

Online Supplement for Daily Stress and Relationship Quality: A Two-Decade Scoping Review
from an Intersectional Lens

Appendix A: Codebook

(RQ1) From whose vantage point is the research being conducted?

Positionality statement included?

- 0 no, 1 yes
 - If 1, record details

Log each author's department

Log each authors' geographic region

Code collective author list geographic region (i.e., all authors are located in...)

- 0 = United States
- 1 = English-Speaking countries (e.g., Australia, Canada, New Zealand, and United Kingdom)
- 2 = Europe
- 3 = Asia
- 4 = Latin America
- 5 = Africa
- 6 = Middle East
- 7 = Israel
- 8 = Authors from multiple regions

First author career stage

- 0 = information not provided
- 1 = first author is a student
- 2 = first author is a post-doc
- 3 = first author is an assistant professor
- 4 = first author is an associate or full professor
- 5 = other (please specify; e.g., research scientist)

Funding information

- 0 = no funding mentioned
- 1 = Internal/university funding
- 2 = Private agency funding
- 3 = State funding
- 4 = Federal/National funding

(RQ2) What types of questions are valued?

(Stress or Stressors) Perception of stress or stressors examined

- 0 = Stress (e.g., psychological experience of stress – intensity)
- 1 = stressors (e.g., list of stressors – checklist or rating of individual stressors and/or numbers of stressors)
- 2 = Both (e.g., number of stressors AND how stressful they were [intensity/severity score of those stressors])

(General vs. Specific Type) General stress/stressors (e.g., daily hassles) or specific types of stress (e.g., minority stress, parenting stress, pain-related stress, age-related stress, etc.)

- 0 = general stress examined, not specific to identity
- 1 = stress specific to a single identity is focused on (e.g., socioeconomic stress OR sexual minority stress; single identities examined separately)
 - 1a = Socioeconomic stress and/or financial stress
 - 1b = Sexual minority stress
 - 1c = Minority stress
 - 1d = Health-related stress
 - 1e = Occupational or School-Related stress
 - 1f = Parenting stress
 - 1g = other (please indicate)
- 2 = stress specific to multiple identities is examined as interacting (e.g., socioeconomic stress AND minority stress) - indicate which using a-g above

Stress Scale Used (if named)

Relationship Quality Constructs measured (include scale name if provided)

Relationship Quality (RQ) Codes – for *daily* measures of RQ

- 1 = Satisfaction/happiness (including RQ measured by Relationship Assessment Scale)
- 2 = Commitment
- 3 = Intimacy/closeness
- 4 = Trust
- 5 = Passion
- 6 = Love
- 7 = Global RQ (e.g., total score of PRQC)

Quantitative or Qualitative

- 1 = Quantitative
- 2 = Qualitative

Self-report or observational

- 1 = Self-report
- 2 = Observational/Physiological

Number of assessments per day

Number of days sampled

Dyadic data or individual

- 1 = Individual
- 2 = Dyadic
- 3 = Both; some are individuals without partner, some dyadic

Theoretical perspective (list theories used for guiding RQs or Hypotheses)

Role of sample characteristics in research question and design (adapted from Williamson et al., 2022).

- 1 = No special consideration to sample characteristics in the research questions or design (“Basic Science”). E.g., may have a diverse sample, but focus is on advancing general knowledge about relationships.
- 2 = Research focuses on replication of results in a different sample (“Generalizability”). E.g., is a documented phenomenon also found in a new demographic? For example, “research has found this finding, but because the literature has focused on heterosexual samples, we examine whether these results also apply in same-gender couples.”
- 3 = research focuses on a question about a specific population with the goal of learning more about how this group operates in their romantic relationship or in comparison to another group (“Population Specific”). E.g., how does minority stress affect relationship quality in same-gender couples?

(RQ3) Who is included in the research vs. who is left out/whose voices are missing?

Participant Recruitment Criteria

- Summarize provided info

Participant analytic sample inclusion/exclusion criteria

- Summarize provided info

Sample Size

Age

- Range, mean, SD
- Percent by age group (if available; adapted from [APA](#))
 - Emerging adulthood (18-25)
 - Adulthood (25-35)
 - Middle adulthood (36-64)
 - Later adulthood (65+ years)

Ageism Intersectionality Code

- 1 = Sample age unknown or no questions asked

- 2 = information about age is provided. The sample is entirely in emerging adulthood or adulthood (I.e., under 36).
- 3a = Participants of diverse ages (including middle adulthood and later) are included, but age is not included in analyses.
- 3b = Participants of diverse ages (including middle adulthood and later) are included. Age is included in analyses but primarily as a covariate/control variable.
- 3c = Participants of diverse ages (including middle adulthood and later) are included, and similarities or differences based on participant age are explored
- 4a = Sample is specific to middle adulthood and/or later adulthood participants, but focus is on broad relationship processes (not specific to middle/late adulthood).
- 4b = Sample is purposely specific to middle adulthood and/or later adulthood participants and their experiences; focus is on this single identity status
- 5 = Sample places emphasis on intersecting identities (e.g., older people of color) – 2+ intersectionality wheel pieces are of primary focus.

Class

- Education Reported? Y/N
- Education Level (for United States samples; adapted from Williamson et al., 2022)
 - Percent with equivalent of high school diploma or less
 - Percent with any college education or more (e.g., graduate school)
- Other education details (if applicable)

Income

- Income Reported? Y/N
- Summarize any provided income details
- Percent of sample that are students
 - NA = Not applicable, NR = Not reported)

Classism Intersectionality Code

- 1 = Sample income and education are unknown or no questions asked
- 2 = information about income and/or education is provided. The sample is entirely middle/high income and/or highly educated (i.e., at least some college completed).
- 3a = Participants of lower income and/or education (e.g., high school equivalent or lower) are included, but income and/or education are not included in analyses.
- 3b = Participants of lower income and/or education are included. Income and/or education are included in analyses but primarily as a covariate/control variable.
- 3c = Participants of lower income and/or education are included, and similarities or differences based on income and/or education are explored.
- 4a = Sample is specific to low income and/or low education participants (e.g., low income married couples), but focus is on broad relationship processes (not specific to income or education).
- 4b = Sample is purposely specific low income and/or low education participants and their experiences; focus is on this single identity status (e.g., low income married couples)
- 5 = Sample places emphasis on intersecting identities (e.g., low income people of color) – 2+ intersectionality wheel pieces are of primary focus.

Gender/Gender-identity
Question about sex? Y/N

Question about Gender Identity? Y/N?

Percentages of genders

- Percent men
- Percent women
- Percent Nonbinary or minority gender identities
 - (NA = Not Applicable, NR = Not reported [includes presumption all participants are cisgender])

Gender/Gender-based Oppression Intersectionality Code

- 1 = Sample gender is unknown or no questions asked
- 2 = information about sample gender is provided. The sample is entirely women OR entirely men, but focus is on broad relationship processes (not specific to their gender).
- 3a = Both men and women are included, but gender is not included in analyses.
- 3b = Both men and women are included. Gender is included in analyses, but primarily as a covariate/control variable.
- 3c = Both men and women are included, and similarities or differences based on gender are explored.
- 4 = Sample is purposely specific to one gender and their experiences as an oppressed group; focus is on this single identity status
- 5 = Sample places emphasis on intersecting identities (e.g., women of color) – 2+ intersectionality wheel pieces are of primarily focus.

Cisnormativity Intersectionality Code

- 1 = Sample gender identity is unknown or no questions asked. There may be a presumption that all participants are cisgender (e.g., number of men and women reported, no mention of gender identity)
- 2 = information about gender identity is provided (i.e., participants were asked their gender identity). The sample is entirely cisgender (e.g., they specifically report 0 nonbinary or trans participants, or removed gender minorities from analyses).
- 3a = Gender minority participants are included, but gender identity is not included in analyses.
- 3b = Gender minority participants are included. Gender identity is included in analyses but primarily as a covariate/control variable.
- 3c = Gender minority participants are included, and similarities or differences based on gender identity are explored.
- 4a = Sample is specific to gender minority individuals; focus is on broad relationship processes (not specific to their gender identity status).
- 4b = Sample is purposely specific to gender minority individuals and their experiences; focus is on this single identity status.
- 5 = Sample places emphasis on intersecting identities (e.g., gender minority people of color) – 2+ intersectionality wheel pieces are of primarily focus.

Geographic location of participants (adapted from Williamson et al.,2022)

- 0 = United States
- 1 = English-Speaking countries (Australia, Canada, New Zealand, & United Kingdom)
- 2 = Europe
- 3 = Asia
- 4 = Latin America
- 5 = Africa
- 6 = Middle East
- 7 = Israel
- 8 = participants from multiple regions (added)

Placeism/WEIRD Samples Intersectionality Code

- 1 = Sample geographic location is unknown or no questions asked.
- 2 = information about geographic region is provided. The sample is entirely from a single Western industrialized nation.
- 3a = Participants from multiple nations are included, but geographic region is not included in analyses.
3b = Participants from multiple nations are included. Geographic region is included in analyses but primarily as a covariate/control variable.
- 3c = Participants from multiple nations are included, and similarities or differences based on participant geographic location are explored
- 4a = Sample is specific to participants from a non-Western or non-industrialized nation. Focus is on broad relationship processes (not specific to their identity or context living in a non-Western or non-industrialized nation).
- 4b = Sample is purposely specific to participants from a non-Western or non-industrialized nation and their experiences (e.g., all participants from China); focus is on this single identity status.
- 5 = Sample places emphasis on intersecting identities (e.g., LGB people living in China) – 2+ intersectionality wheel pieces are of primarily focus.

Race/Ethnicity

- Data provided about race and/or ethnicity? Y/N
- Percent of Participants White/Caucasian/of European descent
- Report percentages of any reported race/ethnicity demographics

Racism Intersectionality Code

- 1 = Sample race/ethnicity unknown or no questions asked
- 2 = information about race/ethnicity is provided. The sample is entirely Caucasian/White/of European descent participants.
- 3a = Participants of different races/ethnicities are included, but race/ethnicity is not included in analyses.
- 3b = Participants of different races/ethnicities are included. Race/ethnicity is included in analyses but primarily as covariate/control variable.

- 3c = Participants of different races/ethnicities are included, and similarities or differences based on race/ethnicity are explored
- 4a = Sample is specific to racial/ethnic minorities (e.g., African Americans). Focus is on broad relationship processes (not specific to race or ethnicity).
- 4b = Sample is purposely specific to racial/ethnic minorities (e.g., African Americans) and their experiences; focus is on this single identity status
- 5 = Sample places emphasis on intersecting identities (e.g., LGB African Americans) – 2+ intersectionality wheel pieces are of primarily focus.

Gender make-up of couples

- Percent different-gender couples (NR = Not reported)
- Percent same-gender couples (NR = Not reported)
- Percent nonbinary or other (NA = not applicable, NR = Not reported)

Sexual Orientation

- NR = No sexual orientation information reported
- 1 = Presumption of heterosexual identity (i.e., all participants in different-gender relationships and described as heterosexual)
- 2 = Presumption of gay or lesbian identity (i.e., participants in same-gender relationships and described as gay or lesbian)
- 3 = Individuals' sexual identities reported (provide percentages)

Heteronormativity Intersectionality Code

- 1 = Sample sexual orientation is unknown or no questions asked. There may be a presumption that all participants are heterosexual (e.g., sample is entirely married men and their wives, participants described as heterosexual).
- 2 = information about sexual orientation is provided (i.e., participants were asked their sexual orientation irrespective of their partner's gender). The sample is entirely heterosexual (e.g., they specifically report 0 LGB participants, or removed same-gender couples from analyses).
- 3a = Sexual minority participants are included, but sexual orientation is not included in analyses.
- 3b = Sexual minority participants are included. Sexual orientation is included in analyses, but primarily as a covariate/control variable.
- 3c = Sexual minority participants are included, and similarities or differences based on sexual orientation are explored.
- 4a = Sample is specific to sexual minority individuals. Focus is on broad relationship processes (not specific to their sexual orientation).
- 4b = Sample is purposely specific to sexual minority individuals and their experiences; focus is on this single identity status.
- 5 = Sample places emphasis on intersecting identities (e.g., sexual minority people of color) – 2+ intersectionality wheel pieces are of primarily focus.

Ability/Disability status

- Record details as relevant

- NR = Not reported

Ableism Intersectionality Code

- 1 = Sample ability/disability status unknown or no questions asked
- 2 = information about ability/disability is provided. The sample is entirely participants with no disabilities.
- 3a = Participants of different ability statuses are included, but ability status is not included in analyses.
- 3b = Participants of different ability statuses are included. Ability status is included in analyses but primarily as a covariate/control variable.
- 3b = Participants of different ability statuses are included, and similarities or differences based on ability/disability are explored
- 4a = Sample is specific to participants with a disability (e.g., participants with physical, mental, or intellectual disabilities). Focus is on broad relationship processes (not specific to their ability status).
- 4b = Sample is purposely specific to participants with a disability (e.g., participants with physical, mental, or intellectual disabilities) and their experiences; focus is on this single identity status
- 5 = Sample places emphasis on intersecting identities (e.g., low income participants with diabetes) – 2+ intersectionality wheel pieces are of primary focus.

----- End of Coding -----

References for Codebook

APA Dictionary of Psychology. *American Psychological Association*, American Psychological Association, <https://dictionary.apa.org/adulthood>.

Williamson, H. C., Bornstein, J. X., Cantu, V., Ciftci, O., Farnish, K. A., & Shouweiler, M. T. (2022). How diverse are the samples used to study intimate relationships? A systematic review. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 39(4), 1087-1109.
<https://doi.org/10.31234/osf.io/c6qfy>

Appendix B: References of Articles Included for the Scoping Review

- Ben-Ari, A., & Lavee, Y. (2011). How does socio-political context shape daily living: The case of Jews and Arabs in Israel. *Psychology*, 2(1), 1-100.
<https://doi.org/10.4236/psych.2011.210>
- Ben- Ari, A., & Lavee, Y. (2007). The effect of security- related stress on dyadic closeness among Jews and Arabs in Israel: A daily diary study. *Family process*, 46(3), 381-393.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1545-5300.2007.00218.x>
- Benlian, A. (2020). A daily field investigation of technology-driven spillovers from work to home. *MIS Quarterly*, 44(3), 1259-1300. <https://doi.org/10.25300/MISQ/2020/14911>
- Buck, A. A., & Neff, L. A. (2012). Stress spillover in early marriage: The role of self-regulatory depletion. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 26(5), 698-708.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/a0029260>
- Campbell, S. B., & Renshaw, K. D. (2019). Daily posttraumatic stress disorder symptom accommodation and relationship functioning in military couples. *Family process*, 58(4), 908-919. <https://doi.org/10.1111/famp.12393>
- Carson, J. W., Carson, K. M., Gil, K. M., & Baucom, D. H. (2004). Mindfulness-based relationship enhancement. *Behavior therapy*, 35(3), 471-494.
[https://doi.org/10.1016/S0005-7894\(04\)80028-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0005-7894(04)80028-5)
- Debrot, A., Siegler, S., Klumb, P. L., & Schoebi, D. (2018). Daily work stress and relationship satisfaction: Detachment affects romantic couples' interactions quality. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 19(8), 2283-2301. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10902-017-9922-6>

- Estlein, R., & Lavee, Y. (2021). Effect of daily stress on desire for physical proximity and emotional closeness. *Journal of Family Issues*.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0192513X211007528>
- Frost, D. M., & Fingerhut, A. W. (2016). Daily exposure to negative campaign messages decreases same-sex couples' psychological and relational well-being. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, 19(4), 477-492. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1368430216642028>
- Girme, Y. U., Maniaci, M. R., Reis, H. T., McNulty, J. K., Carmichael, C. L., Gable, S. L., Baker, L. R., & Overall, N. C. (2018). Does support need to be seen? Daily invisible support promotes next day relationship well-being. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 32(7), 882-893. <https://doi.org/10.1037/fam0000453>
- Hilpert, P., Xu, F., Milek, A., Atkins, D. C., Bodenmann, G., & Bradbury, T. N. (2018). Couples coping with stress: Between-person differences and within-person processes. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 32(3), 366-374. <https://doi.org/10.1037/fam0000380>
- Lavee, Y., & Ben-Ari, A. (2007). Relationship of dyadic closeness with work-related stress: A daily diary study. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 69(4), 1021-1035.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3737.2007.00428.x>
- Milek, A., Butler, E. A., & Bodenmann, G. (2015). The interplay of couple's shared time, women's intimacy, and intradyadic stress. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 29(6), 831-842.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/fam0000133>
- Neff, L. A., Gleason, M. E., Crockett, E. E., & Ciftci, O. (2021). Blame the pandemic: Buffering the association between stress and relationship quality during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/19485506211022813>

- Li, T., & Fung, H. H. (2013). How negative interactions affect relationship satisfaction: The paradoxical short-term and long-term effects of commitment. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, 4(3), 274-281. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1948550612453748>
- Righetti, F., Gere, J., Hofmann, W., Visserman, M. L., & Van Lange, P. A. (2016). The burden of empathy: Partners' responses to divergence of interests in daily life. *Emotion*, 16(5), 684. <https://doi.org/10.1037/emo0000163>
- Totenhagen, C. J., Serido, J., Curran, M. A., & Butler, E. A. (2012). Daily hassles and uplifts: A diary study on understanding relationship quality. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 26, 719-728. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0029628>
- Totenhagen, C. J., Butler, E. A., & Ridley, C. A. (2012). Daily stress, closeness, and satisfaction in gay and lesbian couples. *Personal Relationships*, 19(2), 219-233. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-6811.2011.01349.x>
- Totenhagen, C. J., & Curran, M. A. (2011). Daily hassles, sacrifices, and relationship quality for pregnant cohabitators. *Family Science*, 2, 68-72. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19424620.2011.597101>
- Totenhagen, C. J., Curran, M. A., Serido, J., & Butler, E. A. (2013). Good days, bad days: Do sacrifices improve relationship quality? *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 30(7), 881-900. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0265407512472475>
- Totenhagen, C. J., Randall, A., K., Cooper, A. N., Tao, C., & Walsh, K. J. (2017). Stress spillover and crossover in same-sex couples: Concurrent and lagged daily effects. *Journal of GLBT Family Studies*, 31(3), 236-256. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1550428X.2016.1203273>

- Totenhagen, C. J., Wilmarth, M. J., Serido, J., & Betancourt, A. E. (2018). Do day-to-day finances play a role in relationship satisfaction? A dyadic investigation. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 32(4), 528-537. <https://doi.org/10.1037/fam0000406>
- Totenhagen, C. J., Randall, A. K., & Lloyd, K. (2018). Stress and relationship functioning in same-sex couples: The vulnerabilities of internalized homophobia and outness. *Family Relations*, 67(3), 399-413. <https://doi.org/10.1111/fare.12311>