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Abstract

Couples reported on bases for giving support and relationship satisfaction just prior to and approximately two years into marriage. Overall, a need-based, non-contingent (communal) norm was seen as ideal, was followed and was linked to higher satisfaction. A contingent, record keeping (exchange) norm was seen as not ideal yet was sometimes used and, by two years into marriage, was linked with lower satisfaction. Idealization of and adherence to a communal norm dropped slightly across time. Insecure attachment predicted greater adherence to an exchange norm. Over two years of marriage people high in avoidance increased use of an exchange norm whereas people low in avoidance decreased use of an exchange norm. Anxious individuals evidenced especially close links between norm use and satisfaction. Overall a picture emerges of people valuing and striving toward communal norm adherence, with secure relative to insecure individuals doing so with more success and equanimity across time.
Ways of giving benefits in marriage: Norm use and attachment related variability

A defining characteristic of high quality intimate relationships is that each person is non-contingently responsive to the welfare of the other person. That is, each person attends to and acts non-contingently to promote the partner’s welfare. In addition, each person seeks support from the partner as needed. Attention to own and partner’s needs and opportunities for mutually enjoyable activities moves flexibly in response to cues of each person’s needs. People do not keep records of who has done what, and as responsiveness occurs, positive emotions, relationship satisfaction and individual and couple well-being emerge (Clark & Mills, in press; Clark & Lemay, in press; Clark, Graham, Lemay & Williams, 2008; Clark & Monin, 2005; Reis, Clark & Holmes, 2004). Today there is little dispute among scholars of close relationships that non-contingent communal responsiveness is good for relationships. For example, we assume it is good for a person to return a partner’s books to the library or to offer a sympathetic shoulder rub without thinking of what the other partner did or will do to earn this responsiveness. We assume it is good to seek advice or assistance without calculating what one has done or will do for one’s partner. At the same time, people frequently fail to “pull off” communal responsiveness. They are sometimes unresponsive unless a partner promises to reciprocate, they sometimes are reluctant to seek support they cannot pay back, they sometimes do keep track of benefits, and issues of fairness and equity are raised even in the best of relationships.

The present paper examines communal and exchange norm use among a group of engaged, then married, individuals across time. We explicitly ask: To what degree are these two norms seen as ideal and followed? How do people react to use of these norms?
What is the trajectory of norm use across time? Finally, are there important and theoretically sensible individual differences in norm use, reactivity to norm use, and trajectories of norm use across time?

Hypotheses

We hypothesized that: Participants (a) would endorse a communal norm as ideal for their marriages; (b) would report that they and their spouse follow the norm; and (c) would be most satisfied when they and their spouse did follow the norm. Why? Communal norm adherence allows for the welfare of each person to be protected and promoted, because responsiveness occurs when needs and desires arise. Moreover, given the lack of “strings” attached to communally motivated support, receiving support can easily be attributed to the partner’s care, and donating support can easily be attributed to one being a caring person.

We further hypothesized that: Participants (d) would not endorse an exchange norm as ideal, yet (e) would report that they and their spouses followed this norm to a slight degree (and less than a communal norm) and (f) would be less satisfied to the extent that they followed this norm. Why? When operating on an exchange norm basis, the donor’s own needs and desires (for reciprocation), rather than the state of the partner’s welfare, drive provision of benefits. As such, many of the partner’s needs and desires will be neglected, donors may not perceive themselves as caring, and recipients may not perceive care. Indeed, recipients may often feel indebted when their partners provide support.

With regard to changes in norm adherence that might occur across time, we hypothesized that: (g) Use of a communal norm should decrease from engagement to two years into marriage. It is effortful to follow this norm. When partners are engaged to be
married, this effort will be driven by desire to establish the relationship and justify commitment as well as by care for one’s partner. Desires to establish the relationship and justify commitment should drop across time and, with them, adherence to the norm itself should drop somewhat (see Clark, 1984). Attachment related insecurities (either anxiety or avoidance) should be linked with greater use of exchange norms because both types of insecurity involve a lack of trust in partners (e.g., Mikulincer, 1998) and adherence to a non-contingent need-based norm requires high trust across time that partners will be available if and when needs arise. Adherence to an exchange norm requires less trust, for one can quickly tell if comparable and prompt reciprocation of benefits occurs and one can attempt to enforce the partner’s reciprocation if it does not. (i) Insecurity in the form of attachment anxiety ought to be linked to more reactivity to own and partner norm use as evidenced by closer associations between norm use and relationship satisfaction. Anxious people are hyper-vigilant about and reactant to issues surrounding responsiveness (Mikulincer & Shaver, 2007). As a result anxious individuals’ satisfaction with relationships may be linked especially closely to their own and their partner’s adherence to communal and to exchange norms.

Method

Participants

Both members of 108 newly-married couples participated. Couples were recruited from bridal fairs, brochures, flyers, electronic bulletin boards, and word-of-mouth. At the start, husbands’ mean age was 27.19 years and wives’ mean was 25.98 years; on average, they had dated 33.43 months before engagement and had been engaged 14.38 months. The range of time couple members had known one another was 8 to 164 months. Most
participants were Caucasian (92%) and well-educated (80% had finished college). No participant had been married previously or had a child.

Procedure

Couples were scheduled for a pre-testing session, which took place at their homes within two months of their wedding. During this session (Time 1), a researcher explained all procedures and asked couple members to complete the initial questionnaires separately and confidentially. A second questionnaire (Time 2) was mailed to each member of the couple approximately two years following their marriage. Husbands’ and wives’ questionnaires were enclosed in separate envelopes and were accompanied by instructions to complete the questionnaires independently and to refrain from discussing them with one another (N = 96 dyads).

Measures

Idealization of and adherence to norms. Each participant was presented with a “communal” and an “exchange” prototype for giving and receiving benefits. The communal prototype was: “The way marital relationships should operate is that each person should pay attention to the other person’s needs. Each person should give a benefit to the other in response to the other’s needs when the other has a real need that he or she cannot meet by him or herself. Each person should do this to the best of his or her ability so long as the personal costs are reasonable. When one person does something for the other, the other should not owe the giver anything.” The exchange prototype was: “The way marital relationships ideally should operate is that each person should benefit the other with the expectation of receiving a benefit of similar value in return. After receiving a benefit, members should feel obligated to give the other a benefit of
comparable value. Members of the relationship ought to keep track of benefits given and received in order to keep them in balance.”

After reading each prototype, participants responded to three statements using 7-point Likert scales (-3: strongly disagree; 3: strongly agree): “I believe that this is the way marital relationships ideally should operate,” “Over the past two months, this is the way that I have been operating in my relationship with my spouse,” and “Over the past two months, this is the way my spouse has been operating in his/her relationship with me.”

**Marital satisfaction.** Marital satisfaction was assessed with Norton’s (1983) Quality of Marriage Index, which consists of six items (e.g., “We have a good relationship”) responded to on 5-point response scales (1 = strongly disagree; 5 = strongly agree) (T1 alpha = .90, T2 alpha = .95) and Hendrick, Dicke, and Hendrick’s (1998) Relationship Assessment Scale, including seven questions (e.g., “To what extent are you satisfied with your relationship?”) answered on 5-point response scales (1=not much; 5=very much) (T1 alpha = .70, T2 alpha = .85). Scores on these two scales were highly correlated (T1 \( r = .54 \), T2 \( r = .83 \)) and were averaged to create an index of satisfaction.

**Attachment-related anxiety and avoidance.** Attachment anxiety and avoidance were assessed using 17 items originally developed by Simpson, Rholes, and Phillips (1996). The attachment-related avoidance subscale consisted of eight items assessing discomfort with closeness (e.g., “I’m not very comfortable having others depend on me”), responded
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1 Evidence supporting the validity of our new prototype measures of own and perceptions of partner adherence to a communal and to an exchange norm is available online in “S1: Supplementary analyses supporting the validity of the communal and exchange adherence measures.”
to on 7-point response scales (1 = strongly disagree; 7 = strongly agree) (T1 alpha = .80, T2 alpha = .80). The attachment-related anxiety subscale consisted of nine items assessing anxiety about others’ acceptance (e.g., “I often worry that my partner(s) don’t really love me”) using the same response scales (T1 alpha = .75, T2 alpha = .80).²

Results

Analyses were conducted using multilevel models (SAS PROC MIXED). Analyses to address mean differences (i.e., communal versus exchange, first versus second assessment and/or ideal versus practiced ratings) were three-level models, with multiple ratings nested within people and people nested within dyads. Analyses examining the linear associations of norm adherence or idealization with another variable (i.e., anxiety, avoidance or relationship satisfaction) were two-level models, with persons nested within dyads. Intercepts were modeled as randomly varying across higher level units to account for the nested data structure (Kenny, Kashy, & Cook, 2006). Significant interactions were probed by examining conditional effects (Cohen, Cohen, West, & Aiken, 2003). First we present results regarding effects across the whole sample. Then we examine links involving individual differences in attachment-related anxiety and avoidance.

Normative Results

Idealization and practice. Mean scores on idealization and practice of norms are shown in Figure 1. As predicted, participants rated the communal norm on the ideal end of the scale and exchange norm as on the not ideal end of the scale at both times. Exchange norms were rated as significantly less ideal than communal norms at both

² Correlations between all study measures presented separately for males and for females may be found online in “S2: Correlations between the primary study measures.”
times ($b < -3.87$, $t < -32.77$, $p < .001$). Figure 1 also reveals that, at both assessment waves, participants claimed to follow exchange norms significantly less than communal norms ($b < -3.08$; $t < -22.62$, $p < .001$) and perceived their spouses as following exchange norms significantly less than communal norms ($b < -2.92$; $t < -20.80$, $p < .001$).

Figure 1 further suggests small drops in idealization and practice of communal behavior over time – drops that were significant for idealization of communal norms ($b = -.52$, $t = -6.14$, $p < .001$), self-reported practice of communal norms ($b = -.49$, $t = -5.06$, $p < .001$), and perceptions of spouse practice of communal norms ($b = -.61$, $t = -5.99$, $p < .001$). In contrast, (the lack of) idealization of exchange norms, self reports of practicing exchange norms, and perceptions of spouse practicing exchange norms did not change significantly over time ($p > .35$).

**Links with marital satisfaction.** Communal ideals did not predict satisfaction at either assessment wave ($p > .17$). However, participants’ communal practices and their perceptions of spouse’s communal practices predicted satisfaction at Time 1 ($b > .07$, $t > 3.85$, $p < .001$) and at Time 2 ($b > .05$; $t > 1.73$, $p < .08$), with the links appearing to be weaker, but not significantly so ($p > .64$), at Time 2. The pattern was reversed for adherence to exchange norms. Idealization of exchange norms did not predict satisfaction at the first assessment wave ($p = .85$), whereas it tended to predict reduced satisfaction at the second assessment wave ($b = -.05$, $t = -1.82$, $p = .07$). Likewise, practice of exchange norms and perceptions of spouses’ practice of exchange norms did not predict relationship satisfaction at the first assessment wave ($p > .25$), but both predicted reduced satisfaction at the second assessment ($b = -.10$, $t < -3.95$, $p < .001$), and the T2
associations were significantly more negative than the T1 associations ($b_s < -.10$, $t_s = -3.93$, $p_s < .001$).

**Individual Differences**

*Anxiety and avoidance as predictors of norm adherence.* We tested whether anxiety and avoidance predicted concurrent and residualized change in idealization and practice of norms. In these models, anxiety and avoidance were entered simultaneously as predictors of the communal and exchange norm variables. At T1, concurrent anxiety predicted lower adherence to communal norms and perceptions of spouse’s adherence to communal norms ($b_s < -.17$, $t_s < -2.09$, $p_s < .05$) and predicted greater adherence to exchange norms ($b = .27$, $t = 2.36$, $p < .05$) (but not perceptions of spouse's adherence to exchange norms, $p = .14$). At T1, no effects of avoidance on adherence were significant, $p_s > .23$, and no effects of anxiety or avoidance on ideals were significant, $p_s > .46$. At T2, concurrent avoidance predicted greater adherence to exchange norms ($b = .28$, $t = 2.51$, $p < .05$), greater idealization of exchange norms ($b = .25$, $t = 2.66$, $p < .01$), and tended to predict greater perceptions of spouse’s adherence to exchange norms ($b = .19$, $t = 1.80$, $p < .07$). At T2, avoidance did not predict any of the communal norm variables, $p_s > .38$, and no effects of anxiety were significant, $p_s > .20$.

T1 avoidance marginally predicted residual increases (predicting the T2 criterion controlling for the T1 assessment of the criterion) in own adherence to exchange norms and perceptions of spouse’s adherence to exchange norms ($b_s > .17$; $t_s > 1.65$, $p_s \leq .10$). (The effect of T1 avoidance on residual increases in own exchange norms was significant when T1 anxiety was not included in the model, $b = .23$, $t[189] = 2.10$, $p < .05$.) All other links between anxiety and avoidance and concurrent or residualized change in norm
adherence and idealization were not significant ($p < .13$).

To understand the effect of change in norm use, the means of exchange behavior are plotted for low and high avoidance (based on 1 SD below and above the mean, respectively) in Figure 2. Those who were low in avoidance appeared to drop in exchange behavior and perceptions of spouse’s exchange behavior over time, whereas those who were high in avoidance appeared to increase.

**Anxiety and avoidance as moderators of the effect of norm adherence on satisfaction.**

We tested whether attachment-related anxiety and avoidance moderated the association between concurrent norm adherence and relationship satisfaction. Anxiety moderated the associations between T1 own exchange behavior ($b = -.03$, $t = -2.01$, $p < .05$), T2 own communal behavior ($b = .05$, $t = 1.91$, $p = .06$), and T2 perceptions of spouse’s exchange behavior ($b = -.05$, $t = -2.11$, $p < .05$) and our measures of satisfaction. (All other interactions were not significant, $p > .10$). When anxiety was high (+1 SD), T1 own exchange behavior predicted less satisfaction ($b = -.04$, $t = -2.12$, $p < .05$), T2 own communal behavior predicted greater satisfaction ($b = .09$, $t = 2.52$, $p < .05$), and T2 perceptions of spouse’s exchange behavior predicted less satisfaction ($b = -.13$, $t = -3.77$, $p < .001$). These relations were not significant when anxiety was low (-1 SD) ($p > .38$).

There were no moderating effects of avoidance on links between norm adherence and satisfaction.

**Discussion**

As expected, a communal norm was perceived as ideal and was reported to have been followed at high levels by self and spouse both prior to marriage and two years into marriage whereas an exchange norm was not seen as ideal and was followed only at low
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levels by self or spouse at each time. Adherence to a communal norm was positively linked to relationship satisfaction prior to marriage and (marginally) two years later. Unexpectedly, adherence to an exchange norm was unrelated to marital satisfaction prior to marriage but, as expected, it was significantly negatively related to satisfaction two years later.

**Communal norm use and links to satisfaction across time.** As predicted, across all participants own use and perceived partner use of communal norms dropped significantly, albeit slightly, across time. The decrease is likely due to drops in felt need to impress the partner and/or to justify an upcoming commitment. Idealization of communal norms also dropped significantly across time, suggesting a dose of realism later in marriage regarding one’s own and spouse’s ability and motivation to be perfectly responsive. Still, the fact that the ideal and adherence ratings for a communal norm remained high and far higher than ratings of an exchange norm suggest people had not drastically changed their minds regarding the best norm for marriage. The concurrent positive associations between communal strivings and satisfaction showed a non-significant tendency to be stronger at Time 1 than at Time 2. With appropriate caution (given the lack of a significant difference in the size of the correlations at each point) we suspect that adherence to the norm may become more automatic and taken for granted across time.

**Exchange norm use and links to satisfaction across time.** On average, adherence to an exchange norm did not rise across time; it was not associated with lower satisfaction before marriage but was associated with lower satisfaction two years later. Yet, considering these results across all participants masks the most interesting finding of the
study: the observed significant interaction between attachment related avoidance and
norm adherence across time. The overall results must be interpreted in light of that
interaction.

Figure 2 reveals that avoidance was not associated with exchange norm use just prior
to marriage. Yet avoidance predicted later levels of exchange norm use. For those low in
avoidance, adherence to an exchange norm \textit{dropped} across time along with the similar
drop in adherence to a communal norm already reported. In contrast, for those high in
avoidance, adherence to an exchange norm \textit{rose} as adherence to a communal norm
dropped. What is occurring, we speculate, is that those high (but not those low) in
avoidance come not to trust their partners and to begin feeling insecure as communal
responsiveness drops. Then this causes them to increase their frequency of keeping track
of whether they are being treated fairly (in exchange terms). [This direction of causality
(i.e. relationship related distress leading to calculating fairness) is supported by work
reported by Grote & Clark (2001).] Finally, once individuals use exchange norms, doing
so likely further undermines satisfaction with relationships because acts of care can no
longer be clearly attributed to the donor being caring and recipient cared for by the donor.
In other words we suggest that the increased adherence to an exchange norm among those
high in avoidance is both caused by relationship distress and causes relationship distress.

These findings raise additional interesting theoretical possibilities. Prior to marriage
avoidance was not linked to norm adherence. Perhaps just prior to making a major
commitment almost all people experience sentiment override (i.e., focusing almost
exclusively on the positives of the relationship; see Clark & Grote, 1998; Markman,
1979; 1981). Alternatively, perhaps people discount the importance of exchange behavior
prior to marriage to reduce any feelings of dissonance regarding making a formal commitment to the partner (Festinger, 1957). Still another intriguing possibility is that low level adherence to an exchange norm seems to most people to be an appropriate, self-protective strategy prior to commitment to a relationship. Across time and formal commitment, though, it appears that those low in avoidance “settle into” their communal relationships. They adhere less to a communal norm and also seem to drop in felt need for self-protective adherence to an exchange norm. Those high in avoidance, though, seem less comfortable. As adherence to a communal norm drops they appear to react defensively by turning to an exchange norm that, sadly, ends up being related to (and perhaps causing) drops in satisfaction.

It is worth noting that our results fit well with and add context to earlier observations of individual differences in exchange orientation being linked to lower satisfaction in established relationships (Murstein, Cerreto & MacDonald, 1977; Murstein & MacDonald, 1984) as well as findings of avoidance being linked to adhering to an exchange norm (Bartz & Lydon (2008) and avoidant people feeling uncomfortable relying on communal norms (Bartz & Lydon 2006; 2008).

Regarding the practical value of these results, we have identified a reliable premarital predictor – high avoidance – of a worrisome trajectory of support processes that are linked to relationship satisfaction. This knowledge may be of use to pre-marital and marital counselors in devising interventions aimed at preventing downward trajectories in marital functioning across time.

Closeness of ties between norm use and satisfaction. Whereas avoidance predicted trajectories of norm use, anxiety predicted something else – the closeness of some links
between reported norm use and satisfaction. Specifically, for individuals high (but not low) in anxiety at Time 1, own exchange adherence and, at Time 2, perceptions of partner exchange adherence were linked to lower levels of own satisfaction, and own communal adherence at Time 2 was linked to greater own satisfaction. These effects fit with our overall initial hypothesis that anxious people would be more naturally attentive to and reactive to their own and to their partner’s adherence to communal and exchange norms than would those low in anxiety. Our rationale was that anxious people are hyper-vigilant and reactive to information relevant to the nature of care in their close relationships.

Consider first reactivity to own (at Time 1) and partner’s (at Time 2) adherence to an exchange norm. At Time 1 highly anxious people may be less likely than less anxious people to simply accept a bit of adherence to an exchange norm with equanimity, seeing it as a natural part of early relationships (Clark & Beck, in press). Instead they may take their own and their partner’s actions as indicators that the relationship is not going well. Alternatively, highly anxious people’s adherence to an exchange norm may often arise as a reaction to being dissatisfied with their relationship whereas that of less anxious persons may simply be a sign of a bit of caution early in the relationship.

The fact that anxiety made a difference for the magnitude of some links between own and partner adherence to norms and not for others was unexpected. We hesitate to make much of this pattern in the absence of its replication. Yet the pattern is thought provoking. For instance, the shift from anxious individuals being especially reactive to their own exchange adherence early in the relationship to being especially reactive to partner adherence later may be a function of a change in relational focus of attention across time (Clark et al., 2008). As anxious people form and solidify new relationships
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they may be especially focused on the appropriateness of their own behavior toward their partner as they strategically negotiate the relationship. After commitment they may shift to a focus on the partner and whether the partner is treating them right.

An overall picture. In sum, our data paint a picture of couples believing in and, imperfectly, striving to follow communal norms in marriage with secure individuals doing so with more success and equanimity than insecure people.
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Figure Captions

Figure 1. Norm use and idealization as a function of type of norm and time.

Time 1 values are plotted in the upper panel. Time 2 values are plotted in the lower panel. Although idealization, own adherence and perceived partner adherence were all rated on scales from -3 (Strongly Disagree) to +3 (Strongly Agree) and all mean ratings are depicted here, comparisons between idealization and adherence should be made with caution, as the constructs are distinct. That said, with caution we do, ourselves, believe that people perceive their degree of adherence to a communal norm to be less than ideal and that they do not believe they ought to be following an exchange norm any more (and perhaps less) than they are currently doing.

Figure 2. Use of exchange norms as a function of attachment avoidance and time.

Own use of exchange norms is plotted in the upper panel. Perceived partner’s use of exchange norms is plotted in the lower panel.
Supplemental Analyses Supporting the Validity of the Measures of Adherence to a Communal Norm and Adherence to an Exchange Norm

The results reported in the main text, which fell in theoretically meaningful ways that fit with prior literature, provide evidence for the construct validity of our new prototype measures of own and perceived partner adherence to communal and exchange norms. Yet the reader may be interested in how these new measures of own norm adherence fit with: extant, multi-item, validated measures of: a) individual differences in communal orientation (Clark, Ouellette, Powell & Milberg, 1987; Mills & Clark, 1994) and exchange orientation (Mills & Clark, 1994); and b) communal strength of a relationship (Mills, Clark, Ford, & Johnson, 2004).

Thus, we conducted additional multilevel analyses (with the two partners nested within dyad; intercepts varying across dyads) to examine the convergent validity of our measures of communal and exchange norm adherence with established measures of individual differences in communal and exchange orientation. In these analyses, we regressed communal or exchange adherence on individual differences in communal and exchange orientation simultaneously.

At the first assessment wave, communal orientation did not predict significantly greater reports of adhering to communal norms on our new measure, \(b = .24, p = .15\) (although the direction of the result was as expected), but exchange orientation did predict adhering to exchange norms, \(b = 1.05, p < .001\). At the second assessment wave, communal orientation significantly predicted adhering to communal norms, \(b = .36, p < .05\), and exchange orientation significantly predicted adhering to exchange norms, \(b = .85, p < .001\).

In addition, we sought to determine whether our measures of communal norm adherence in marriages would converge with a validated measure of communal strength of a particular relationship administered with regard to that marriage (Mills et al, 2004). Communal strength
was a statistically significant predictor of adherence to a communal norm as tapped by our new measure of communal norm adherence at the first assessment wave, $b = .39, p < .001$; and at the second assessment wave, $b = .38, p < .001$.

These results provide supplementary evidence for the validity of our prototype measures of adherence to communal and exchange norms. We would further note that we are neither surprised nor concerned that a general individual difference measure of communal orientation did not significantly predict scores on own communal norm adherence just prior to marriage. The situational demands on a person to provide care for a partner to whom they are about to make a life-long commitment are enormous. When situational demands are strong, the predictive power of individual differences measures of personality should be weakest.
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Table S1

Zero-Order Correlation Coefficients among Study Variables by Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Anxiety_T1</td>
<td>- .17</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Avoidance_T1</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>- .02</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. C. Ideals_T1</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>- .52</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. OC. Practices_T1</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>- .57</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.28</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. SC. Practices_T1</td>
<td>-.32</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>- -.07</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. E. Ideals_T1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>- .84</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. OE. Practices_T1</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>- .89</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. SE. Practices_T1</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>- .05</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Satisfaction_T1</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>-.29</td>
<td>-.27</td>
<td>- -.20</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Anxiety_T2</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-.28</td>
<td>- .33</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Avoidance_T2</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.29</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>- .02</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. C. Ideals_T2</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. OC. Practices_T2</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SC. Practices&lt;sub&gt;T2&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>E. Ideals&lt;sub&gt;T2&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>OE Practices&lt;sub&gt;T2&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>SE. Practices&lt;sub&gt;T2&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>Satisfaction&lt;sub&gt;T2&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>-.46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>-.46</td>
<td>-.49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>-.46</td>
<td>-.49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Correlation coefficients presented above the diagonal are those for women. Presented below the diagonal are those for men. C = Communal, E = Exchange; O = Other/Partner; S = Self; Coefficients greater than .20 are statistically significant, \( p < .05 \).