

A longitudinal assessment of relationship characteristics that predict new parents' relationship satisfaction

Rutgers University has made this article freely available. Please share how this access benefits you.
Your story matters. <https://rucore.libraries.rutgers.edu/rutgers-lib/49290/story/>

This work is an **ACCEPTED MANUSCRIPT (AM)**

This is the author's manuscript for a work that has been accepted for publication. Changes resulting from the publishing process, such as copyediting, final layout, and pagination, may not be reflected in this document. The publisher takes permanent responsibility for the work. Content and layout follow publisher's submission requirements.

Citation for this version and the definitive version are shown below.

Citation to Publisher Version: Theiss, Jennifer A., Estlein, Roi & Weber, Kirsten M. (2013). A longitudinal assessment of relationship characteristics that predict new parents' relationship satisfaction. *Personal Relationships* 20(2), 216–235. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-6811.2012.01406.x>.

Citation to this Version: Theiss, Jennifer A., Estlein, Roi & Weber, Kirsten M. (2013). A longitudinal assessment of relationship characteristics that predict new parents' relationship satisfaction. *Personal Relationships* 20(2), 216–235. Retrieved from [doi:10.7282/T3KS6TMK](https://doi.org/10.7282/T3KS6TMK).

Terms of Use: Copyright for scholarly resources published in RUcore is retained by the copyright holder. By virtue of its appearance in this open access medium, you are free to use this resource, with proper attribution, in educational and other non-commercial settings. Other uses, such as reproduction or republication, may require the permission of the copyright holder.

Article begins on next page



**A Longitudinal Assessment of Relationship Characteristics
that Predict New Parents' Relationship Satisfaction**

Journal:	<i>Personal Relationships</i>
Manuscript ID:	PERE-OA-07-11-0125.R2
Manuscript Type:	Original Article
Keywords:	Parenthood, Marital Satisfaction, Uncertainty, Interdependence

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Review

1
2
3
4
5
6 A Longitudinal Assessment of Relationship Characteristics that Predict New Parents'

7
8 Relationship Satisfaction

9
10
11
12 Jennifer A. Theiss

13
14
15 Roi Estlein

16
17
18 Rutgers University

19
20
21
22 Kirsten M. Weber

23
24
25 Central Michigan University

26
27
28
29 Author Note

30
31
32 Jennifer A. Theiss (Ph.D., University of Wisconsin – Madison) is an assistant professor
33
34 in the Department of Communication at Rutgers University where Roi Estlein is a doctoral
35
36 candidate. Kirsten M. Weber (Ph.D., Pennsylvania State University) is an assistant professor in
37
38 the Department of Communication at Central Michigan University. The authors wish to thank
39
40 Puja Singh for her assistance with data collection.
41
42

43
44 Address correspondence to Jennifer A. Theiss (jtheiss@rutgers.edu), Department of
45
46 Communication, Rutgers University, 4 Huntington St., New Brunswick, NJ 08901.
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

A LONGITUDINAL ASSESSMENT

2

Abstract

Drawing on the relational turbulence model, this study queries whether it is the amount of relational uncertainty and partner interference in a relationship, or the magnitude of an increase in these mechanisms over time, that accounts for decreased relationship satisfaction for new parents. To test these competing hypotheses, we conducted a longitudinal study of 78 couples in which both partners completed surveys about their relationship at four time points during the transition to parenthood. Multi-level modeling revealed that the amount and the increase of relational uncertainty and partner interference were negatively associated with relationship satisfaction when considered separately, but when evaluated in combination, the magnitude of an increase in these variables was the stronger predictor of relationship satisfaction.

Keywords: interference from partners, relational uncertainty, relationship satisfaction, relational turbulence model, transition to parenthood

A LONGITUDINAL ASSESSMENT

3

A Longitudinal Assessment of Relationship Characteristics that Predict New Parents'
Relationship Satisfaction

The transition to parenthood is usually an exciting time for couples, but the myriad changes to the romantic relationship that accompany the birth of a first child can contribute to unexpected stressors (Gottman & Notarius, 2000; Simpson, Rholes, Campbell, Wilson, & Tran, 2002). Although some studies have shown that relationship satisfaction remains relatively stable during the transition to parenthood (e.g., Clement & Markman, 1996; Huston & Vangelisti, 1995; Kurdek, 1993), most existing research on this pivotal moment in relationships suggests that the birth of a first child is associated with a decline in relationship satisfaction (e.g., Belsky & Rovine, 1990; Cowan et al., 1985; Demo & Cox, 2000; Elek, Hudson, & Bouffard, 2003; Glenn & McLanahan, 1982; Lawrence, Rothman, Cobb, Rothman, & Bradbury, 2008). To explain decreases in relationship satisfaction during the transition to parenthood some scholars have pointed to ecological factors, such as cultural norms and lack of social network support (e.g. Levy-Shiff, 1994; Levy-Shiff, Dimitrovsky, Shulman, & Har-Even, 1998), and others have focused on dispositional factors, such as psychological characteristics and past relationship experiences (e.g. Antonucci & Mikus, 1988; Cowan & Cowan, 2000). The goal of this study is to more specifically highlight relationship characteristics that are salient during this transition that account for decreased relationship satisfaction following the birth of the first child.

We draw on the logic of the relational turbulence model (Solomon & Knobloch, 2001, 2004; Solomon & Theiss, 2008) to identify the relationship characteristics that predict changes in relationship satisfaction during the transition to parenthood. The relational turbulence model nominates *relational uncertainty* and *interference from partners* as two relationship characteristics that are heightened during relationship transitions and make people more reactive

A LONGITUDINAL ASSESSMENT

4

1
2
3 to their relational circumstances. Most applications of the relational turbulence model have
4
5 focused on the *amount* of relational uncertainty and interference from partners as predictors of
6
7 upheaval in relationships (e.g., Solomon & Knobloch, 2004; Solomon & Theiss, 2008). An
8
9 alternative explanation is that relationship partners experience turmoil when there is a *change* in
10
11 the amount of relational uncertainty and partner interference they perceive in the relationship.
12
13 Particularly in long-term, committed relationships where relational uncertainty and partner
14
15 interference are consistently low, “high levels” of these variables are typically still below the
16
17 mid-point of the scale (e.g., Knobloch, 2008; Knobloch, Miller, Bond, & Mannone, 2007; Theiss
18
19 & Nagy, 2010). Thus, it may be that people experience relational turbulence in response to a
20
21 change in their baseline levels of these relationship characteristics, rather than in response to
22
23 “high” amounts of those qualities.
24
25
26
27
28

29
30 Thus, the goals of this study are two-fold. Our first objective is to draw on theory to
31
32 identify relationship characteristics that contribute to decreased relationship satisfaction during
33
34 the transition to parenthood. We turn to the relational turbulence model as our theoretical
35
36 framework for accomplishing this goal. Our second objective is to extend the relational
37
38 turbulence model by probing one of the core tenets of the model regarding the amount of
39
40 relational uncertainty and partner interference, versus changes in these variables over time, as
41
42 predictors of turmoil. We begin by articulating the logic behind these objectives. Then, we
43
44 describe the results of a longitudinal dyadic study in which couples who were becoming first-
45
46 time parents responded to surveys about their relationship at four time points during the
47
48 transition to parenthood, ranging from pregnancy to six months after birth.
49
50
51
52

53 **The Transition to Parenthood as Relational Turbulence**

54
55
56
57
58
59
60

A LONGITUDINAL ASSESSMENT

5

1
2
3 The transition to parenthood is one of the most dramatic changes to occur in the course of
4 a romantic relationship (MacDermid, Huston, & McHale, 1990; Segrin & Flora, 2005). There is
5 a long history of research on the transition to parenthood as a crisis for couples, with studies
6 indicating that this transition is marked by a significant decrease in relationship satisfaction (e.g.,
7 Cox, Paley, Burchinal, & Payne, 1999; Cowan & Cowan, 2000; Glenn & McLanahan, 1982;
8 Gottman & Gottman, 2007; Hackel & Ruble, 1992; Kurdek, 1993). Two reasons typically
9 emerge to explain decreased satisfaction following the birth of the first child: fewer opportunities
10 for intimacy and increased stress from new responsibilities.
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21

22 First, studies show that the birth of a first child is often accompanied by a significant
23 decline in both physical and emotional intimacy between partners. Verbal and nonverbal
24 expressions of positive affection, including sexual intimacy, are decreased after the birth of the
25 child (Belsky & Kelly, 1994; Cowan & Cowan, 2000). New parents also spend much less time
26 together (Belsky, 1990) and engage in fewer leisure activities together as a couple (Huston &
27 Vangelisti, 1995; MacDermid et al., 1990; Moller, Hwang, & Wickberg, 2008). Relationship
28 partners experience less emotional intimacy and empathy during this transition (Kerem,
29 Fishman, & Josselson, 2001) and participate in more conflict (Cowan & Cowan, 2000). These
30 experiences may contribute to uncertainties about the state of the new parents' relationship.
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

43 Second, the decline in relationship satisfaction for new parents has also been attributed to
44 the increased stress a child places on a couple's relationship (Lavee, Sharlin & Katz, 1996).
45 Specifically, the new responsibilities associated with the birth of a first child can interfere in the
46 personal goals, routines, and actions that partners enjoyed prior to becoming parents (O'Brien &
47 Peyton, 2002). Moreover, the transition to parenthood is described as a period of
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

A LONGITUDINAL ASSESSMENT

6

responsibilities. After the birth, wives usually take care of the interior household chores and child rearing and most husbands take care of exterior household chores and finance (Cowan & Cowan, 2000; Huston & Vangelisti, 1995; Moller et al., 2008; Rochlen, McKelley, Suizzo, & Scaringi, 2008). During this transition, then, spouses need to reestablish roles and task responsibilities, reorganize the division of housework, negotiate issues with regard to childrearing, and renegotiate existing boundaries (Claxton & Perry-Jenkins, 2008; Moller et al., 2008; Rochlen et al., 2008). This upheaval in partners' roles and routines can be a source of distress for partners negotiating this transition.

Assumptions of the Relational Turbulence Model

The empirical explanations for decreased relationship satisfaction among new parents mirror the mechanisms in the relational turbulence model that contribute to upheaval in romantic relationships. The relational turbulence model argues that certain periods of relationship development are vulnerable to turmoil and give rise to extreme reactions to relationship events. The variety of tumultuous experiences that may occur within romantic relationships during times of change are labeled *relational turbulence*, which is defined as intensified emotional, cognitive, and communicative reactions to relationship circumstances (Solomon & Knobloch, 2001, 2004). In this paper, we focus on relationship satisfaction as a cognitive marker of underlying relational turbulence during the transition to parenthood. *Relationship satisfaction* refers to partners' subjective evaluation of the extent to which they feel enjoyment, contentment, and love in their romantic relationship (Hendrick, 1988). The relational turbulence model identifies two mechanisms in romantic relationships that promote heightened reactivity to interpersonal events, namely relational uncertainty and interference from partners.

A LONGITUDINAL ASSESSMENT

7

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

Relational uncertainty refers to the degree of confidence people have in their perceptions of a relationship and it encompasses three interrelated sources of doubt: *self uncertainty* refers to the ambiguity that people have regarding their own involvement in a relationship, *partner uncertainty* refers to doubts about a partner's level of involvement in a relationship, and *relationship uncertainty* refers to doubts about the status of the relationship more generally (Knobloch & Solomon, 1999). Studies have suggested that relational uncertainty is a persistent factor in both dating relationships (Knobloch & Solomon, 1999) and in more committed associations (Knobloch, 2008; Solomon & Theiss, 2008; Theiss & Nagy, 2010) that polarizes people's cognitive, emotional, and behavioral reactions to relationship events (e.g. Solomon & Knobloch, 2004).

27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Interference from partners refers to the degree to which individuals perceive their partner as undermining personal goals and actions (Solomon & Knobloch, 2001). It manifests in situations where one person's routine is interrupted by efforts to coordinate actions and establish interdependence with a relational partner (Berscheid, 1983). The process of establishing interdependence allows partners to have more influence in one another's lives, which can either facilitate one's goals or interfere with them (; Solomon & Knobloch, 2001; 2004). The first iteration of the relational turbulence model argued that the early stages of relationship development provide few opportunities for influence, but as partners begin to integrate their lives, increased opportunities for influence can be disruptive to individual goals and routines. With time and practice, partners learn to establish more coordinated patterns of behavior that facilitate, rather than interfere with, one another's goals. Although the model initially argued that interference from partners should be replaced with facilitation at high levels of intimacy (Solomon & Knobloch, 2004), data indicate that partner interference does not subside, but

A LONGITUDINAL ASSESSMENT

8

1
2
3 plateaus in highly intimate relationships (Solomon & Theiss, 2008). Moreover, transitional
4
5 periods in relationships require changes to well-established routines, which can contribute to
6
7 increased partner interference (Solomon, Weber, & Steuber, 2010).
8
9

10
11 Prior research has documented the consequences of relational uncertainty and
12
13 interference from partners for people's cognitive, emotional, and communicative reactions to
14
15 relational episodes. With regard to cognitive reactivity, both relational features are associated
16
17 with perceptions of irritations as more severe and relationally threatening (Solomon &
18
19 Knobloch, 2004; Theiss & Knobloch, 2009; Theiss & Solomon, 2006b), increased suspicion over
20
21 third party rivals (Theiss & Solomon, 2006a), heightened appraisals of turmoil (Knobloch,
22
23 2007), the perceived intentionality of hurtful messages and the perceived damage they have to
24
25 the relationship (Theiss, Knobloch, Checton, & Magsamen-Conrad, 2009), and decreased sexual
26
27 satisfaction (Theiss & Nagy, 2010). As for emotional reactivity, relational uncertainty and
28
29 interference from partners correspond with increased negative emotion (Knobloch, Miller, &
30
31 Carpenter, 2007; Knobloch & Theiss, 2010), more intense feelings of hurt (Theiss et al., 2009),
32
33 and with increased emotional jealousy (Knobloch, Solomon, & Cruz, 2001; Theiss & Solomon,
34
35 2006a). These two relational mechanisms are also associated with several communicative
36
37 manifestations in romantic relationships, such as the tendency to withhold private information
38
39 from romantic partners (Afifi & Guerrero, 2000), to avoid talking about certain topics (Knobloch
40
41 & Carpenter-Theune, 2004), and to be more indirect in communication with a partner about
42
43 jealousy (Theiss & Solomon, 2006a), irritations (Theiss & Knobloch, 2009; Theiss & Solomon,
44
45 2006b), sexual intimacy (Theiss, 2011) and hurt (Theiss, et al., 2009).
46
47
48
49
50
51
52

Amount of Relational Uncertainty and Partner Interference as Predictors of Satisfaction53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

A LONGITUDINAL ASSESSMENT

9

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38

Following the logic of the relational turbulence model, one reason for upheaval during the transition to parenthood might be the *amount* of relational uncertainty and interference from partners that people experience during this time. As outlined above, there are a variety of experiences during the transition to parenthood that might contribute to relational uncertainty and interference from partners. For example, the decreased physical intimacy that corresponds with the birth of a child (e.g., Belsky & Kelly, 1994) might contribute to questions about what sexual behaviors are now appropriate in the relationship (i.e., relationship uncertainty), whether or not individuals are still attracted to their partner (i.e., partner uncertainty), and the extent to which individuals are motivated to maintain a relationship that lacks intimacy (i.e., self uncertainty). In addition, having to negotiate new roles and routines will likely disrupt individual patterns of behavior that had become normative prior to the birth of the child. For example, individuals may experience partner interference when they are woken up in the middle of the night to feed the baby while their partner sleeps, or when they must leave work early to pick up the child from daycare because their partner cannot be reached. Thus, the transition to parenthood is a period of relationship development that is ripe for relational uncertainty and partner interference.

39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

As predicted by the relational turbulence model, high levels of relational uncertainty and partner interference after the birth of a child should correspond with intensified reactions to relationship circumstances. Specifically, we highlight appraisals of relationship satisfaction as a cognitive manifestation of turbulence that is sensitive to heightened relational uncertainty and partner interference. Prior research has linked relational uncertainty and partner interference with sexual satisfaction (Theiss & Nagy, 2010) and relationship satisfaction (Knobloch & Theiss, in press). Consistent with these findings, we predict that high amounts of relational uncertainty and

A LONGITUDINAL ASSESSMENT

10

1
2
3 interference from partners are negatively associated with relationship satisfaction during the
4
5 transition to parenthood. Formally stated:

8 H1: Self, partner, and relationship uncertainty are negatively associated with new
9
10 parents' relationship satisfaction.

12 H2: Interference from partners is negatively associated with new parents' relationship
13
14 satisfaction.

Change in Relational Uncertainty and Partner Interference as Predictors of Satisfaction

17
18
19 An alternative explanation for decreased relationship satisfaction during the transition to
20 parenthood is the *change* in relational uncertainty and partner interference from previous levels,
21 rather than the raw amount of these variables. In other words, it may not be high amounts of
22 relational uncertainty and interference from partners that contribute to a decline in new parents'
23 relationship satisfaction, but rather the *magnitude of the increase* in these relational mechanisms
24 during the transition to parenthood. Prior tests of the relational turbulence model have largely
25 focused on the amount of relational uncertainty and interference from partners as predictors of
26 upheaval in relationships, due in part to cross-sectional research designs that prohibit the
27 observation of change over time (e.g., Knobloch & Carpenter-Theune, 2004; Solomon &
28 Knobloch, 2004; Theiss, 2011; Theiss & Nagy, 2010). Moreover, most studies, especially those
29 conducted on more established and committed relationships, document extremely low mean
30 levels of relational uncertainty and partner interference (e.g., Knobloch et al., 2007; Theiss,
31 2011; Theiss & Nagy, 2010); therefore, individuals who are "high" on these scales still have
32 relatively low levels of each variable. Thus, there are conceptual and operational advantages to
33 thinking about the change in relational uncertainty and interference from partners as predictors of
34 tumult for new parents.
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

A LONGITUDINAL ASSESSMENT

11

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35

Similar to our argument that an *increase* in the mechanisms of turbulence correspond with less satisfaction in a romantic relationship, one previous study documented the reverse pattern, such that a *decrease* in relational uncertainty, rather than low amounts of uncertainty, was associated with heightened relational intimacy (Theiss & Solomon, 2008). This finding stems from the logic that the process of uncertainty reduction itself is perceived as rewarding for relationship partners (Knobloch & Solomon, 2002; Livingston, 1980) because it helps them to “clarify ambiguities, resolve doubts, and achieve mutual understanding of the nature of their relationship” (Theiss & Solomon, 2008, p. 630). Based on this logic, we argue that the opposite is also true, such that the change in relational uncertainty and interference from partners during transitional periods in relationships is what couples perceive as dissatisfying, rather than being in a cognitive state characterized by high levels of doubt and disruption. In other words, partners become dissatisfied when a relationship that was once characterized by confidence and coordination is now marked by a greater degree of uncertainty and interference. This logic is presented in the following hypotheses:

36
37
38
39
40

H3: The magnitude of an increase in relational uncertainty is negatively associated with new parents’ relationship satisfaction.

41
42
43
44
45

H4: The magnitude of an increase in partner interference is negatively associated with new parents’ relationship satisfaction.

46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

In sum, we offer two competing perspectives to explain the decline in relationship satisfaction that typically accompanies the birth of the first child. On one hand, new parents’ dissatisfaction might be responsive to high levels of relational uncertainty and partner interference that are triggered during this transition. On the other hand, new parents may be less satisfied because they perceive a change from what was a relatively tranquil relationship prior to

A LONGITUDINAL ASSESSMENT

12

1
2
3 the arrival of their child to what is now more uncertain and disruptive than they are used to.

4
5 Thus, we conducted a longitudinal dyadic study to distinguish between the effects of the *amount*
6
7 of relational uncertainty and partner interference versus the *change* in these variables over time.

8
9 Accordingly, we offer one final research question that disentangles these explanations for
10
11 decreased relationship satisfaction during the transition to parenthood:
12
13

14
15 RQ1: Is the amount of relational uncertainty and partner interference, or the magnitude of
16
17 an increase in relational uncertainty and partner interference, the best predictor of
18
19 relationship satisfaction?
20
21

22 Method

23
24 To test our hypotheses and research question, we conducted a longitudinal Web-based
25
26 survey of couples who were navigating the transition to parenthood. We recruited participants for
27
28 this study by posting announcements in online support forums for first-time parents and
29
30 distributing flyers at OB-GYN offices. Individuals who were interested in participating were
31
32 instructed to email the researchers, at which point they received a brief screening questionnaire
33
34 to verify that they met the eligibility requirements for the study. Individuals were eligible to
35
36 participate if (a) they were involved in a heterosexual romantic relationship, (b) they or their
37
38 partner were pregnant with their first child, (c) the pregnancy had progressed to the second or
39
40 third trimester, (c) both individuals in the relationship were the biological parents of the child,
41
42 (d) the partners were cohabiting, (e) both partners were at least 18 years of age, and (f) they had
43
44 internet access in their home. When individuals indicated that they met the eligibility criteria we
45
46 requested contact information for their romantic partner so that we could obtain informed
47
48 consent. If the romantic partner also consented to participate, each individual was assigned a
49
50 unique username and password to access the online questionnaires. Participants completed online
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

A LONGITUDINAL ASSESSMENT

13

1
2
3 questionnaires at four time-points during the transition to parenthood (a) during pregnancy, (b)
4
5 one month after birth, (c) three months after birth and (d) six months after birth. Individuals
6
7 received a \$15 giftcard to a national retailer for completing the first and last waves of the study
8
9 and \$10 giftcards for completing the second and third waves of the study.
10
11

Participants

12
13
14
15 A total of 78 couples (156 individuals) participated in the study. Participants ranged in
16
17 age from 18 to 48 years, with a mean age of 28.38 years. The majority of the sample was
18
19 Caucasian (83.2%), with an additional 5.8% Hispanic, 3.9% Indian, 3.2% African American,
20
21 3.2% Native American, 1.9% Asian/Pacific Islander, and 2.6% other.¹ With regard to
22
23 relationship status, 68 couples were married, six couples were engaged to be married, and 4
24
25 couples were cohabiting but not married. Couples had been in their current level of relationship
26
27 status for an average of 2.47 years (range 3 months to 10 years). Most couples indicated that
28
29 their pregnancy was planned (67.09%). In addition, 21.05% of couples previously had a
30
31 pregnancy that resulted in miscarriage or stillbirth.
32
33
34
35

Procedures

36
37
38 The questionnaires for each wave of the study were administered through an internet
39
40 website. Individuals were emailed with a unique username and password to access the survey
41
42 website for each wave of the study. Respondents submitted their survey responses online and
43
44 data were stored on a secure server. The pre-birth questionnaire obtained demographic and
45
46 relational information and they completed closed-ended scales to report their perceptions of
47
48 relationship satisfaction, relational uncertainty, and partner interference. The subsequent waves
49
50 of the study at one month, three months, and six months post-birth began with an open-ended
51
52 question in which participants were asked to give an account of the ways in which their
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

A LONGITUDINAL ASSESSMENT

14

1
2
3 relationship had changed since completing the previous questionnaire. They also included the
4
5 same measures of relationship satisfaction, relational uncertainty, and partner interference that
6
7 were included in the pre-birth questionnaire.
8
9

Measures

10
11
12 A variety of closed-ended Likert-type scales were used to operationalize the variables in
13
14 this study. Confirmatory factor analyses (CFA) were conducted on all multi-item scales to ensure
15
16 they met the criteria of face validity, internal consistency, and parallelism (Hunter & Gerbing,
17
18 1982). Criteria for a good fitting model were set at $\chi^2/df < 3$, confirmatory fit index (CFI) $> .90$,
19
20 and root mean squared error of approximation (RMSEA) $< .10$ (Kline, 1998). After confirming
21
22 unidimensionality, composite scores were calculated for each scale by averaging responses
23
24 across items. See Table 1 for a summary of descriptive statistics for each scale during each wave
25
26 of the study.
27
28
29
30

31
32 **Relationship satisfaction.** We developed items to measure relational satisfaction.
33
34 Participants used a seven-point Likert-type scale (1 = *strongly disagree*, 7 = *strongly agree*) to
35
36 indicate their level of their agreement with five items: (a) I am completely satisfied with my
37
38 relationship; (b) I am very happy with all aspects of my relationship; (c) I am content with my
39
40 partner; (d) some things about this relationship make me unhappy (reverse coded); and (e) this
41
42 relationship is gratifying to me ($M = 6.07$; $SD = 1.00$; $\alpha = .85$).
43
44
45

46
47 **Relational uncertainty.** We used Knobloch's (2008) scale that measures the sources of
48
49 relational uncertainty in marriage. Respondents used a six-point Likert-type scale (1 =
50
51 *completely or almost completely uncertain*, 6 = *completely or almost completely certain*) to
52
53 respond to items that were preceded by the stem, "How certain are you about...?" All items were
54
55 reverse coded so that the resulting measure indexed relational *uncertainty*. The *self uncertainty*
56
57
58
59
60

A LONGITUDINAL ASSESSMENT

15

1
2
3 scale consisted of four items: (a) your feelings about your relationship; (b) your goals for the
4
5 future of your relationship; (c) your view of your relationship; and (d) the importance of the
6
7 relationship to you ($M = 1.26$; $SD = 0.51$; $\alpha = .92$). *Partner uncertainty* was measured with four
8
9 items: (a) your partner's view of your relationship; (b) the importance of your relationship to
10
11 your partner; (c) your partner's goals for the future of your relationship; and (d) how your partner
12
13 feels about your relationship ($M = 1.65$; $SD = 0.80$; $\alpha = .92$). The *relationship uncertainty* scale
14
15 included four items: (a) the current status of your relationship; (b) how you can or cannot behave
16
17 around your partner; (c) the definition of your relationship, and (d) the future of your relationship
18
19 ($M = 1.30$; $SD = 0.50$; $\alpha = .77$).

20
21
22
23
24
25 **Interference from partners.** Solomon and Knobloch's (2001) scale was used to measure
26
27 partner interference. Participants used a six-point Likert-type scale (1 = *strongly disagree*, 6 =
28
29 *strongly agree*) to indicate their level of agreement with five items: (a) this person interferes with
30
31 the achievement of everyday goals I set for myself; (b) this person interferes with the amount of
32
33 time I spend with my friends; (c) this person interferes with my ability to use my time well; (d)
34
35 this person interferes with the things I need to do each day; and (e) this person interferes in my
36
37 ability to make plans ($M = 1.60$; $SD = 0.87$; $\alpha = .85$).

38
39
40
41 **Increase in relational uncertainty and partner interference.**² We also computed
42
43 variables measuring an increase in the sources of relational uncertainty and interference from
44
45 partners. These variables were computed by subtracting the level of each variable in one wave of
46
47 the study from the level of that same variable in the subsequent wave of the study (self
48
49 uncertainty Δ : range = -4.00 to 3.00, $M = .02$, $SD = 0.55$; partner uncertainty Δ : range = -3.25 to
50
51 3.00, $M = -.10$, $SD = 0.64$; relationship uncertainty Δ : range = -2.50 to 2.50, $M = .02$, $SD = 0.47$;
52
53 interference from partners Δ : range = -2.80 to 5.00, $M = .09$, $SD = 0.82$). Thus, positive values
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

A LONGITUDINAL ASSESSMENT

16

1
2
3 represent the magnitude of an increase in relational uncertainty and partner interference, and
4
5 negative values represent the magnitude of a decrease in relational uncertainty and partner
6
7 interference.
8
9

Analyses

Preliminary Analyses

10
11
12
13
14
15 As a starting point, we conducted preliminary analyses on the data collected in the pre-
16
17 birth questionnaire. First, we conducted paired-samples t-tests on all variables to evaluate mean
18
19 differences in our variables between male partners and female partners. Results indicated no
20
21 significant differences.
22
23

24
25 Next, we assessed the bivariate correlations among all of the variables (see Table 2).
26
27 Results indicated that the three sources of relational uncertainty were all positively interrelated,
28
29 and they were all positively associated with partner interference and negatively associated with
30
31 relationship satisfaction. Interference from partners was also negatively associated with
32
33 relationship satisfaction.
34
35

36
37 We also calculated the intraclass correlation (ρ) for relationship satisfaction as the
38
39 dependent variable in this study. The intraclass correlation calculates the total variability in the
40
41 dependent variable that is attributable to between-persons and between-groups variance, as
42
43 opposed to within-person variance. An intraclass correlation that is close to 0 indicates that most
44
45 the variability in the dependent variable is attributable to within-person variance, and an
46
47 intraclass correlation that is close to 1 indicates that most of the variability is attributable to
48
49 between-persons and between-groups variance (Kreft & De Leeuw, 1998; Snijders & Bosker,
50
51 2003). The intraclass correlation for relationship satisfaction ($\rho = .16$) indicates that the majority
52
53 of the variability is attributable to within-person variance across waves of the study.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Substantive Analyses

The longitudinal analyses focused on how the amount of relational uncertainty and partner interference corresponded with concurrent reports of relationship satisfaction during the same wave of the study, and on how the change in relational uncertainty and partner interference from the previous wave corresponded with concurrent reports of relationship satisfaction. The data were analyzed using hierarchical linear modeling 6.0 (HLM) software, which is designed to accommodate nonindependent or nested data (Bryk & Raudenbush, 1992). We evaluated our hypotheses using a full maximum likelihood, 3-level model with repeated measures as Level 1 variables, stable individual characteristics as Level 2 variables, and dyadic characteristics as Level 3 variables. Predictors were entered into the model as uncentered variables, group mean-centered variables (i.e., centered around the individual's mean across waves of the study), or grand mean-centered variables (i.e., centered around the sample mean). Intercepts were estimated as random effects and slopes were estimated as fixed effects.

To conduct our analyses, we configured the data so that the sources of relational uncertainty, partner interference, and relationship satisfaction during the previous wave (Wave T-1) were combined with measures of the same variables and change scores in the subsequent wave (Wave T). In each of our analyses, relationship satisfaction for Wave T was treated as the dependent variable, so we controlled for the level of relationship satisfaction reported during the previous wave (T-1) in our analyses. Relationship length measured during the first wave was included as a covariate on the Level 3 intercept and was entered as grand mean-centered to control for differences in relationship satisfaction between couples with longer or shorter relationships. To test H1 and H2, each of the facets of relational uncertainty and partner interference, as measured in Wave T, were entered as predictors in separate models. The

A LONGITUDINAL ASSESSMENT

18

1
2
3 predictors were entered as group mean-centered to determine how deviations around the
4
5 individual mean of that variable corresponded with perceptions of the dependent variable. To test
6
7 H3 and H4, the change score for each of the relational uncertainty variables and partner
8
9 interference were entered as uncentered predictors in separate models. We also included the
10
11 within subject mean for the corresponding independent variable in each model as a covariate on
12
13 the Level 2 intercept to discern the within-person effect from the between-persons effect. See
14
15 Appendix for equations.
16
17
18
19

20 Our final model included both the amount and the change in each independent variable as
21
22 predictors in the same model to determine which mechanism best predicts decreased satisfaction.
23
24 Again, relationship satisfaction in Week T was the dependent variable in this model. We
25
26 included relationship length on the Level 3 intercept to control for between couple differences in
27
28 relationship satisfaction. We also included relationship satisfaction in Week T-1 as a covariate in
29
30 the model. The amount of self, partner, and relationship uncertainty or partner interference in
31
32 Week T were entered as group mean-centered predictors in separate models. The within-person
33
34 mean for the corresponding variable was also entered on the Level 2 intercept to control for
35
36 between-person variation in relational uncertainty. We also included the change in the
37
38 corresponding independent variable as uncentered predictors. See Appendix for equations.
39
40
41
42
43

Results

44
45 Recall that our first set of hypotheses predicted that the amount of relational uncertainty
46
47 (H1) and partner interference (H2) are negatively associated with relationship satisfaction.
48
49 Results are reported in Table 3. The between person effects are reflected in the results for the
50
51 within-person means on the intercept and they indicate that individuals with above average levels
52
53 of relational uncertainty and partner interference reported less relationship satisfaction. Length of
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

A LONGITUDINAL ASSESSMENT

19

1
2
3 relationship was not significantly associated with relationship satisfaction. The within-person
4 effects are represented in the slopes and revealed that relational uncertainty and partner
5 interference were negatively associated with relationship satisfaction over time. Thus, H1 and H2
6 were supported. The residuals indicated that there was significant variability left to explain in the
7 Level 2 intercept for the model in which self uncertainty was the predictor.

8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15 Our second set of hypotheses predicted that the change in relational uncertainty (H3) and
16 partner interference (H4) from one wave to the next was negatively associated with concurrent
17 relationship satisfaction. Again, relationship length did not alter the value of the intercept. The
18 between-person effects on the intercept revealed that individuals with above average levels of
19 relational uncertainty and partner interference reported significantly less relationship satisfaction.
20 The within-person effects showed that an increase in relational uncertainty or partner
21 interference from one wave to the next was negatively associated with relationship satisfaction.
22 Thus, the hypotheses were supported. Residuals showed no variability left to be explained in the
23 intercepts for the model.

24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36 One final set of analyses examined the amount of relational uncertainty and partner
37 interference, as well as the change in those variables over time, as predictors in the same model
38 to distinguish between these competing explanations for decreased relationship satisfaction
39 during the transition to parenthood. Again, relationship length did not significantly alter the
40 intercept, but there were between person differences such that individuals with above average
41 relational uncertainty and partner interference reported less relationship satisfaction. With regard
42 to the slopes, results indicated that the amount of relationship uncertainty and partner
43 interference were nonsignificant in all of the models. In contrast, the change in relational
44 uncertainty and partner interference were significant, such that an increase in relational
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 uncertainty and partner interference from one wave to the next were negatively associated with
4 relationship satisfaction. Residuals indicated no variability left to explain in the intercept. Thus,
5
6 the results of this analysis point to an increase in relational uncertainty and partner interference
7
8 as the only predictor of relationship satisfaction when the concurrent amount of these variables is
9
10 covaried.
11
12
13
14

15 Discussion

16
17 This study drew on the relational turbulence model to offer competing explanations for
18 decreased relationship satisfaction among first-time parents. On one hand, the relational
19 turbulence model highlights the *amount* of relational uncertainty and interference from partners
20 as predictors of dissatisfaction. On the other hand, we reasoned that it may be the *change* from a
21 relatively certain and coordinated relationship to one that is more uncertain and disruptive that
22 predicts a decrease in relationship satisfaction. When evaluated separately, results indicated that
23 both the amount and the change in relational uncertainty and partner interference were viable
24 explanations for decreased relationship satisfaction during the transition to parenthood. When
25 evaluated together, the change in these variables emerged as the only significant predictor of
26 relationship satisfaction. In this section, we discuss these results with regard to their implications
27 for the literature on the transition to parenthood and for the relational turbulence model.
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

43 Explaining Challenges during the Transition to Parenthood

44
45 An ever-expanding literature consistently points to the transition to parenthood as a
46 tumultuous time in the trajectory of romantic relationships. Studies suggest that couples
47 experience less physical and emotional intimacy (Belsky & Kelly, 1994), engage in fewer joint
48 activities (Moller et al., 2008), communicate less frequently (Salmela-Aro, Aunola, Saiato,
49 Halmesmaki, & Nuri, 2006), and engage in more conflict (Cowan & Cowan, 2000). Moreover,
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

A LONGITUDINAL ASSESSMENT

21

1
2
3 the majority of research on this transition points to decreased relationship satisfaction after the
4 arrival of a baby (Glenn & McLanahan, 1982; Kurdek, 1993; Schulz, Cowan, & Cowan, 2006).

5
6
7
8 Our study adds to the growing body of literature that points to a decline in relationship
9 satisfaction during the transition to parenthood, but we nominate two new variables that predict
10 this outcome: relational uncertainty and interference from partners.
11
12
13

14
15 Although many studies point to the hardships that accompany the birth of a first child, the
16 literature is lacking in terms of theoretically driven explanations for the challenges that emerge
17 during this transition (but see Simpson et al., 2002). Our study draws on the relational turbulence
18 model as a theoretical framework that helps to explain why the transition to parenthood might be
19 characterized by tumult, distress, and dissatisfaction. Specifically, our results indicate that
20 relational uncertainty and interference from partners are two mechanisms in romantic
21 relationships that correspond with dissatisfaction. Although many studies of new parents have
22 identified sources of hardship after the arrival of a new baby, relatively fewer studies have
23 articulated how those experiences are associated with relational mechanisms that are linked to
24 decreased satisfaction (but see Elliston, McHale, Talbot, Parmley, & Kuersten-Hogan, 2008; Van
25 Egeren, 2004). Relational uncertainty and interference from partners are two mechanisms
26 inherent to relationship functioning that may mediate the association between a variety of
27 relationship events (e.g., decreased physical intimacy, increased conflict) and relationship
28 dissatisfaction.
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 With regard to relational uncertainty, there are a variety of experiences during the
49 transition to parenthood that might contribute to doubts about one's commitment to the
50 relationship. Women go through a number of psychological, emotional, and physical changes
51 during pregnancy (Devine, Bove, & Olson, 2000), which might ignite questions over whether or
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

A LONGITUDINAL ASSESSMENT

22

1
2
3 not her partner is still attracted to her post-pregnancy body, whether or not he understands her
4 emotional needs, and whether or not she can still connect with him on an intimate level.
5
6 Similarly, men may question if their partner will continue to invest in the romantic relationship
7
8 now that her attention is divided between her roles as a mother and a relationship partner
9
10 (Finnbogadóttir, Crang Svalenius, & Persson, 2003). A number of studies point to decreased
11
12 intimacy following the birth of a child (Cowan & Cowan, 2000; Twenge, Campbell, & Foster,
13
14 2003), which can raise doubts over the viability of that romantic relationship over time. Thus, we
15
16 are encouraged by the utility of relational uncertainty as one variable that helps to explain
17
18 people's reactivity during the transition to parenthood.
19
20
21
22
23

24
25 Interference from partners is also an explanatory mechanism that helps to organize
26
27 existing findings regarding relationship challenges following the birth of a child. Studies
28
29 consistently show a redistribution of roles and responsibilities between new parents (Claxton &
30
31 Perry-Jenkins, 2008; Dew & Wilcox, 2011), which is really at the heart of partner interference.
32
33 Relationship partners may be discouraged and frustrated in their efforts to keep a clean house,
34
35 schedule a daily work-out, acquire groceries, or stay late at the office now that they have to
36
37 renegotiate these routines around the baby's schedule. Thus, interference from partners is another
38
39 variable that is useful for understanding why relationship partners struggle during the transition
40
41 to parenthood. In combination, support for relational uncertainty and partner interference as
42
43 predictors of new parents' relational dissatisfaction highlights the utility of the relational
44
45 turbulence model for explaining heightened reactivity during the transition to parenthood.
46
47
48
49

Extending the Relational Turbulence Model

50
51
52 This study also extends the relational turbulence model conceptually and operationally.
53
54 One way in which this study expands the relational turbulence model is by applying it to a salient
55
56
57
58
59
60

A LONGITUDINAL ASSESSMENT

23

1
2
3 transition in the development of romantic relationships. Originally, the relational turbulence
4 model was intended to explain heightened reactivity to relationship circumstances during the
5 transition from casual to serious involvement in dating relationships (Solomon & Knobloch,
6 2004; Solomon & Theiss, 2008). More recently, the model has gained traction as a tool for
7 explaining upheaval during various transitional moments in more established romantic
8 relationships (Solomon et al., 2010), such as the diagnosis of breast cancer (Weber & Solomon,
9 2008), coping with infertility (Steuber & Solomon, 2008), and the reunion of military couples
10 following deployment (Knobloch & Theiss, in press). To this list, we add the transition to
11 parenthood as a relationship experience that is characterized by turmoil and marked by relational
12 uncertainty and interference from partners. The model is fruitful in this context because it helps
13 to organize a literature that is currently devoid of theory and it points specifically to relationship
14 processes that explain why new parents face relational challenges during this transition.
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30

31
32 Beyond the application of the relational turbulence model in a new context, this study
33 marks an important contribution to the model because it is the first to longitudinally document a
34 relationship transition as it occurs. Most of the studies that examine transitions in established
35 relationships have two shortcomings: (a) they are cross-sectional in nature, and (b) they are
36 focused on individuals or dyads who have already experienced the transition and are currently
37 responding to the aftermath in their relationship (e.g., Knobloch & Theiss, in press; Steuber &
38 Solomon, 2008; Weber & Solomon, 2010). Even the longitudinal studies that were conducted in
39 dating relationships surveyed individuals and dyads at various stages of relationship
40 development and could not guarantee that partners made the transition from casual to serious
41 involvement during the course of the study (e.g., Knobloch & Theiss, 2010; Solomon & Theiss,
42 2008). By recruiting couples during pregnancy and tracking changes to their relationship
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

A LONGITUDINAL ASSESSMENT

24

1
2
3 following the birth of their child, our study evaluates the transition to parenthood as it unfolds.
4
5 Thus, as the relational turbulence model expands to consider transitional periods in more
6
7 established relationships, more studies are needed that are capable of documenting those
8
9 transitions from beginning to end.
10
11

12
13 Operationally, this study also extends the relational turbulence model by investigating the
14
15 nature of relational uncertainty and partner interference as variables that are reflective of change.
16
17 Whereas the vast majority of studies that employ the relational turbulence model focus on the
18
19 amount of relational uncertainty and interference from partners as predictors of upheaval, we
20
21 offered competing hypotheses that examined the magnitude of an increase in these variables as
22
23 predictors of relational outcomes. Results indicated that the change in relational uncertainty and
24
25 interference from partners were stronger predictors of relationship satisfaction than the raw
26
27 amounts of those variables. These findings lay a foundation for thinking about the mechanisms
28
29 of the relational turbulence model in a different way.
30
31
32
33

34 Although scholars have consistently used the amount of relational uncertainty and
35
36 interference from partners as predictors in the relational turbulence model, this strategy raises at
37
38 least two issues. First, individuals in romantic relationships, especially highly committed
39
40 relationships, tend to report low levels of relational uncertainty and partner interference. In most
41
42 studies, the mean for each variable is well below the mid-point of the scale. Thus, comparisons
43
44 of individuals with low versus high amounts of the variable are really contrasting individuals
45
46 with low and lower amounts of the variable. Second, the scales measure people's global
47
48 assessments of relational uncertainty and partner interference, so they are not sensitive to
49
50 episodic spikes in each variable at any given time. The items that measure these variables ask
51
52 respondents to reflect on their relationship generally, so even during turbulent transitions,
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

A LONGITUDINAL ASSESSMENT

25

1
2
3 respondents might respond in a way that reflects their typical feelings about their relationship
4
5 rather than their feelings about the relationship in that moment. Although the amount of
6
7 relational uncertainty and partner interference might be a suitable predictor in cross-sectional
8
9 studies, research that employs longitudinal designs might consider calculating the increase or
10
11 decrease in those variables as a more meaningful predictor of reactivity in relationships.
12
13
14

Strengths, Limitations, and Future Directions

15
16
17 Our study has some significant strengths, but also a few weaknesses that should be
18
19 recognized. The first strength of this study is the longitudinal nature of the data. One benefit of a
20
21 longitudinal design is that it enabled us to measure changes in relationship characteristics from
22
23 one wave of the study to the next. Specifically, we were able to observe how a change in
24
25 relationship functioning predicted subsequent reactions to relationship events. Another strength
26
27 of this study is the use of dyadic data, which takes into account the relationship experiences of
28
29 both partners during the transition to parenthood. Many studies have focused on the ways in
30
31 which motherhood has relational implications for women (e.g. Goldstein, Diener, &
32
33 Mandelsdorf, 1996; Horowitz & Damato, 1999; Porter & Hsu, 2003), but relatively fewer studies
34
35 have focused on the struggles that men face as they become fathers (but see Finnbogadóttir et al.,
36
37 2003). Moreover, studies that have examined the experiences of both mothers and fathers
38
39 surveyed individuals, rather than dyads (e.g., Cowan & Cowan, 2000; Delmore-Ko, Pancer,
40
41 Hunsberger, & Pratt, 2000). By surveying both mothers and fathers from the same couple we
42
43 were able to obtain a more complete picture of this experience.
44
45
46
47
48
49

50
51 There are also a few weaknesses of this study. First, our inclusion criteria required that
52
53 couples be in their second or third trimester in order to participate because we wanted to avoid
54
55 the potential for miscarriage (which is heightened during the first trimester), but we acknowledge
56
57
58
59
60

A LONGITUDINAL ASSESSMENT

26

1
2
3 that the transition to parenthood may begin before couples get to this point. Relationships may
4 begin to change at the point couples decide to try for a pregnancy, when they become pregnant,
5 and during the first trimester as they start to prepare their lives for a new addition. Similarly,
6 changes to the romantic relationship are likely to continue past the sixth month after a child is
7 born, but limited resources prevented a more long term study. Although we successfully captured
8 part of the transition, our study falls short in terms of documenting the full length of time in
9 which partners experience relationship change. Another limitation of this study is that we limited
10 participation to couples who were the biological parents of their child. Thus, our results do not
11 generalize to couples who are going through the experience of adoption, which may present an
12 array of other challenges not reflected in these results.
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

27 In conclusion, this study used a longitudinal research design to distinguish between the
28 mechanisms in the relational turbulence model that are responsible for decreased relationship
29 satisfaction during the transition to parenthood. Our findings suggest that it is not necessarily
30 high amounts of relational uncertainty and partner interference that contribute to dissatisfaction,
31 but rather an increase in these relationship variables over time. These results are significant
32 because they apply theory to the literature on the transition to parenthood and they extend the
33 relational turbulence model by evaluating the influence that its core mechanisms have on
34 relationship outcomes. Future research on new parents should continue to investigate more
35 theoretically driven hypotheses and future tests of the relational turbulence model should
36 consider alternatives to evaluating the mechanisms of turbulence. We are hopeful that future
37 research will embrace these recommendations to further disentangle the challenges that face new
38 parents.
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

References

- Afifi, W. A., & Guerrero, L. K. (2000). Motivations underlying topic avoidance in close relationships. In S. Petronio (Ed.), *Balancing the secrets of private disclosures* (pp. 165-179). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Antonucci, T. C., & Mikus, K. (1988). The power of parenthood: Personality and attitudinal changes during the transition to parenthood. In G. Y. Michaels & W. A. Goldberg (Eds.), *The transition to parenthood: Current theory and research* (pp. 62-84). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Belsky, J. (1990). Children and marriage. In F. D. Finchman & T. A. Bradbury (Eds.), *The psychology of marriage: Basic issues and applications* (pp. 172-200). New York: Guilford.
- Belsky, J., & Kelly, J. (1994). *The transition to parenthood: How a first child changes a marriage. Why some couples grow closer and others apart*. New York: Dell.
- Belsky, J., & Rovine, M. (1990). Patterns of marital change across the transition to parenthood: Pregnancy to three years postpartum. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 52, 5-19.
- Berscheid, E. (1983). Emotion. In H. H. Kelley, E. Berscheid, A. Christensen, J. Harvey, T. L. Huston, G. Levinger, et al. (Eds.), *Close relationships* (pp. 110-168). San Francisco: Freeman.
- Bryk, A. S., & Raudenbush, S. W. (1992). *Hierarchical linear models: Applications and data analysis methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Claxon, A., & Perry-Jenkins, M. (2008). No fun anymore: Leisure and marital quality across the transition to parenthood. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 70, 28-43.

A LONGITUDINAL ASSESSMENT

28

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
- Clements, M., & Markman, H. (1996). The transition to parenthood: Is having children hazardous to marriage? In N. Vanzetti & S. Duck (Eds.), *A lifetime of relationships* (pp. 290-310). Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole Publishing.
- Cowan, C. P., & Cowan, P. A. (2000). *When partners become parents: The big life change for couples*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Cowan, C. P., Cowan, P. A., Heming, G., Gerratt, E., Coysh, W. S., Curtis-Boles, H., & Boles A. J. (1985). Transition to parenthood: His, hers, and theirs. *Journal and Family Issues*, 6, 451-481.
- Cox, M. J., Paley, B., Burchinal, M., & Payne, C. C. (1999). Marital perceptions and interactions across the transition to parenthood. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 61, 611-625.
- Delmore-Ko, P., Pancer, S.M., Pratt, M. & Hunsberger, B. (2000). Becoming a parent: The relation between prenatal expectations and postnatal experience. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 14, 625-640.
- Demo, D. H., & Cox, M. J. (2000). Families with young children: A review of research in the 1990's. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 62, 876-896.
- Devine, C. M., Bove, C. F., & Olson, C. M. (2000). Continuity and change in women's weight orientations and lifestyle practices through pregnancy and the postpartum period: The influence of life course trajectories and transitional events. *Social Sciences and Medicine*, 50, 567-582.
- Dew, J., & Wilcox, W.B. (2011). If Momma ain't happy: Explaining declines in marital satisfaction among new mothers. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 73, 1-12.

A LONGITUDINAL ASSESSMENT

29

- 1
2
3 Elek, S. M., Hudson, D. B., & Bouffard, C. (2003). Marital and parenting satisfaction and infant
4 care self-efficacy during the transition to parenthood: The effect of infant sex. *Issues in*
5
6 *Comprehensive Pediatric Nursing*, 26, 45–57.
7
8
9
10 Elliston, D., McHale, J. Talbot, J., Parmley, M., & Kursten-Hogan, R. (2008). Withdrawal from
11 coparenting interactions during early infancy. *Family Processes*, 47, 481-499.
12
13
14
15 Finnbogadóttir, H., Crang-Svalenius, E., & Persson, E. K. (2003). Expectant first-time fathers'
16 experiences of pregnancy. *Midwifery*, 19, 96-105.
17
18
19
20 Glenn, N. D., & McLanahan, S. (1982). Children and marital happiness: A further specification
21 of the relationship. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 44, 63-72.
22
23
24
25 Goldstein, L. H., Diener, M. L., & Mangelsdorf, S. C. (1996). Maternal characteristics and social
26 support across the transition to motherhood: Associations with maternal behavior.
27
28 *Journal of Family Psychology*, 10, 60-71.
29
30
31
32 Gottman, J. M., & Gottman, J. S. (2007). *And baby makes three*. NY: Crown Publishers.
33
34
35 Gottman, J. M., & Notarius, C. I. (2000). Decade review: Observing marital interaction. *Journal*
36
37 *of Marriage and the Family*, 62, 927-947.
38
39
40
41 Hackel, L. S., & Rubel, D. N. (1992). Changes in the marital relationship after the first baby is
42 born: Predicting the impact of expectancy disconfirmation. *Journal of Personality and*
43
44 *Social Psychology*, 62, 944-957.
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

A LONGITUDINAL ASSESSMENT

30

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
- Hunter, J. E., & Gerbing, D. W. (1982). Unidimensional measurement, second order factor analysis, and casual models. In B. M. Staw & L. L. Cummings (Eds.), *Research in organizational behavior* (Vol. 4, pp. 267-320). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Huston, T. L., & Vangelisti, A. L. (1995). How parenthood affects marriage. In M. A. Fitzpatrick & A. L. Vangelisti (Eds.), *Explaining family interactions* (pp. 147-176). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Kerem, E., Fishman, N., & Josselson, R. (2001). The experience of empathy in everyday relationships: Cognitive and affective elements. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 18*, 709-729.
- Kline, R. B. (1998). *Principles and practice of structural equation modeling*. Guilford Press, New York.
- Knobloch, L. K. (2007). Perceptions of turmoil within courtship: Associations with intimacy, relational uncertainty, and interference from partners. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 24*, 363-384.
- Knobloch, L. K. (2008). The content of relational uncertainty within marriage. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 2008*, 467-495.
- Knobloch, L. K., & Carpenter-Theune, K. E. (2004). Topic avoidance in developing romantic relationships: Associations with intimacy and relational uncertainty. *Communication Research, 31*, 173-205.
- Knobloch, L. K., Miller, L. E., Bond, B. J., & Mannone, S. E. (2007). Relational uncertainty and message processing in marriage. *Communication Monographs, 74*, 154-180.
- Knobloch, L. K., Miller, L. E., & Carpenter, K. E. (2007). Using the relational turbulence model to understand negative emotion within courtship. *Personal Relationships, 14*, 91-112.

A LONGITUDINAL ASSESSMENT

31

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Knobloch, L. K., & Solomon, D. H. (1999). Measuring the sources and content of relational uncertainty. *Communication Studies, 50*, 261-278.

Knobloch, L. K., & Solomon, D. H. (2002). Information-seeking beyond initial interaction: Managing relational uncertainty within close relationships. *Human Communication Research, 28*, 243-257.

Knobloch, L. K., Solomon, D. H., & Cruz, M. G. (2001). The role of relationship development and attachment in the experience of romantic jealousy. *Personal Relationships, 8*, 205-224.

Knobloch, L. K., & Theiss, J. A. (2010). An actor-partner interdependence model of relational turbulence: Cognitions and emotions. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 27*, 595-619.

Knobloch, L. K., & Theiss, J. A. (in press). Relational turbulence during the post-deployment transition: Relational maintenance, partner responsiveness, and appraisals of turmoil. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*.

Kreft, I., & de Leeuw, J. (1998). *Introducing multilevel modeling*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Kurdek, L. A. (1993). Nature and prediction of changes in marital quality for first-time parent and nonparent husbands and wives. *Journal of Family Psychology, 27*, 627-626.

Lavee, Y. Sharlin, S., & Katz, R. (1996). The effect of parenting stress on marital quality. *Journal of Family Issues, 17*, 114-135.

Lawrence, E., Rothman, A. D., Cobb, R. J., Rothman, M. T., & Bradbury, T. N. (2008). Marital satisfaction across the transition to parenthood. *Journal of Family Psychology, 22*, 41-50.

Levi-Shiff, R. (1994). Individual and Contextual correlates of marital change across the transition to parenthood. *Developmental Psychology, 30*, 591-601.

A LONGITUDINAL ASSESSMENT

32

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
- Levi-Shiff, R., Dimitrovsky, L., Shulman, S., & Har-Even, D. (1998). Cognitive appraisals, coping strategies, and support resources as correlates of parenting and infant development. *Developmental Psychology, 34*, 1417-1427.
- Livingston, K. R. (1980). Love as a process of reducing uncertainty: Cognitive theory. In K. S. Pope (Ed.), *On love and loving* (pp. 133-151). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- MacDermid, S. M., Huston, T. L., & McHale, S. M. (1990). Changes in marriage associated with the transition to parenthood: Individual differences as a function of sex-role attitudes and changes in the division of household labor. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 52*, 475-486.
- Moller, K., Hwang, C. P., & Wickberg, B. (2008). Couple relationship and transition to parenthood: Does workload at home matter? *Journal of Reproductive and Infant Psychology, 26*, 57-68.
- O'Brien, M., & Peyton, V. (2002). Parenting attitudes and marital intimacy: A longitudinal analysis. *Journal of Family Psychology, 16*, 118-127.
- Porter, C. L., & Hsu, H.C. (2003). First-time mothers' perceptions of efficacy during the transition to motherhood: Links to infant temperament. *Journal of Family Psychology, 17*, 54-64.
- Rochlen, A. B., McKelley, R.A., Suizzo, M. A., & Scaringi, V. (2008). Predictors of relationship satisfaction, psychological well-being, and life satisfaction among stay-at-home fathers. *Psychology of Men and Masculinity, 9*, 17-28.
- Salmela-Aro, K., Aunola, K., Saiato, T., Halmesmaki, E., & Nurmi, J. E. (2006). Couples share similar changes in depressive symptoms and marital satisfaction anticipating the birth of a child. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 23*, 781-803.

A LONGITUDINAL ASSESSMENT

33

- 1
2
3 Schulz, M. S., Cowan, C. P., & Cowan, P. A. (2006). Promoting healthy beginnings: A
4
5 randomized controlled trial of a preventive intervention of preserve marital quality during
6
7 the transition to parenthood. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 74*, 20-31.
8
9
- 10 Segrin, C., & Flora, J. (2005). *Family communication*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum
11
12 Associates.
13
14
- 15 Simpson, J. A., Rholes, W. S., Campbell, L., Wilson, C., & Tran, S. (2002). Adult attachment,
16
17 the transition to parenthood, and marital well-being. In P. Noller & J. A. Feeney (Eds.),
18
19 *Understanding marriage: Developments in the study of couple interaction* (pp. 385-410).
20
21 Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
22
23
- 24 Snijders, T. A. B., & Bosker, R. J. (2003). *Multilevel analysis: An introduction to basic and*
25
26 *advanced multilevel modeling*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
27
28
- 29 Solomon, D. H., & Knobloch, L. K. (2001). Relationship uncertainty, partner interference, and
30
31 intimacy within dating relationships. *Journal of Science and Personal Relationships, 18*,
32
33 804-820.
34
35
- 36 Solomon, D. H., & Knobloch, L. K. (2004). A model of relational turbulence: The role of
37
38 intimacy, relational uncertainty, and interference from partners in appraisals of irritations.
39
40 *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 21*, 795-816.
41
42
- 43 Solomon, D. H., & Theiss, J. A. (2008). A longitudinal test of the relational turbulence model of
44
45 romantic relationship development. *Personal Relationships, 15*, 339-357.
46
47
- 48 Solomon, D. H., Weber, K. M., & Steuber, K. R. (2010). Turbulence in relational transitions. In
49
50 S. R. Wilson & S. W. Smith (Eds.), *New directions in interpersonal communication*
51
52 *research* (pp. 115-134). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

A LONGITUDINAL ASSESSMENT

34

- 1
2
3 Steuber, K. R., & Solomon, D. H. (2008). Relational uncertainty, partner interference, and
4
5 infertility: A qualitative study of discourse within online forums. *Journal of Social and*
6
7 *Personal Relationships*, 25, 831-855.
8
9
- 10 Theiss, J. A. (2011). Modeling dyadic effects in the associations between relational uncertainty,
11
12 sexual communication, and sexual satisfaction for husbands and wives. *Communication*
13
14 *Research*, 38, 565-584.
15
16
- 17 Theiss, J. A., & Knobloch, L. K. (2009). An actor-partner interdependence model of the
18
19 experience and expression of irritations in romantic relationships. *Communication*
20
21 *Research*, 36, 510-536.
22
23
- 24 Theiss, J. A., Knobloch, L. K., Checton, M. G., & Magsamen-Conrad, K. (2009). Relationship
25
26 characteristics associated with the experience of hurt in romantic relationships: A test of
27
28 the relational turbulence model. *Human Communication Research*, 35, 588-615.
29
30
- 31 Theiss, J. A., & Nagy, M. E. (2010). Actor-partner effects in the associations between
32
33 relationship characteristics and reactions to marital sexual intimacy. *Journal of Social and*
34
35 *Personal Relationships*, 27, 1089-1109.
36
37
- 38 Theiss, J. A., & Solomon, D. H. (2006a). Coupling longitudinal data and hierarchical linear
39
40 modeling to examine the antecedents and consequences of jealousy experiences in
41
42 romantic relationships: A test of the relational turbulence model. *Human Communication*
43
44 *Research*, 32, 469-503.
45
46
- 47 Theiss, J. A., & Solomon, D. H. (2006b). A relational turbulence model of communication about
48
49 irritations in romantic relationships. *Communication Research*, 33, 391-418.
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

A LONGITUDINAL ASSESSMENT

35

Theiss, J. A., & Solomon, D. H. (2008). Parsing the mechanisms that increase relational intimacy: The effects of uncertainty amount, open communication about uncertainty, and the reduction of uncertainty. *Human Communication Research*, 34, 625-654.

Twenge, J. M., Campbell, W. K., & Foster, C. A. (2003). Parenthood and marital satisfaction: A meta-analytic review. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 65, 574-583.

Van Egeren, L. A. (2004). The development of the coparenting relationship over the transition to parenthood. *Infant Mental Health Journal*, 25, 453-477.

Weber, K. M. & Solomon, D. H. (2008). Locating relationship and communication issues among stressors associated with breast cancer. *Health Communication*, 23, 548-559.

Weber, K. M. & Solomon, D. H. (2010, November). *The relational turbulence model and couple decision making*. Paper presented at the 96th annual meeting of the National Communication Association, Interpersonal Communication Divisions, San Francisco, CA.

Footnotes

¹The percentages for ethnicity sum to more than 100% because participants were instructed to check all ethnicities that applied.

²One common concern about change scores is that they compound measurement error because error is contributed by each score used in the computation (Harris, 1963). To obtain a more accurate assessment of the reliability of the change scores we squared the coefficient alpha for each of the independent variables as measured in the pre-birth questionnaire. Applying the product rule in this way provides a general estimate of the constraint imposed on the reliability of the change score by error within each component variable (Anderson & Gerbing, 1982). With the exception of relationship uncertainty ($\alpha^2 = .59$), the squared reliability estimates for self uncertainty ($\alpha^2 = .85$), partner uncertainty ($\alpha^2 = .85$), and interference from partners ($\alpha^2 = .72$) were acceptable.

Appendix

In the models that follow, the subscript i refers to the time of measurement (Level 1), the subscript j refers to the respondent (Level 2), and the subscript k refers to the couple (Level 3).

Variables that are italicized are group mean-centered and variables that are capitalized are grand mean-centered.

The following equations represent the model that was constructed when amount of self uncertainty was the independent variable. Identical models were constructed for partner uncertainty, relationship uncertainty, and interference from partners when testing H1 and H2, and for the change in each independent variable when testing H3 and H4.

Model 1: The Amount of Relational Uncertainty and Partner Interference as Predictors of Concurrent Relationship Satisfaction

Level 1 Equation:

$$Y_{ijk} = \pi_{0jk} + \pi_{1jk}(Y_{(i-1)jk}) + \pi_{2jk}(\textit{self uncertainty}_{.jk}) + r_{ijk}$$

Level 2 Equation:

$$\pi_{0jk} = \beta_{00} + \beta_{01}(M \textit{self uncertainty}_{.jk}) + u_{0jk}$$

$$\pi_{1jk} = \beta_{10}$$

$$\pi_{2jk} = \beta_{20}$$

Level 3 Equation:

$$\beta_{00} = \gamma_{000} + \gamma_{001}(\text{RELATIONSHIP LENGTH}_{.k}) + u_{00k}$$

$$\beta_{01} = \gamma_{010}$$

$$\beta_{10} = \gamma_{100}$$

$$\beta_{20} = \gamma_{200}$$

Model 2: Distinguishing between Amount versus Change in Relational Uncertainty and Partner Interference as Predictors of Relationship Satisfaction

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

A LONGITUDINAL ASSESSMENT

38

The following equations represent the model that was constructed when self uncertainty and change in self uncertainty were the independent variables. Identical models were constructed for partner uncertainty, relationship uncertainty, and interference from partners

Level 1 Equation:

$$Y_{ijk} = \pi_{0jk} + \pi_{1jk}(Y_{(i-1)jk}) + \pi_{2jk}(\text{self uncertainty}_{.jk}) + \pi_{3jk}(-\Delta \text{ in self uncertainty}_{ijk}) + r_{ijk}$$

Level 2 Equation:

$$\pi_{0jk} = \beta_{00} + \beta_{01}(M \text{ self uncertainty}_{.jk}) + u_{0jk}$$

$$\pi_{1jk} = \beta_{10}$$

$$\pi_{2jk} = \beta_{20}$$

$$\pi_{3jk} = \beta_{30}$$

Level 3 Equation:

$$\beta_{00} = \gamma_{000} + \gamma_{001}(\text{RELATIONSHIP LENGTH}_{.k}) + u_{00k}$$

$$\beta_{01} = \gamma_{010}$$

$$\beta_{10} = \gamma_{100}$$

$$\beta_{20} = \gamma_{200}$$

$$\beta_{30} = \gamma_{300}$$

A LONGITUDINAL ASSESSMENT

39

Table 1

Descriptive Statistics for All Variables in Each Wave of the Study

	Pre-Birth Survey	One Month Survey	Three Month Survey
Sample Size (N)	151	144	122
Relational Satisfaction	6.07 (1.01)	6.11 (1.01)	5.51 (1.06)
Self Uncertainty	1.26 (0.51)	1.28 (0.49)	1.33 (0.56)
Partner Uncertainty	1.65 (0.80)	1.45 (0.73)	1.50 (0.77)
Relationship Uncertainty	1.30 (0.50)	1.29 (0.54)	1.35 (0.54)
Interference from Partners	1.65 (1.01)	1.62 (0.86)	1.82 (1.10)

Note. Cell entries are means. Values in parentheses are standard deviations.

A LONGITUDINAL ASSESSMENT

40

Table 2

Bivariate Correlations Among All Variables

	1	2	3	4	5
1. Relationship Satisfaction					
2. Self Uncertainty	-.56 ***				
3. Partner Uncertainty	-.59 ***	.56 ***			
4. Relationship Uncertainty	-.74 ***	.72 ***	.69 ***		
5. Interference from Partners	-.57 ***	.31 ***	.35 ***	.44 ***	

*** $p < .001$.

For Peer Review

Table 3

Amount of Relational Uncertainty and Partner Interference Predicting Concurrent Relationship Satisfaction

	<u>Self Uncertainty</u>	<u>Partner Uncertainty</u>	<u>Relationship Uncertainty</u>	<u>Interference From Partners</u>
Intercept	4.27 ***	3.50 ***	3.96 ***	2.96 ***
Relationship Length	-.00	-.00	-.00	-.00
Self Uncertainty Mean	-.92 ***			
Partner Uncertainty Mean		-.50 ***		
Relationship Uncertainty Mean			-.79 ***	
Interference from Partners Mean				-.33 ***
Slopes				
Relationship Satisfaction _(T-1)	.44 ***	.51 ***	.47 ***	.56 ***
Self Uncertainty _(T)	-.78 ***			
Partner Uncertainty _(T)		-.46 ***		
Relationship Uncertainty _(T)			-.84 ***	
Interference from Partners _(T)				-.29 ***

For Peer Review

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

A LONGITUDINAL ASSESSMENT

42

Residuals

Intercept _(Level 1)	.00	.00	.00	.00
Intercept _(Level 2)	.04 **	.00	.02	.01

Note. The dependent variable in each model is relationship satisfaction in Wave T. Coefficients are unstandardized. Cell entries in the intercept category are the change in the intercept attributable to relationship length or the within person mean, which represents the between persons effect on that variable. The cell entries in the slopes category represent the within-person slope over the course of the study. The cell entries in the residuals category are τ and represent the remaining unexplained variation in the intercept. Self, partner, and relationship uncertainty and interference from partners were entered in separate models and their effects are represented on the diagonal.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

A LONGITUDINAL ASSESSMENT

Table 4

Change in Relational Uncertainty and Partner Interference Predicting Subsequent Relationship Satisfaction

	<u>Self Uncertainty</u>	<u>Partner Uncertainty</u>	<u>Relationship Uncertainty</u>	<u>Interference From Partners</u>
Intercept	3.18 ***	3.19 ***	2.93 ***	2.60 ***
Relationship Length	.00	-.01	-.00	-.01
Self Uncertainty Mean	-.64 ***			
Partner Uncertainty Mean		-.46 ***		
Relationship Uncertainty Mean			-.53 ***	
Interference from Partners Mean				-.29 ***
Slopes				
Relationship Satisfaction _(T-1)	.57 ***	.55 ***	.60 ***	.62 ***
Δ Self Uncertainty	-.52 ***			
Δ Partner Uncertainty		-.29 **		
Δ Relationship Uncertainty			-.57 ***	
Δ Interference from Partners				-.24 ***

For Peer Review

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

A LONGITUDINAL ASSESSMENT

44

Residuals

Intercept _(Level 1)	.00	.00	.00	.00
Intercept _(Level 2)	.00	.00	.00	.00

Note. The dependent variable in each model is relationship satisfaction in Wave T. Coefficients are unstandardized. Cell entries in the intercept category are the change in the intercept attributable to relationship length or the within person mean, which represents the between persons effect on that variable. The cell entries in the slopes category represent the within-person slope over the course of the study. The cell entries in the residuals category are τ and represent the remaining unexplained variation in the intercept. Change in self, partner, and relationship uncertainty and interference from partners were entered in separate models and their effects are represented on the diagonal.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

Table 5

Amount of Relational Uncertainty and Partner Interference versus Change in Predicting Subsequent Relationship Satisfaction

	<u>Self Uncertainty</u>	<u>Partner Uncertainty</u>	<u>Relationship Uncertainty</u>	<u>Interference From Partners</u>
Intercept	3.27 ***	3.29 ***	3.14 ***	2.64 ***
Relationship Length	-.00	-.00	-.00	-.00
Self Uncertainty Mean	-.66 ***			
Partner Uncertainty Mean		-.47 ***		
Relationship Uncertainty Mean			-.59 ***	
Interference from Partners Mean				-.29 ***
Slopes				
Relationship Satisfaction _(T-1)	.56 ***	.53 ***	.57 ***	.61 ***
Self Uncertainty _(T)	-.18			
Partner Uncertainty _(T)		-.23		
Relationship Uncertainty _(T)			-.31	
Interference from Partners _(T)				-.06

For Peer Review

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

A LONGITUDINAL ASSESSMENT

46

1				
2				
3				
4	Δ Self Uncertainty	-.46 ***		
5				
6	Δ Partner Uncertainty		-.21 *	
7				
8	Δ Relationship Uncertainty			-.44 ***
9				
10	Δ Interference from Partners			-.21 **
11				
12	Residuals			
13				
14	Intercept _(Level 1)	.00	.00	.00
15				
16	Intercept _(Level 2)	.00	.00	.00
17				
18				
19				
20				

21
22 *Note.* The dependent variable in each model is relationship satisfaction in Wave T. Coefficients are unstandardized. Cell entries in the
23 intercept category are the change in the intercept attributable to relationship length or the within person mean, which represents the
24 between persons effect on that variable. The cell entries in the slopes category represent the within-person slope over the course of the
25 study. The cell entries in the residuals category are τ and represent the remaining unexplained variation in the intercept. Self, partner,
26 and relationship uncertainty and interference from partners were entered in separate models and their effects are represented on the
27 diagonal.
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35

36
37 * $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49