Supplemental Materials:

Exclude Me, Enjoy Us?

Unmitigated Communion and Relationship Satisfaction Across Seven Years

Appendix S.A

Theorizing Change-Predicting-Change in Unmitigated Communion and Relationship

Satisfaction

From a relational developmental systems (RDS) perspective, development moves in between processes of stability and change in ways that help individuals navigate life's ebbs and flows (e.g., Lerner et al., 2015); sometimes consistency in intrapersonal characteristics and interpersonal relations is needed to shield individuals from contextual changes, other times flexibility is needed to adapt to new circumstances and experience self-growth. As such, the ways in which people change across time can be prompted by how they or their partners *were* in the past or tended to be (e.g., their level of a trait, their behavioral tendencies), as well as by how they or their partners have *changed* in the past (i.e., the rate at which they have adopted more or less of a trait or behavior). Although we focus on this first type of change process in our manuscript (i.e., how one's prior level of unmitigated communion influences the rate of change in future relationship satisfaction [and vice versa]), it is also plausible that *prior changes* in unmitigated communion may influence *future changes* in relationship satisfaction (and vice versa). Parsing apart these unique change processes that otherwise get inflated in much developmental research enables us to distinguish, for example, what serves as a stronger predictor of an individual's decline in relationship satisfaction: is it because their partner has a generally high tendency to provide extreme care, or is it because their partner changed in their typical provisions of extreme care (or both)?

No work, to our knowledge, has explored these discontinuous change processes between unmitigated communion and relationship satisfaction. On the one hand, it is possible that the positive links between unmitigated communion and relationship satisfaction may exist regardless of whether we are looking at how prior *levels* of one construct predict changes in the other construct or if we are looking at how prior *changes* in one construct predict changes in the other. In other words, if higher levels of unmitigated communion predict a slower decline in relationship satisfaction (as we predict in hypothesis 1a and 1b), it may also be the case that positive change within relatively smaller windows of time (i.e., increases from year-to-year) predict a similarly slow decline in relationship satisfaction. The same logic can be applied when thinking about how changes in relationship satisfaction may influence future changes in unmitigated communion. Thus, a positive feedback loop may exist between the two types of change processes that unmitigated communion and relationship satisfaction can potentially follow, such that higher levels of and positive changes in one construct may predict a more gradual decline in the other construct (and vice versa).

On the other hand, there may be important changes in these variables that underpin their own and each other's developmental trajectories that could ultimately *disrupt* the positive link between unmitigated communion and relationship satisfaction. For example, some work demonstrates positive associations between unmitigated communion and being intrusive in others' lives and problems (e.g., Helgeson et al., 2015; Helgeson & Fritz, 1998). If individuals become intensely involved in their partners' lives over a shorter window of time, perhaps from a stressful life circumstance or a period of felt insecurity, these behaviors may be perceived as overbearing to their partners (e.g., Helgeson & Fritz, 2000). These intrusive perceptions may be especially prevalent if partners are not used to such extreme levels of care (i.e., the change was

unexpected) or did not solicit these actions (i.e., the change was unrequested), which may detract

from their satisfaction in the relationship. Given the dearth of research on how changes in

unmitigated communion may be linked to changes in relationship satisfaction (and potential

necessary conditions that may elicit partners' negative perceptions on such changes in extreme

care), we put forth two tentative directional hypotheses, but do not specify how the *rate* of

change may be implicated in these associations. Specifically, if one partner increases in

unmitigated communion between prior waves, then the other partner will decrease in relationship

satisfaction between future waves (hypothesis 3a). Similarly, if one partner increases in

relationship satisfaction between prior waves, then the other partner will decrease in unmitigated

communion between future waves (hypothesis 3b).

Bivariate Autoregressive Cross-Lagged Latent Change Score Model Results for Change-

Predicting-Change Predictions

Before discussing the results about how prior change in one construct predicts future

change in the other construct, a notable pattern emerged in both the anchor and partner models: a

more gradual decrease in each construct predicted a faster decrease for itself between the next

two waves (e.g., slower declines in relationship satisfaction between Waves 1 and 3 predicted a

more rapid satisfaction decrease between Waves 3 and 5). In terms of our change-predicting-

change hypotheses, we predicted that one partner's increases in unmitigated communion between

prior waves would predict a decrease in the other partner's relationship satisfaction between

future waves (hypothesis 3a). Similarly, if one partner increased in relationship satisfaction

between prior waves, then the other partner would experience declines in unmitigated

communion between future waves (hypothesis 3b). We found that in the anchor relationship

satisfaction model, one significant path between the change scores emerged: a more gradual

decrease in unmitigated communion between Waves 3 and 5 predicted a more gradual decrease in anchor relationship satisfaction between Waves 5 and 7, counter to the partner effect predicted in hypothesis 3a. We did not find support for hypothesis 3b about prior changes in relationship satisfaction influencing future changes in unmitigated communion. In the multiple-group model with partner relationship satisfaction, we did not find support for hypothesis 3a or 3b. The full results for these predictions can be found in Table S.A.1.

Table S.A.1

Standardized Bivariate Autoregressive Cross-Lagged Latent Change Score Modeling Change-Predicting-Change Results for

Relationship Satisfaction and Unmitigated Communion (n = 1,340 Anchors and Partners)

	Anchor Rel. Sat. Model			Male Anchor Partner Rel. Sat. Model			Female Anchor Partner Rel. Sat. Model		
	Δ W 1 to 3	Δ W 3 to 5	Δ W 5 to 7	Δ W 1 to 3	Δ W 3 to 5	Δ W 5 to 7	Δ W 1 to 3	Δ W 3 to 5	Δ W 5 to 7
Predicting UC									
Prior Δ in Rel. Sat.	-	-.03[a]	-.03[a]	-	-.03[a]	-.02[a]	-	-.03[a]	-.03[a]
Prior Δ in UC	-	-.20*[b]	-.19*[b]	-	-.19*[b]	-.19*[b]	-	-.21*[b]	-.20*[b]
Predicting Rel. Sat.									
Prior Δ in UC	-	-.03	.05*	-	-.01[c]	-.02[c]	-	.03[c]	.03[c]
Prior Δ in Rel. Sat.	-	-.22*[d]	-.21*[d]	-	-.16*[e]	-.17*[e]	-	-.21*[e]	-.18*[e]

Note: [a–e]Signifies within-model paths constrained to equality. Rel. Sat. = Relationship Satisfaction. UC = Unmitigated Communion.

Relationship duration, anchor willingness to sacrifice, and anchor and partner self-esteem and fear of love withdrawal are included as

covariates in all models, and anchor sex is an additional covariate in the anchor relationship satisfaction model. Anchor relationship

satisfaction model fit indices: χ^2 (166) = 263.702; RMSEA = .021 [C. I. = .016, .026]; CFI = .966; TLI = .959; SRMR = .021.

Multiple-group partner relationship satisfaction model fit indices: χ^2 (317) = 424.035; RMSEA = .022 [C. I. = .016, .028], CFI = .970;

TLI = .963; SRMR = .029.

* *p* < .05

Appendix S.B

Comparing Original Pairfam Couple Sample to Our Sub-Sample of Continuing Partners

We computed a series of *t* tests to determine whether our subsample of continuing partners differed from the original sample of couples in pairfam on the variables under investigation, as well as on a few demographic variables. Of the 10 *t* tests computed exploring differences in the key variables under investigation in this study (and correcting for family-wise error), three significant differences emerged. First, anchors in our subsample reported higher relationship satisfaction (*M* = 8.39, *SD* = 2.04) than the original sample (*M* = 8.12, *SD* = 2.27). Second, partners in our subsample were in their relationships for longer periods of time at baseline (*M* = 9.45 years, *SD* = 5.54 years) compared to partners in the original sample (*M* = 8.30 years, *SD* = 5.60 years). Third, anchors in our subsample reported lower fear of love withdrawal (*M* = 1.55, *SD* = .69) than the original sample (*M* = 1.63, *SD* = .75). Importantly, we would expect differences like this in our subsample, as the relative stability inherent in continuing partnerships likely corresponds to partners' heightened satisfaction and security in the relationship as a whole. In terms of demographic variables, our subsample had higher monthly incomes (*M* = €2,897.22, *SD* = €1,332.19), higher education (*M* = 5.13, *SD* = 1.82), and more children (*M* = 1.21, *SD* = 1.12) than the original sample (income: *M* = €2,599.29, *SD* = €1,349.66; education: *M* = 4.65, *SD* = 1.88; children: *M* = 1.08, *SD* = 1.10), illustrating key limits of generalizability for this subsample.

Appendix S.C

Information on the Mechanical Turk Study and Sample

To validate the pairfam unmitigated communion item (and several other pairfam variables), we conducted a study using Amazon's Mechanical Turk that compared pairfam measures against well-established, more comprehensive measures of the same constructs. This Mechanical Turk study was launched (and the results were analyzed) prior to running the analyses in the present study. Our original target sample for the Mechanical Turk study was approximately 500 participants. We selected this sample size because we also included an experimental manipulation of sexual rejection (after all of our key questions for this paper), which required approximately 100 participants per rejection condition (5 conditions in total) in a between-subjects design. We ended up with a final sample of 498 participants, but after filtering out 12 participants who failed our attention checks and/or honesty probes, our final subsample was 486. The study took approximately 15 minutes to complete, and each participant was compensated with $2.00 CAD. Demographic information about this sample can be found in Table S.C.1.

Table S.C.1

Mechanical Turk Validation Study Sample Demographics (N = 486)

Demographic Variable	*M* (range) or *n*	*SD* or %
Age (years)	35.9 (19 - 69)	9.7
Gender		
Women	264	54.3%
Men	221	45.5%
Transgender	1	0.2%
Ethnicity		
Western European	244	50.1%
Eastern European	95	19.5%
Bi- or multi-ethnic	33	6.8%
Native American	30	6.2%
African	26	5.5%
East Asian	15	3.1%
Hispanic/Latinx	15	3.1%
Caribbean	12	2.5%
South Asian	6	1.2%
Middle Eastern	3	0.6%
South East Asian	2	0.4%
Other/Not Reported	5	1.0%
Relationship status		
Married	255	52.5%
Dating (exclusive)	176	36.2%
Engaged	31	6.4%
Dating (more than one person)	18	3.7%
Other	6	1.2%
Highest Level of Education		
Some high school	2	0.4%
High school diploma/some university	106	21.9%
Associate, vocational, or two-year degree	109	22.3%
Bachelor's degree	198	40.8%
Master's degree or higher	71	14.6%
Relationship Duration	9.4	8.3
Employed Full-Time in Paid Labour	332	68.3%

Validation of the Pairfam Unmitigated Communion Item

We determined a priori that if a confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) with the pairfam item and the established scale items as indicators had good model fit and showed the pairfam item significantly loading onto the latent construct of interest, this would provide evidence of construct validity for the pairfam item. Model fit was evaluated by the following global fit indices: the chi-square test (χ^2), the root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA), the comparative fit index (CFI), the Tucker-Lewis Index (TLI), and standardized root mean square residual (SRMR). A non-significant chi-square, values greater than .95 for CFI and TLI, and values smaller than .06 and .08 for RMSEA and SRMR suggest good model fit (Little, 2013). To make our test even more rigorous, we proposed that if the pairfam indicator had more than half of its variance explained by the latent construct (i.e., a standardized factor loading equal to or greater than .71; Kline, 2016), then we would have additional evidence of a high quality pairfam item.

We computed a CFA with the unmitigated communion pairfam item and the nine items (parceled into three indicators) from the Unmitigated Communion Scale (UCS; Fritz & Helgeson, 1998; see Table S.C.2 for full scale) adapted to be about an intimate partner. Specifying a latent unmitigated communion construct with indicators from pairfam and the established measure proved a good fit to the data, x^2 (2) = 2.144; RMSEA = .011 [C.I. = .000, .091]; CFI = 1.000; TLI = .999; SRMR = .009, and the pairfam indicator had an acceptable standardized factor loading of .73 (which was greater than the UCS indicators that ranged from .64 to .70). Thus, the single item measuring unmitigated communion in pairfam provided strong evidence of construct validity.

To test the discriminate validity of the pairfam unmitigated communion item, we also

computed a CFA with the UCS and Communal Strength Scale (CSS; Mills, Clark, Ford, &

Johnson, 2004; see Table S.C.2 for full scale) to distinguish it from the related construct of

communal motivation. We specified a latent unmitigated communion construct (with the pairfam

indicator and the USC items as indicators) and a latent communal motivation construct (with the

pairfam indicator and the CSS items as indicators). This baseline model proved good fit to the

data, x^2 (12) = 23.132; RMSEA = .044 [C.I. = .015, .070]; CFI = .991; TLI = .985; SRMR =

.030. To test whether the pairfam item was a stronger indicator of unmitigated communion

versus communal motivation, we applied equality constraints to the pairfam items loading onto

each of the latent constructs and compared the constrained model fit to the baseline model. A

significant chi-square difference test would provide evidence that the constraints significantly

reduced model fit, suggesting that the pairfam item is a stronger indicator of the construct on

which the absolute value of its factor loading is larger. The application of equality constraints

significantly reduced model fit, x^2 (13) = 100.490; RMSEA = .118 [C.I. = .097 .140]; CFI = .931;

TLI = .889; SRMR = .069; x^2_{diff} (1) = 77.358, $p < .001$, providing evidence that the pairfam item

is a significantly stronger indicator of unmitigated communion (standardized factor loading =

.82) than of communal motivation (standardized factor loading = -.14).

Validation of the Pairfam Relationship Satisfaction Item

We also validated pairfam's relationship satisfaction measure in the aforementioned

Mechanical Turk study. We computed one CFA with the pairfam relationship satisfaction item

and the four items (parceled into three indicators) from the Couples Satisfaction Index (CSI-4;

Funk & Rogge, 2007; see Table S.C.2 for full scale) and another CFA with the pairfam item and

the five items (parceled into three indicators) from the Global Relationship Satisfaction Subscale

of the Investment Model Scale (IMS; Rusbult, Martz, & Agnew, 1998; see Table S.C.2 for full

scale). Akin to the unmitigated communion CFA, specifying a latent relationship satisfaction construct with indicators from pairfam and the established measure fit the data well and demonstrated acceptable factor loadings. The CSI-4 model: $x^2 (2) = 11.005$; RMSEA = .096 [C.I. = .046, .155]; CFI = .996; TLI = .987; SRMR = .007; pairfam factor loading = .91; CS1-4 factor loadings = from .88 to .96. The IMS model: $x^2 (2) = 10.692$; RMSEA = .095 [C.I. = .045, .154]; CFI = .996; TLI = .988; SRMR = .007; pairfam factor loading =.94; IMS factor loadings = from .89 to .93. Pairfam's relationship satisfaction item therefore passed both tests of construct validity when compared to two established satisfaction scales, providing evidence that it is a valid indicator of the construct.

Table S.C.2

Pairfam Items and Measures Included in Mechanical Turk Validation Study

Construct & Pairfam Item	Measures in Mechanical Turk Validation Study
Unmitigated Communion Often, I leave everything else aside in order to support my partner. Scale: 1 = *not at all* to 5 = *absolutely* Source: Bierhoff, Grau, & Ludwig (1993)	**Unmitigated Communion Scale** Using the scale below, choose the number that indicates the extent to which you agree or disagree. Think of your relationship with your romantic partner when responding to each statement. 1. I always place the needs of my partner above my own. 2. I never find myself getting overly involved in my partner's problems. 3. For me to be happy, I need my partner to be happy. 4. I worry about how my partner will get along without me when I am not there. 5. I have no trouble getting to sleep at night when my partner is upset. 6. It is impossible for me to satisfy my own needs when they interfere with the needs of my partner. 7. I can't say no when my partner asks me for help. 8. Even when exhausted, I will always help my partner. 9. I often worry about my partner's problems. Scale: 1 = *strongly disagree* to 5 = *strongly agree* Source: Adapted from Fritz & Helgeson (1998) to be specifically about romantic partners.
Unmitigated Communion (test of discriminant validity) Often, I leave everything else aside in order to support my partner. Scale: 1 = *not at all* to 5 = *absolutely* Source: Bierhoff, Grau, & Ludwig (1993)	**Communal Strength Scale** 1. How far would you be willing to go to visit your partner? 2. How happy do you feel when doing something that helps your partner? 3. How large a benefit would you be likely to give to your partner? 4. How large a cost would you incur to meet a need of your partner? 5. How readily can you put the needs of your partner out of your thoughts? 6. How high a priority for you is meeting the needs of your partner? 7. How reluctant would you be to sacrifice for your partner? 8. How much would you be willing to give up to benefit your partner? 9. How far would you go out of your way to do something for your partner? 10. How easily could you accept not helping your partner? Scale: 0 = *not at all* to 4 = *extremely* Source: Mills, Clark, Ford, & Johnson (2004)

Relationship Satisfaction	Couples Satisfaction Index
All in all, how satisfied are you with your relationship?	1. Please indicate the degree of happiness, all things considered, of your relationship.
Scale: 0 = *very dissatisfied* to 10 = *very satisfied*	Scale: 0 = *extremely unhappy*, 1 = *fairly unhappy*, 2 = *a little unhappy*, 3 = *happy*, 4 = *very happy*, 5 = *extremely happy*, 6 = *perfect*
	2. I have a warm and comfortable relationship with my partner.
Source: Hendrick, Dicke, & Hendrick, (1998)	Scale: 0 = *not at all true*, 1 = *a little true*, 2 = *somewhat true*, 3 = *mostly true*, 4 = *almost completely true*, 5 = *completely true*
	3. How rewarding is your relationship with your partner?
	4. In general, how satisfied are you with your relationship?
	Scale: 0 = *not at all*, 1 = *a little*, 2 = *somewhat*, 3 = *mostly*, 4 = *almost completely*, 5 = *completely*
	Source: Funk & Rogge (2007)

Global Relationship Satisfaction Subscale of the Investment Model Scale
1. I feel satisfied with our relationship.
2. My relationship is much better than others' relationships.
3. My relationship is close to ideal.
4. Our relationship makes me very happy.
5. Our relationship does a good job of fulfilling my needs for intimacy, companionship, etc.

Scale: 0 = *do not agree at all* to 8 = *agree completely*

Source: Rusbult, Martz, & Agnew (1998)

Appendix S.D

Covariate Correlations

Being in a longer-term union was linked to lower partner relationship satisfaction (r = -.07), but higher unmitigated communion was associated with a greater willingness to sacrifice (rs from .32 to .40). Anchor self-esteem was positively linked to unmitigated communion (rs from .06 to .12) and anchor (rs from .16 to .27) and partner (rs from .14 to .20) relationship satisfaction, whereas higher partner self-esteem was linked to higher satisfaction only (anchor rs from .08 to .17; partner rs from .26 to .37). Finally, higher fear of love withdrawal was linked to lower anchor relationship satisfaction (anchor fear rs from -.21 to -.29; partner fear rs from -.13 to -.23) and partner relationship satisfaction (anchor fear rs from -.19 to -.27; partner fear rs from -.28 to -.43), but only partner-reported fear of love withdrawal was negatively linked to unmitigated communion (rs from -.07 to -.22). A detailed overview of the correlations among the focal study variables and the covariates at each wave (as well as descriptive statistics for all study variables) is included in Tables S.D.1-S.D.4.

Table S.D.1

Wave 1 *Correlations and Descriptive Statistics Between Focal Variables and Covariates for Female Anchors Above and Male*

Anchors Below the Diagonal (n = 1,340 Anchors and Partners)

Variable	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.	9.	*M*	*SD*	*% Miss*
1. Anchor Unmitigated Comm. W1	-	.10*	.12*	.39*	.05	.07	.05	-.14*	-.00	3.58	.99	1.20
2. Anchor Rel. Satisfaction W1	.20*	-	.26*	.01	.16*	.12*	-.23*	-.17*	-.04	8.35	2.03	.80
3. Partner Rel. Satisfaction W1	.13*	.14*	-	.01	.14*	.28*	-.23*	-.27*	-.05	8.44	1.67	2.40
4. Anchor Willingness to Sacrifice W1	.28*	-.02	.03	-	-.06	.03	.15*	-.04	-.07	2.94	1.06	.80
5. Anchor Self Esteem W1	.13*	.15*	.18*	.05	-	.23*	-.35*	-.19*	.03	4.03	.78	.00
6. Partner Self Esteem W1	.03	.05	.35*	-.04	.10*	-	-.17*	-.43*	-.03	4.05	.74	.90
7. Anchor Fear of Love Withdraw. W1	-.10*	-.19*	-.18*	.05	-.30*	-.10*	-	.14*	-.09*	1.60	.73	.30
8. Partner Fear of Love Withdraw. W1	-.09*	-.09*	-.29*	-.08*	-.09*	-.44*	.15*	-	-.11*	1.63	.73	.90
9. Relationship Duration	-.03	.04	-.09*	.01	-.04	.06	-.06	-.15*	-	9.94	5.67	.10
M	3.64	8.39	8.46	3.33	4.27	3.79	1.50	1.72	8.84			
SD	.94	2.04	1.68	.94	.63	.89	.63	.82	5.32			
% Miss	.20	.50	2.30	1.30	.00	.20	1.50	.30	.00			

Note. Comm. = Communion. Rel. = Relationship. Withdraw. = Withdrawal. W1 = Wave 1. % Miss = Percent missing data.

Unmitigated communion range: 1 – 5. Relationship satisfaction range: 1 – 10. Willingness to sacrifice, self-esteem, and fear of love

withdrawal range: 1 – 5. Relationship duration range: .10 – 20.00. Partner variables above the diagonal are for partners of female

anchors, while those below are for partners of male anchors.

* *p* < .05

Table S.D.2

Wave 3 *Correlations and Descriptive Statistics Between Focal Variables and Covariates for Female Anchors Above and Male*

Anchors Below the Diagonal (n = 1,340 Anchors and Partners)

Variable	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.	9.	M	SD	% Miss
1. Anchor Unmitigated Comm. W3	-	.19*	.18*	.37*	.03	.05	-.05	-.10*	.02	3.50	.93	4.00
2. Anchor Rel. Satisfaction W3	.15*	-	.31*	.03	.27*	.14*	-.25*	-.28*	-.04	8.06	2.02	3.40
3. Partner Rel. Satisfaction W3	.06	.18*	-	-.01	.11*	.26*	-.19*	-.42*	.01	8.23	1.62	2.40
4. Anchor Willingness to Sacrifice W3	.24*	.01	-.01	-	-.11*	-.04	.17*	.06	-.06	2.85	1.00	3.90
5. Anchor Self Esteem W3	.07	.19*	.18*	-.07	-	.11*	-.32*	-.16*	.05	3.81	.86	3.10
6. Partner Self Esteem W3	.00	.10*	.27*	-.04	.15*	-	-.12*	-.39*	-.02	4.00	.71	22.80
7. Anchor Fear of Love Withdraw. W3	-.03	-.18*	-.20*	.07	-.36*	-.14*	-	.24*	-.09*	1.59	.69	3.40
8. Partner Fear of Love Withdraw. W3	-.04	-.17*	-.28*	.04	-.14*	-.37*	.18*	-	-.03	1.66	.71	23.00
9. Relationship Duration	.03	.01	-.07	.02	-.08	.09	.01	-.10*	-	9.94	5.67	.10
M	3.55	8.03	8.21	3.23	4.08	3.81	1.56	1.65	8.84			
SD	.90	2.06	1.71	.86	.74	.83	.67	.73	5.32			
% Miss	4.20	3.80	16.20	4.80	3.80	16.20	4.00	16.10	.00			

Note. Comm. = Communion. Rel. = Relationship. Withdraw. = Withdrawal. W3 = Wave 3. % Miss = Percent missing data.

Unmitigated communion range: 1 – 5. Relationship satisfaction range: 1 – 10. Willingness to sacrifice, self-esteem, and fear of love

withdrawal range: 1 – 5. Relationship duration range: .10 – 20.00. Partner variables above the diagonal are for partners of female

anchors, while those below are for partners of male anchors.

* *p* < .05

Table S.D.3

Wave 5 Correlations and Descriptive Statistics Between Focal Variables and Covariates for Female Anchors Above and Male

Anchors Below the Diagonal (n = 1,340 Anchors and Partners)

Variable	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.	9.	M	SD	% Miss
1. Anchor Unmitigated Comm. W5	-	.19*	.21*	.37*	.13*	.08	-.00	-.12*	-.02	3.41	.90	2.70
2. Anchor Rel. Satisfaction W5	.17*	-	.44*	-.03	.28*	.15*	-.26*	-.30*	-.02	7.85	2.08	3.00
3. Partner Rel. Satisfaction W5	.09*	.32*	-	-.00	.19*	.33*	-.28*	-.45*	-.00	7.92	1.89	30.10
4. Anchor Willingness to Sacrifice W5	.34*	-.04	.02	-	-.05	-.01	.22*	-.02	-.05	2.84	.95	2.80
5. Anchor Self Esteem W5	.08	.24*	.22*	-.03	-	.11*	-.38*	-.19*	.03	3.81	.81	2.20
6. Partner Self Esteem W5	.04	.16*	.39*	-.07	.13*	-	-.21*	-.40*	-.03	4.04	.69	27.00
7. Anchor Fear of Love Withdraw. W5	-.04	-.32*	-.27*	.15*	-.35*	-.22*	-	.26*	-.07	1.63	.68	2.60
8. Partner Fear of Love Withdraw. W5	-.01	-.15*	-.40*	.04	-.19*	-.43*	.17*	-	-.09*	1.66	.73	26.40
9. Relationship Duration	-.07	-.01	-.04	-.07	-.11*	.11*	.01	-.07	-	9.94	5.67	.10
M	3.47	7.78	8.11	3.23	4.03	3.88	1.60	1.64	8.84			
SD	.87	2.15	1.68	.82	.72	.79	.66	.74	5.32			
% Miss	2.50	2.30	16.70	2.70	2.30	16.70	2.50	16.60	.00			

Note. Comm. = Communion. Rel. = Relationship. Withdraw. = Withdrawal. W5 = Wave 1. % Miss = Percent missing data.

Unmitigated communion range: 1 – 5. Relationship satisfaction range: 1 – 10. Willingness to sacrifice, self-esteem, and fear of love

withdrawal range: 1 – 5. Relationship duration range: .10 – 20.00. Partner variables above the diagonal are for partners of female

anchors, while those below are for partners of male anchors.

* *p* < .05

Table S.D.4

Wave 7 *Correlations and Descriptive Statistics Between Focal Variables and Covariates for Female Anchors Above and Male*

Anchors Below the Diagonal (n = 1,340 Anchors and Partners)

Variable	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.	9.	M	SD	% Miss
1. Anchor Unmitigated Comm. W7	-	.13*	.16*	.41*	.02	.19	-.06	-.06	.04	3.36	.93	.30
2. Anchor Rel. Satisfaction W7	.22*	-	.31*	-.01	.30*	.27*	-.26*	-.25*	-.02	7.55	2.27	.40
3. Partner Rel. Satisfaction W7	.19*	.29*	-	.01	.11*	.40*	-.19*	-.39*	.04	7.92	1.89	30.10
4. Anchor Willingness to Sacrifice W7	.34*	.04	.10*	-	-.12*	.03	.12*	.02*	-.05	2.89	.97	.70
5. Anchor Self Esteem W7	.07	.23*	.19*	-.06	-	.06	-.41*	-.11*	.06	3.81	.81	.10
6. Partner Self Esteem W7	.05	.07	.34*	-.05	-.08	-	-.25*	-.43*	.01	3.96	.81	86.00
7. Anchor Fear of Love Withdraw. W7	-.06	-.24*	-.34*	.05	-.40*	-.19	-	.23*	-.04	1.60	.66	.10
8. Partner Fear of Love Withdraw. W7	-.13*	-.07	-.35*	-.00	-.03	-.38*	.17*	-	-.04	1.61	.70	29.90
9. Relationship Duration	.00	-.00	-.00	-.01	-.02	-.08	.01	-.06	-	9.94	5.67	.10
M	3.46	7.61	7.92	3.24	3.99	3.83	1.63	1.65	8.84			
SD	.90	2.24	1.89	.83	.77	.83	.68	.75	5.32			
% Miss	.30	.20	17.90	.30	.70	83.90	.30	17.40	.00			

Note. Comm. = Communion. Rel. = Relationship. Withdraw. = Withdrawal. W7 = Wave 1. % Miss = Percent missing data.

Unmitigated communion range: 1 – 5. Relationship satisfaction range: 1 – 10. Willingness to sacrifice, self-esteem, and fear of love

withdrawal range: 1 – 5. Relationship duration range: .10 – 20.00. Partner variables above the diagonal are for partners of female

anchors, while those below are for partners of male anchors.

* *p* < .05

Appendix S.E

Missing Data Analysis

Given that missing data ranged from .20% to 4.20% for unmitigated communion, from .20% to 3.80% for anchor relationship satisfaction, and from 2.30% to 30.10% for partner relationship satisfaction, we computed a series of t tests to determine whether patterns of missingness at Waves 3, 5, and 7 were due to initial levels of these focal constructs. Of the 18 t tests computed (9 for females and 9 for males) and correcting for family-wise error, one significant difference emerged: partners of female anchors with lower relationship satisfaction at baseline ($M = 8.10$, $SD = 1.97$) were more likely to have missing scores on relationship satisfaction at Wave 5 than those who were more satisfied at baseline ($M = 8.57$, $SD = 1.53$). Importantly, this effect only emerged if the significance level used when correcting for family-wise error was also applied to Levene's test for equality of variances; if not, then the effect became non-significant. These results suggest that the vast majority of the data was missing at random, supporting the use of full-information maximum likelihood (FIML) estimation. FIML estimation utilizes all available information in the variance/covariance matrix when computing model parameters, and it provides more reliable estimates than traditional deletion or mean imputation procedures and performs similarly to multiple imputation in longitudinal data (Enders, 2011).

Appendix S.F

Univariate Latent Change Score Models

As a precursor to our main analyses, we examined the trajectories of each construct with univariate latent change score models, and all changes were statistically significant unless otherwise noted. Unmitigated communion began at 3.64 (scale ranged from 1 to 5) and decreased .09 units between Waves 1 and 3 and another .08 units between Waves 3 and 5, before stabilizing between Waves 5 and 7 ($M = -.02$, $p = .49$). The anchor's relationship satisfaction started at 8.39 units (scale ranged from 0 to 10) and decreased .36 units between Waves 1 and 3, .26 units between Waves 3 and 5, and .17 units between Waves 5 and 7. Partner's relationship satisfaction started at 8.50 and declined .27 units between Waves 1 and 3, .10 units between Waves 3 and 5, and .19 units between Waves 5 and 7. These results are consistent with findings from prior research demonstrating average declines over time in unmitigated communion and relationship satisfaction (Johnson et al., 2019; VanLaningham et al., 2001).

Appendix S.G

Table S.G.1

*Standardized Bivariate Autoregressive Cross-Lagged Latent Change Score Modeling Results for Relationship Satisfaction and Unmitigated Communion **Without Covariates** (n = 1,340 Anchors and Partners)*

	Anchor Rel. Sat. Model			Male Anchor Partner Rel. Sat. Model			Female Anchor Partner Rel. Sat. Model		
	Δ W 1 to 3	Δ W 3 to 5	Δ W 5 to 7	Δ W 1 to 3	Δ W 3 to 5	Δ W 5 to 7	Δ W 1 to 3	Δ W 3 to 5	Δ W 5 to 7
Predicting UC									
Prior Rel. Sat. Level	.08*	.02	.10*	-.03	.01	.12*	.11*	.04	.00
Prior Δ in Rel. Sat.	-	-.01	-.05	-	-.02	-.12*	-	-.01	-.01
Prior UC Level	-.57*	-.42*	-.46*	-.55*	-.41*	-.45*	-.58*	-.43*	-.45*
Prior Δ in UC	-	-.24*	-.21*	-	-.25*	-.20*	-	-.23*	-.23*
Predicting Rel. Sat.									
Prior UC Level	.05†	.06*	.04	.00ᵃ	-.02	.08	.00ᵃ	.09*	.04
Prior Δ in UC	-	-.05	.06*	-	-.03ᵇ	.01ᵇ	-	-.04ᵇ	.01ᵇ
Prior Rel. Sat. Level	-.59*	-.42*	-.37*	-.47*	-.41*	-.34*	-.52*	-.34*	-.32*
Prior Δ in Rel. Sat.	-	-.22*	-.28*	-	-.26*	-.14*	-	-.25*	-.22*
Covariances									
UC and Rel. Sat.	.13*	.13*	.08*	.06	.14*	.13*	.13*	.15*	.08

Note: [a–b]Signifies within-model paths constrained to equality. Rel. Sat. = Relationship Satisfaction. UC = Unmitigated Communion. Anchor relationship satisfaction model fit indices: χ^2 (3) = .150; RMSEA = .000 [C. I. = .000, .000]; CFI = 1.000; TLI = 1.013; SRMR = .001. Multiple-group partner relationship satisfaction model fit indices: χ^2 (7) = 3.785; RMSEA = .000 [C. I. = .000, .030], CFI = 1.000; TLI = 1.011; SRMR = .006.

* $p < .05$, †$p = .050$

Appendix S.H

Bivariate Autoregressive Cross-Lagged Latent Change Score Model Results for Covariates

A greater willingness to sacrifice (β = .35) and higher self-esteem for the anchor (β = .09) predicted higher Wave 1 levels of unmitigated communion and a more gradual decrease in unmitigated communion over time (willingness to sacrifice average βs = .25; self-esteem βs = .04). Partners' higher fear of love withdrawal was associated with lower Wave 1 unmitigated communion (β = -.08). Higher self-esteem also predicted higher initial levels of the anchors' relationship satisfaction (β = .11) and a more gradual decrease in satisfaction across time (βs = .11). Higher fear of love withdrawal from both anchors and partners predicted lower initial levels (anchor fear β = -.16; partner fear β = -.09) and steeper declines in anchors' relationship satisfaction (anchor fear βs = -.10; partner fear βs = -.10).

In the partner relationship satisfaction model, most covariate associations with partner satisfaction were consistent regardless of the anchor's gender. Higher partner self-esteem (male anchor model β = .28; female anchor model β = .13) and lower fear of love withdrawal for anchors (male anchor model β = -.12; female anchor model β = -.19) and partners (male anchor model β = -.16; female anchor model β = -.19) were associated with higher Wave 1 partner relationship satisfaction. In addition, higher partner self-esteem and lower anchor- and partner-reported fear of love withdrawal were linked to more gradual decreases in relationship satisfaction over time (partner self-esteem βs = .17 [male anchor model] and .11 [female anchor model]; anchor fear βs = -.12 [male anchor model] and -.08 [female anchor model]; partner fear βs = -.15 [male anchor model] and -.24 [female anchor model]). One association was unique to the male anchor model: a greater willingness to sacrifice in male anchors predicted a more gradual decline in their partners' relationship satisfaction over time (βs = .04; p = .050).