Table S1

Measurement Invariance of Psychological Control Latent Constructs Across Time

	CFI	ΔCFI	RMSEA	SRMR
Husbands' Psychological Control (T1, T2, T3)				
Configural	.966	--	.037 [.027, .045]	.049
Weak	.965	.001	.036 [.026, .044]	.053
Strong	.964	.001	.035 [.026, .044]	.053
Strict	.967	.003	.033 [.023, .041]	.055
Wives' Psychological Control (T1, T2, T3)				
Configural	.960	--	.039 [.030, .048]	.047
Weak	.958	.002	.039 [.030, .047]	.053
Strong	.953	.005	.040 [.032, .048]	.054
Strict	.956	.003	.038[.029, .046]	.053

Note: Level of invariance achieved for each construct is italicized. CFI = Comparative Fit Index; RMSEA = Root Mean Square Error of Approximation; SRMR = Standardized Root Mean Residual.

Table S2.
APIM Model of Perceptions of a Power Struggle Predicting Psychological Control (N = 321 families)

	Wives' Psychological Control			Husbands' Psychological Control		
	b	SE	*p*	*b*	SE	*p*
Direct Effects						
W Power Struggle → T1 Psychological Control	0.36	0.09	**<.001**	0.35	0.09	**<.001**
W Power Struggle → T2 Psychological Control	0.14	0.06	**.029**	0.12	0.07	.072
W Power Struggle → T3 Psychological Control	-0.08	0.06	.148	0.02	0.07	.762
H Power Struggle → T1 Psychological Control	0.11	0.09	.201	0.09	0.08	.283
H Power Struggle → T2 Psychological Control	0.04	0.05	.418	0.02	0.06	.775
H Power Struggle → T3 Psychological Control	0.04	0.05	.472	0.06	0.06	.342

Note. Data from the Flourishing Families Project. χ^2 = 159.655(117), p = .001, RMSEA = .039[.026, .050], SRMR = .035, and CFI = 0.981.

Table S3.

APIM Model of Perceptions of a Power Struggle Predicting Psychological Control with Autonomy as a Mediator (N = 321 families)

	Wives			Husbands		
	b	SE	*p*	*b*	SE	*p*
Direct Effects						
T1 W Power Struggle → T3 Psychological Control	0.04	0.10	.725	0.06	0.08	.473
T1 W Power Struggle → T2 Autonomy	-0.55	0.10	**<.001**	-0.20	0.08	**.017**
T1 H Power Struggle → T3 Psychological Control	0.07	0.07	.326	0.08	0.08	.318
T1 H Power Struggle → T2 Autonomy	-0.05	0.08	.492	-0.41	0.09	**<.001**
T2 Autonomy → T3 Psychological Control	0.05	0.10	.615	0.05	0.06	.454
Indirect Effects						
W Power Struggle → Autonomy → Psychological Control	-0.03	0.05	.622	-0.01	0.02	.490
H Power Struggle → Autonomy → Psychological Control	-0.00	0.01	.797	-0.02	0.03	.461

Note. Data from the Flourishing Families Project, 2009-2011. N=321 families. All models included demographic controls. χ^2 = 316.127(250), p = .003, RMSEA = .029[.018, .038], SRMR = .038, and CFI = 0.976.

Table S4.
Structural Invariance Testing of the APIM and APIMeM (N=1,668 couples)

	Wald	DF	*p*
APIM with Direct Effects			
T1 Power Struggle → T1 Psychological Control (actor effects)	3.695	1	.0546
T1 Power Struggle → T1 Psychological Control (partner effects)	2.645	1	.104
T1 Power Struggle → T2 Psychological Control (actor effects)	1.797	1	.180
T1 Power Struggle → T2 Psychological Control (partner effects)	0.775	1	.385
APIMeM with Autonomy as a Mediator			
T1 Power Struggle → T2 Autonomy (actor effects)	1.264	1	.261
T1 Power Struggle → T2 Autonomy (partner effects)	1.954	1	.162

Note. Data were used from the CREATE Project, 2017-2019. Wald tests were performed between wives' and husbands' hypothesized, significant paths.

Supplemental Details on the Construction of the Autonomy Scale

Wives' and husbands' levels of autonomy were measured using four items from the Differentiation of Self Inventory (Skowron & Friedlander, 1998). The Differentiation of Self Inventory developed by Skowron and Friedlander (1998) started with 43 items. However, in the Flourishing Families Project, only 23 items were kept due to the length of the questionnaire. The questions from the original version of the measure that were removed were: 4, 5, 7, 9, 11, 13, 15, 17, 19, 22, 23, 25, 27, 29, 31, 33, 35, 37, 41, and 43. Because differentiation of self is conceptualized as the ability to function autonomously while maintaining intimacy (Bowen, 1978), it has two sub-scales that measure both intimacy and autonomy. We went through the available items and kept four items that were similar to the items for Autonomy in the Need Satisfaction Scale (Guardia et al., 2000). Although the items we chose are not exactly the same, they closely align conceptually, as seen in the included comparison table.

Autonomy Items in the Need Satisfaction Scale (Guardia et al., 2000)	**Autonomy Items Used in This Study, Based on the Differentiation of Self Inventory (Skowron & Friedlander, 1998)**
When I am with my partner, I feel free to be who I am.	I often feel inhibited around my family.
When I am with my partner, I have a say in what happens and can voice my opinion.	If I were to express to my spouse/partner my true feelings about some things, my spouse/partner could not tolerate it.
When I am with my partner, I feel controlled and pressured to be certain ways.	When I am with my spouse/partner I often feel smothered.
	I am concerned about losing my independence in intimate relationships.

The study included these four items to only include items related to autonomy in order to test the research question related to the potential for autonomy to mediate associations. To ensure that this measure was psychometrically sound, separate Confirmatory Factor Analyses were conducted for wives' and husbands' autonomy. The results of this analysis indicated that all standardized factor loadings were above 0.63, and that the model for wives' autonomy (Chi-square = 2.275(2), p = .321; CFI = 0.999 ; RMSEA = 0.021[0.00, 0.115]) and husbands' autonomy (Chi-square = 3.272(2), p = .195; CFI = 0.993 ; RMSEA= 0.045[0.00, 0.130]) had adequate model fit.