .08 |
| Actor Target Negative-Direct | -.03 | -.59 | -.147 | .080 | .559 | .04 | -.02 | -.34 | -.143 | .102 | .737 | .02 |
| Partner Agent Withdrawal | -.11 | -1.55 | -.242 | .029 | .122 | .10 | .11 | 1.43 | -.041 | .256 | .154 | .10 |
| Partner Agent Negative-Direct | -.17 | -3.51\*\*\* | -.271 | -.077 | .001 | .20 | -.19 | -3.50 | -.296\*\*\* | -.083 | .001 | .20 |
| Actor Target Negative-Direct × Partner Agent Withdrawal | -.06 | -.74 | -.214 | .097 | .457 | .05 | -.01 | -.08 | -.173 | .160 | .940 | .01 |
| Actor Target Negative-Direct × Partner Agent Negative-Direct | .05 | .93 | -.061 | .170 | .354 | .05 | .05 | .77 | -.080 | .182 | .445 | .04 |
| Actor Target Negative-Direct × Time | -.01 | -.71 | -.053 | .025 | .478 | .05 | -.01 | -.32 | -.047 | .034 | .748 | .02 |
| Partner Agent Withdrawal × Time | -.02 | -.96 | -.063 | .022 | .341 | .07 | -.04 | -1.70 | -.096 | .007 | .091 | .12 |
| Partner Agent Negative-Direct × Time | .00 | .23 | -.029 | .036 | .816 | .02 | .03 | 1.62 | -.006 | .064 | .107 | .11 |
| Actor Target Negative-Direct × Partner Agent Withdrawal × Time | **-.06** | **-1.95**\* | **-.122** | **.001** | **.052** | **.13** | **-.09** | **-2.51** | **-.157**\* | **-.019** | **.013** | **.16** |
| Actor Target Negative-Direct × Partner Agent Negative-Direct × Time | **-.04** | **-2.17**\* | **-.083** | **-.004** | **.031** | **.15** | **-.05** | **-2.17** | **-.092**\* | **-.004** | **.031** | **.14** |

*Note.* Significant interaction effects of interest are presented in bold. CI = confidence interval. Effect sizes (*r*) were computed using Rosenthal and Rosnow’s (2007) formula: *r* = √(*t 2* / *t 2* + *df*). Degrees of freedom ranged from 130.49 to 314.78. \**p* < .05. \*\**p* < .01. \*\*\**p* < .001.

**Table SM 8. The effects of Actor Withdrawal/Partner Withdrawal during Couples’ Conflict Discussions on Change in Actors’ Perceived Partner Responsiveness and Relationship Satisfaction over the Following Year**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Perceived Partner Responsiveness** | **Relationship Satisfaction** |
|  |  | *95% CI* |  |  |  |  | *95% CI* |  |  |
| *B* | *t* | *Low* | *High* | *p* | *r* | *B* | *t* | *Low* | *High* | *p* | *r* |
| ***Actor Withdrawal as Agent of Change and Partner Withdrawal as Target of Change*** |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intercept | 5.88 | 117.59\*\*\* | 5.781 | 5.978 | .000 | .99 | 5.85 | 95.34\*\*\* | 5.726 | 5.968 | .000 | .99 |
| Time | -.04 | -2.93\*\* | -.072 | -.014 | .004 | .27 | -.04 | -2.07\* | -.073 | -.002 | .041 | .19 |
| Actor Agent Withdrawal | .21 | 3.11\*\* | .076 | .340 | .002 | .20 | .02 | .33 | -.120 | .169 | .742 | .02 |
| Partner Target Withdrawal | -.10 | -1.74 | -.213 | .013 | .082 | .10 | .00 | .04 | -.125 | .130 | .968 | .00 |
| Actor Agent Withdrawal × Partner Target Withdrawal | .15 | 1.45 | -.053 | .348 | .149 | .09 | .16 | 1.34 | -.073 | .384 | .182 | .08 |
| Actor Agent Withdrawal × Time | -.03 | -1.56 | -.078 | .009 | .120 | .11 | -.00 | -.19 | -.048 | .040 | .852 | .01 |
| Partner Target Withdrawal × Time | -.01 | -.43 | -.041 | .026 | .667 | .03 | -.00 | -.07 | -.042 | .039 | .942 | .00 |
| Actor Agent Withdrawal × Partner Target Withdrawal × Time | -.04 | -1.25 | -.104 | .023 | .214 | .09 | .02 | .62 | -.048 | .092 | .537 | .05 |
| ***Actor Withdrawal as Target of Change and Partner Withdrawal as Agent of Change*** |  |  |  |  |
| Intercept | 5.88 | 118.06\*\*\* | 5.781 | 5.978 | .000 | .99 | 5.85 | 95.32\*\*\* | 5.728 | 5.970 | .000 | .99 |
| Time  | -.04 | -2.92\*\* | -.072 | -.014 | .004 | .27 | -.04 | -2.10\* | -.073 | -.002 | .038 | .19 |
| Actor Target Withdrawal | .14 | 2.48\* | .029 | .249 | .014 | .15 | .03 | .46 | -.094 | .151 | .645 | .03 |
| Partner Agent Withdrawal | -.12 | -1.82 | -.260 | .010 | .069 | .11 | .07 | .90 | -.083 | .222 | .371 | .05 |
| Actor Target Withdrawal × Partner Agent Withdrawal | .21 | 2.02\* | .005 | .413 | .045 | .13 | .17 | 1.42 | -.066 | .408 | .157 | .08 |
| Actor Target Withdrawal × Time | -.02 | -1.11 | -.055 | .015 | .269 | .07 | -.01 | -.79 | -.052 | .022 | .433 | .06 |
| Partner Agent Withdrawal × Time | -.02 | -1.00 | -.062 | .020 | .318 | .08 | -.04 | -1.69 | -.096 | .007 | .092 | .11 |
| Actor Target Withdrawal × Partner Agent Withdrawal × Time | -.02 | -.59 | -.081 | .044 | .554 | .05 | -.04 | -1.08 | -.120 | .035 | .280 | .08 |

*Note.* CI = confidence interval. Effect sizes (*r*) were computed using Rosenthal and Rosnow’s (2007) formula: *r* = √(*t 2* / *t 2* + *df*). Degrees of freedom ranged from 109.95 to 308.07. \**p* < .05. \*\**p* < .01. \*\*\**p* < .001.

**Table SM 9. The effects of Actor Withdrawal and Partner Negative-Direct Behavior on Actors’ Daily Perceived Partner Responsiveness and Relationship Satisfaction**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Perceived Partner Responsiveness** | **Relationship Satisfaction** |
|  |  | *95% CI* |  |  |  |  | *95% CI* |  |  |
| *B* | *t* | *Low* | *High* | *p* | *r* | *B* | *t* | *Low* | *High* | *p* | *r* |
| Intercept | 6.11 | 160.45\*\*\* | 6.039 | 6.190 | .000 | 1.00 | 5.91 | 127.34\*\*\* | 5.821 | 6.005 | .000 | 1.00 |
| ***Within-Person Level*** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Actor Withdrawal | -.22 | -19.01\*\*\* | -.244 | -.199 | .000 | .26 | -.31 | -23.29\*\*\* | -.339 | -.287 | .000 | .32 |
| Partner Negative-Direct | -.15 | -11.28\*\*\* | -.172 | -.121 | .000 | .16 | -.16 | -10.82\*\*\* | -.191 | -.132 | .000 | .16 |
| Actor Withdrawal × Partner Negative-Direct | **-.06** | **-7.13**\*\*\* | **-.075** | **-.043** | **.000** | **.10** | **-.04** | **-3.79**\*\*\* | **-.055** | **-.017** | **.000** | **.06** |
| ***Between-Person Level*** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Actor Withdrawal | -.30 | -8.74\*\*\* | -.374 | -.236 | .000 | .47 | -.31 | -7.58\*\*\* | -.392 | -.231 | .000 | .41 |
| Partner Negative-Direct | -.02 | -.56 | -.107 | .060 | .580 | .03 | .01 | .22 | -.087 | .109 | .826 | .01 |
| Actor Withdrawal × Partner Negative-Direct | -.11 | -2.52\* | -.191 | -.023 | .012 | .16 | -.08 | -1.67 | -.184 | .015 | .097 | .10 |

*Note.* The significant interaction effects presented in bold are similar to that in Figure 2. CI = confidence interval. Effect sizes (*r*) were computed using Rosenthal and Rosnow’s (2007) formula: *r* = √(*t 2* / *t 2* + *df*). Degrees of freedom ranged from 137.20 to 4826.53. \**p* < .05. \*\*\**p* < .001.

**Table SM 10. The effects of Actor and Partner Negative-Direct Behavior as well as Actor and Partner Withdrawal on Actors’ Daily Perceived Partner Responsiveness and Relationship Satisfaction**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Perceived Partner Responsiveness** | **Relationship Satisfaction** |
|  |  | *95% CI* |  |  |  |  | *95% CI* |  |  |
| *B* | *t* | *Low* | *High* | *p* | *r* | *B* | *t* | *Low* | *High* | *p* | *r* |
| Intercept | 6.12 | 153.52\*\*\* | 6.039 | 6.196 | .000 | 1.00 | 5.92 | 118.23\*\*\* | 5.818 | 6.015 | .000 | 1.00 |
| ***Within-Person Level*** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Actor Negative-Direct | -.21 | -16.07\*\*\* | -.240 | -.188 | .000 | .23 | -.23 | -15.06\*\*\* | -.263 | -.202 | .000 | .22 |
| Partner Withdrawal | -.05 | -4.43\*\*\* | -.076 | -.029 | .000 | .06 | -.06 | -4.22\*\*\* | -.085 | -.031 | .000 | .06 |
| Actor Withdrawal | -.15 | -12.59\*\*\* | -.173 | -.127 | .000 | .18 | -.24 | -17.12\*\*\* | -.263 | -.209 | .000 | .24 |
| Partner Negative-Direct | -.09 | -6.34\*\*\* | -.112 | -.059 | .000 | .09 | -.10 | -6.24\*\*\* | -.127 | -.066 | .000 | .09 |
| Actor Negative-Direct × Partner Withdrawal | **-.04** | **-5.30\*\*\*** | **-.058** | **-.027** | **.000** | **.08** | **-.05** | **-4.96\*\*\*** | **-.064** | **-.028** | **.000** | **.07** |
| Actor Withdrawal × Partner Negative-Direct | -.04 | -4.45\*\*\* | -.052 | -.020 | .000 | .07 | -.01 | -1.16 | -.029 | .007 | .246 | .02 |
| ***Between-Person Level*** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Actor Negative-Direct | -.13 | -2.44\* | -.233 | -.025 | .016 | .16 | -.03 | -.44 | -.157 | .100 | .663 | .03 |
| Partner Withdrawal | .02 | .46 | -.069 | .111 | .649 | .03 | -.00 | -.05 | -.113 | .107 | .958 | .00 |
| Actor Withdrawal | -.23 | -5.03\*\*\* | -.316 | -.138 | .000 | .31 | -.29 | -5.14\*\*\* | -.396 | -.176 | .000 | .31 |
| Partner Negative-Direct | -.05 | -.85 | -.155 | .062 | .399 | .05 | .00 | .01 | -.131 | .132 | .995 | .00 |
| Actor Negative-Direct × Partner Withdrawal | .03 | .69 | -.055 | .114 | .492 | .04 | .01 | .24 | -.090 | .115 | .809 | .02 |
| Actor Withdrawal × Partner Negative-Direct | -.12 | -2.75\*\* | -.206 | -.034 | .006 | .17 | -.08 | -1.60 | -.188 | .019 | .110 | .10 |

*Note.* The significant interaction effects presented in bold are similar to that in Figure 2. CI = confidence interval. Effect sizes (*r*) were computed using Rosenthal and Rosnow’s (2007) formula: *r* = √(*t 2* / *t 2* + *df*). Degrees of freedom ranged from 137.87 to 4798.31. \**p* < .05. \*\**p* < .01. \*\*\**p* < .001.

**Table SM 11. The effects of Actor Withdrawal/Partner Negative-Direct Behavior in Daily Lives on Actors’ Perceived Partner Responsiveness and Relationship Satisfaction at Time 2**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Perceived Partner Responsiveness** | **Relationship Satisfaction** |
|  |  | *95% CI* |  |  |  |  | *95% CI* |  |  |
| *B* | *t* | *Low* | *High* | *p* | *r* | *B* | *t* | *Low* | *High* | *p* | *r* |
| Intercept | -.10 | -2.12\* | -.191 | -.006 | .036 | .20 | -.15 | 2.46\* | -.279 | -.030 | .016 | .23 |
| Actor Withdrawal | -.17 | -3.21\*\* | -.272 | -.065 | .002 | .22 | -.05 | -.73 | -.174 | .080 | .466 | .05 |
| Partner Negative-Direct | -.12 | -2.17\* | -.238 | -.012 | .031 | .15 | -.16 | -2.34\* | -.300 | -.026 | .020 | .16 |
| Actor Withdrawal × Partner Negative-Direct | .08 | 1.08 | -.063 | .217 | .280 | .08 | -.03 | -.34 | -.195 | .137 | .732 | .02 |

*Note.* CI = confidence interval. Effect sizes (*r*) were computed using Rosenthal and Rosnow’s (2007) formula: *r* = √(*t 2* / *t 2* + *df*). Degrees of freedom ranged from 101.24 to 207.52. \**p* < .05. \*\**p* < .01.

**Table SM 12. The effects of Actor Negative-Direct Behavior/Partner Negative-Direct Behavior on Actors’ Daily Perceived Partner Responsiveness and Relationship Satisfaction**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Perceived Partner Responsiveness** | **Relationship Satisfaction** |
|  |  | *95% CI* |  |  |  |  | *95% CI* |  |  |
| *B* | *t* | *Low* | *High* | *p* | *r* | *B* | *t* | *Low* | *High* | *p* | *r* |
| Intercept | 6.11 | 138.64\*\*\* | 6.019 | 6.193 | .000 | 1.00 | 5.91 | 109.21\*\*\* | 5.806 | 6.020 | .000 | .99 |
| ***Within-Person Level*** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Actor Negative-Direct | -.28 | -21.63\*\*\* | -.309 | -.257 | .000 | .30 | -.34 | -22.18\*\*\* | -.371 | -.311 | .000 | .31 |
| Partner Negative-Direct | -.12 | -9.28\*\*\* | -.148 | -.097 | .000 | .13 | -.14 | -9.11\*\*\* | -.171 | -.110 | .000 | .13 |
| Actor Negative-Direct × Partner Negative-Direct | **-.04** | **-4.47\*\*\*** | **-.054** | **-.021** | **.000** | **.09** | **-.02** | **-1.98**\* | **-.039** | **-.000** | **.048** | **.04** |
| ***Between-Person Level*** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Actor Negative-Direct | -.33 | -7.14\*\*\* | -.423 | -.240 | .000 | .39 | -.28 | -5.14\*\*\* | -.392 | -.175 | .000 | .30 |
| Partner Negative-Direct | -.05 | -1.00 | -.137 | .045 | .317 | .06 | -.01 | -.15 | -.115 | .098 | .879 | .01 |
| Actor Negative-Direct × Partner Negative-Direct | -.06 | -.74 | -.208 | .095 | .460 | .06 | -.07 | -.78 | -.259 | .112 | .437 | .07 |

*Note.* The significant interaction effects presented in bold are similar to that in Figure 2. CI = confidence interval. Effect sizes (*r*) were computed using Rosenthal and Rosnow’s (2007) formula: *r* = √(*t 2* / *t 2* + *df*). Degrees of freedom ranged from 138.25 to 4824.50. \**p* < .05. \*\*\**p* < .001.

**Table SM 13. The effects of Actor Negative-Direct Behavior, Partner Negative-Direct Behavior and Partner Withdrawal on Actors’ Daily Perceived Partner Responsiveness and Relationship Satisfaction**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Perceived Partner Responsiveness** | **Relationship Satisfaction** |
|  |  | *95% CI* |  |  |  |  | *95% CI* |  |  |
| *B* | *t* | *Low* | *High* | *p* | *r* | *B* | *t* | *Low* | *High* | *p* | *r* |
| Intercept | 6.11 | 138.85\*\*\* | 6.024 | 6.198 | .000 | 1.00 | 5.92 | 108.73\*\*\* | 5.813 | 6.029 | .000 | 1.00 |
| ***Within-Person Level*** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Actor Negative-Direct | -.27 | -20.38\*\*\* | -.295 | -.244 | .000 | .29 | -.32 | -20.91\*\*\* | -.355 | -.294 | .000 | .29 |
| Partner Withdrawal | -.05 | -3.87\*\*\* | -.071 | -.023 | .000 | .06 | -.04 | -3.01\*\* | -.071 | -.015 | .003 | .04 |
| Partner Negative-Direct | -.11 | -7.52\*\*\* | -.133 | -.078 | .000 | .11 | -.13 | -7.67\*\*\* | -.157 | -.093 | .000 | .11 |
| Actor Negative-Direct × Partner Withdrawal | **-.04** | **-4.94\*\*\*** | **-.062** | **-.027** | **.000** | **.07** | **-.06** | **-5.34\*\*\*** | **-.077** | **-.036** | **.000** | **.08** |
| Actor Negative-Direct × Partner Negative-Direct | -.02 | -1.96\* | -.036 | .000 | .051 | .04 | .01 | .49 | -.016 | .026 | .627 | .01 |
| ***Between-Person Level*** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Actor Negative-Direct | -.33 | -7.22\*\*\* | -.425 | -.243 | .000 | .40 | -.29 | -5.20\*\*\* | -.394 | -.178 | .000 | .30 |
| Partner Withdrawal | .05 | 1.15 | -.039 | .148 | .249 | .07 | .08 | 1.49 | -.026 | .190 | .137 | .10 |
| Partner Negative-Direct | -.08 | -1.35 | -.195 | .036 | .179 | .08 | -.06 | -.92 | -.197 | .072 | .359 | .06 |
| Actor Negative-Direct × Partner Withdrawal | -.02 | -.46 | -.129 | .080 | .648 | .03 | -.05 | -.85 | -.172 | .068 | .394 | .06 |
| Actor Negative-Direct × Partner Negative-Direct | -.03 | -.35 | -.207 | .145 | .728 | .03 | -.03 | -.24 | -.236 | .185 | .811 | .02 |

*Note.* The significant interaction effects presented in bold are similar to that in Figure 2. CI = confidence interval. Effect sizes (*r*) were computed using Rosenthal and Rosnow’s (2007) formula: *r* = √(*t 2* / *t 2* + *df*). Degrees of freedom ranged from 114.62 to 4778.29. \**p* < .05. \*\**p* < .01. \*\*\**p* < .001.

**Table SM 14. The effects of Actor Negative-Direct Behavior/Partner Negative-Direct Behavior in Daily Lives on Actors’ Perceived Partner Responsiveness and Relationship Satisfaction at Time 2**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Perceived Partner Responsiveness** | **Relationship Satisfaction** |
|  |  | *95% CI* |  |  |  |  | *95% CI* |  |  |
| *B* | *t* | *Low* | *High* | *p* | *r* | *B* | *t* | *Low* | *High* | *p* | *r* |
| Intercept | -.06 | -1.24 | -.158 | .037 | .219 | .12 | -.12 | -1.74 | -.247 | .017 | .086 | .17 |
| Actor Negative-Direct | -.19 | -3.13\*\* | -.314 | -.071 | .002 | .22 | -.09 | -1.26 | -.231 | .051 | .211 | .09 |
| Partner Negative-Direct | -.11 | -1.87 | -.224 | .006 | .063 | .14 | -.15 | -2.16\* | -.287 | -.013 | .032 | .15 |
| Actor Negative-Direct × Partner Negative-Direct | -.06 | -.60 | -.246 | .131 | .548 | .06 | -.20 | -1.56 | -.458 | .055 | .122 | .15 |

*Note.* CI = confidence interval. Effect sizes (*r*) were computed using Rosenthal and Rosnow’s (2007) formula: *r* = √(*t 2* / *t 2* + *df*). Degrees of freedom ranged from 103.42 to 207.78. \**p* < .05. \*\**p* < .01.

**Table SM 15. The effects of Actor Negative-Direct Behavior, Actor Withdrawal, and Partner Withdrawal on Actors’ Daily Perceived Partner Responsiveness and Relationship Satisfaction**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Perceived Partner Responsiveness** | **Relationship Satisfaction** |
|  |  | *95% CI* |  |  |  |  | *95% CI* |  |  |
| *B* | *t* | *Low* | *High* | *p* | *r* | *B* | *t* | *Low* | *High* | *p* | *r* |
| Intercept | 6.10 | 151.87\*\*\* | 6.024 | 6.183 | .000 | 1.00 | 5.90 | 118.32\*\*\* | 5.801 | 5.998 | .000 | 1.00 |
| ***Within-Person Level*** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Actor Negative-Direct | -.23 | -17.01\*\*\* | -.254 | -.201 | .000 | .24 | -.24 | -15.52\*\*\* | -.271 | -.210 | .000 | .22 |
| Actor Withdrawal | -.16 | -13.14\*\*\* | -.182 | -.134 | .000 | .19 | -.25 | -17.95\*\*\* | -.277 | -.222 | .000 | .25 |
| Partner Withdrawal | -.08 | -7.11\*\*\* | -.103 | -.058 | .000 | .10 | -.09 | -7.05\*\*\* | -.118 | -.067 | .000 | .10 |
| Actor Negative-Direct × Partner Withdrawal | **-.04** | **-4.82\*\*\*** | **-.060** | **-.025** | **.000** | **.07** | **-.06** | **-6.04\*\*\*** | **-.082** | **-.042** | **.000** | **.09** |
| Actor Withdrawal × Partner Withdrawal | -.03 | -2.90\*\* | -.043 | -.008 | .004 | .05 | .02 | 1.78 | -.002 | .038 | .075 | .03 |
| ***Between-Person Level*** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Actor Negative-Direct | -.11 | -2.09\* | -.216 | -.006 | .038 | .14 | -.01 | -.19 | -.139 | .115 | .853 | .01 |
| Actor Withdrawal | -.24 | -5.15\*\*\* | -.327 | -.146 | .000 | .31 | -.30 | -5.37\*\*\* | -.408 | -.189 | .000 | .31 |
| Partner Withdrawal | -.02 | -.46 | -.088 | .055 | .644 | .03 | -.02 | -.48 | -.108 | .066 | .630 | .03 |
| Actor Negative-Direct × Partner Withdrawal | .07 | 1.41 | -.029 | .175 | .162 | .10 | .04 | .62 | -.084 | .161 | .538 | .04 |
| Actor Withdrawal × Partner Withdrawal | -.07 | -1.52 | -.162 | .021 | .129 | .11 | -.04 | -.63 | -.150 | .077 | .530 | .05 |

*Note.* The significant interaction effects presented in bold are similar to that in Figure 2. CI = confidence interval. Effect sizes (*r*) were computed using Rosenthal and Rosnow’s (2007) formula: *r* = √(*t 2* / *t 2* + *df*). Degrees of freedom ranged from 136.17 to 4853.72. \**p* < .05. \*\**p* < .01. \*\*\**p* < .001.

**Table SM 16. The effects of Actor Withdrawal/Partner Withdrawal in Daily Lives on Actors’ Perceived Partner Responsiveness and Relationship Satisfaction at Time 2**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Perceived Partner Responsiveness** | **Relationship Satisfaction** |
|  |  | *95% CI* |  |  |  |  | *95% CI* |  |  |
| *B* | *t* | *Low* | *High* | *p* | *r* | *B* | *t* | *Low* | *High* | *p* | *r* |
| Intercept | -.08 | -1.62 | -.176 | .018 | .108 | .16 | -.16 | -2.44\* | -.299 | -.031 | .017 | .23 |
| Actor Withdrawal | -.17 | -3.12\*\* | -.270 | -.061 | .002 | .21 | -.05 | -.79 | -.182 | .078 | .429 | .06 |
| Partner Withdrawal | -.08 | -1.56 | -.179 | .021 | .121 | .11 | -.07 | -1.08 | -.185 | .054 | .282 | .08 |
| Actor Withdrawal × Partner Withdrawal | -.04 | -.64 | -.173 | .088 | .522 | .06 | .04 | .39 | -.144 | .214 | .700 | .04 |

*Note.* CI = confidence interval. Effect sizes (*r*) were computed using Rosenthal and Rosnow’s (2007) formula: *r* = √(*t 2* / *t 2* + *df*). Degrees of freedom ranged from 103.91 to 205.93. \**p* < .05. \*\**p* < .01.
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