

Copyright
by
Courtney Michelle Walsh
2016

**The Thesis Committee for Courtney Michelle Walsh
Certifies that this is the approved version of the following thesis:**

**The role of emotional capital during the early years of marriage: It's
about the little things**

**APPROVED BY
SUPERVISING COMMITTEE:**

Co-Supervisor:

Lisa Neff

Co-Supervisor:

Marci Gleason

Timothy Loving

**The role of emotional capital during the early years of marriage: It's
about the little things**

by

Courtney Michelle Walsh, B.A.; M.S.Psy.

Thesis

Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School of

The University of Texas at Austin

in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements

for the Degree of

Master of Arts

The University of Texas at Austin

May 2016

Acknowledgements

I would like to acknowledge my supportive family, friends, and colleagues. Their love, support, critical eyes, and comforting ears have been irreplaceable throughout these years. I would like to thank Lisa Neff for her theoretical knowledge and guidance, Marci Gleason for her statistical expertise, and Tim Loving for his support and criticism along the way. I also would not have achieved this monument without Patrick Tennant with all of his wisdom, comradery and caffeine.

Abstract

The role of emotional capital during the early years of marriage: It's about the little things

Courtney Michelle Walsh, M.A.

The University of Texas at Austin, 2016

Supervisors: Lisa Neff and Marci Gleason

In ongoing relationships, partners often accumulate a number of shared positive moments together, referred to as emotional capital. Although these moments may seem trivial on the surface, emotional capital has been shown to be an important resource when faced with relationship threats. The proposed study aimed to examine the longitudinal effects of emotional capital using daily diary assessments collected from 167 couples across the first 3 years of marriage. Conceptually replicating prior work, we found that individuals who accumulated more emotional capital on average maintained greater levels of satisfaction on days of greater relationship threat when compared to those individuals who accumulated less emotional capital. We also tested whether (1) the trajectories of emotional capital across time predicted later reactivity and (2) whether the buffering effect of emotional capital became stronger over time. We did not find support for either of these predictions. Lastly, the current study examined whether emotional capital not only reduced reactivity, but also reduced the likelihood that spouses detected threats in the first place. Results indicated that compared to husbands who accumulated

less emotional capital, husbands who accumulated more emotional capital exhibited less vigilance for their wives' daily negative behaviors within the relationship. Wives' vigilance for their husbands' negative behaviors was unaffected by their accumulations of emotional capital.

Table of Contents

List of Tables	ix
Chapter 1: Introduction	1
Emotional Capital and Reactivity to Negative Relationship Events	2
Beyond the Buffering Effect: Emotional Capital and Attention to Negative Relationship Events	6
Chapter 2: Overview of the Current Study	8
Chapter 3: Method	11
Participants.....	11
Procedure	12
Daily Diary Compliance	13
Wave 1: Early Marriage.....	13
Wave 2: One year follow up	13
Wave 3: Two year follow up	13
Daily Diary Measures	14
Daily emotional capital and daily negative behaviors	14
Daily relationship satisfaction.....	15
Background Questionnaires	16
Relationship satisfaction	16
Demographic Information.....	16
Chapter 4: Results	17
Descriptive Statistics.....	17
Establishing Reactivity to Negative Partner Behaviors	18
The Moderating Role of Emotional Capital.....	21
Buffering Effect of Emotional Capital Over Time	23
The Role of Emotional Capital in Directional Bias and Tracking Accuracy.....	24
Chapter 5: Discussion	29
Future Directions	34

Conclusions.....	36
Appendix A.....	37
Tables.....	37
Appendix B.....	44
Construct Specified Checklists of Daily Relationship Behaviors.....	44
References.....	45

List of Tables

Table 1:	Means and Standard Deviations of Daily Variables for Both Husbands and Wives in All Three Phases	37
Table 2:	Correlations for All Daily Diary Variables.....	38
Table 3:	Results from Five Independent Models Predicting the Linear and Quadratic Effects of Phase on Satisfaction, Emotional Capital, and Negative Partner Behaviors	39
Table 4:	The Moderating Effects of Daily and Global Emotional Capital on the Association Between Daily Negative Partner Behaviors and Satisfaction	40
Table 5:	The Moderating Effects of Daily and Global Emotional Capital on the Association Between Daily Negative Partner Behaviors and Satisfaction Across Phase	41
Table 6:	Directional Bias, Tracking Accuracy, and the Effects of Global Emotional Capital	43

Chapter 1: Introduction

“Life isn't a matter of milestones, but of moments.”

- Rose Fitzgerald Kennedy

Throughout the course of a long-term marriage, couples are certain to face a number of major milestones together, including experiences such as falling in love, planning a wedding, buying a home, the transition to parenthood, and entering retirement. Although these milestones are undoubtedly highly influential for relationship maintenance and well-being (e.g. Aron, Paris, & Aron, 1995; Huston & Holmes, 2004; Doss, Rhoades, Stanley, & Markman, 2009), these types of major events are experienced rather infrequently when considering the entire lifespan of the relationship. In contrast, milestones are preceded and followed by countless days of ostensibly trivial, ordinary moments that couples share together. Though these daily moments may seem unimportant on the surface, recent research suggests otherwise. For example, naturalistic observations of family dynamics reveal that end of day reunions – the time when partners return home from work - afford key opportunities for partners to reconnect with one another, to share information, and to show interest in each other. In this way, simple routine moments have the potential to affirm relational bonds and promote positive relationship outcomes (Campos, Graesch, Repetti, Bradbury, & Ochs, 2009). As Rose Fitzgerald Kennedy once stated, it is these moments that define life and thus define romantic relationships.

Despite the prevalence of these everyday shared positive moments, little is known about the way these moments may shape relationship processes over the course of a long-

term relationship. Theories of emotional capital suggest that the accumulation of shared positive moments, experiences such as laughing together, engaging in fun activities, or having intimate conversations, should serve as an emotional bank account that can provide couples with important perspective when relationship challenges inevitably arise (Gottman, 1999; Kelley, 1983). Couples with greater emotional capital are thought to evaluate any negative relationship experience within the broader context of their previously accumulated positive moments, which should encourage them to respond benevolently to relationship threats. In other words, shared positive moments provide couples with a cushion to fall back on during tough times; the more positive experiences in one's bank account, the less any one negative relationship experience should influence relational well-being. For couples lacking in emotional capital, however, negative relationship experiences might be quite damaging. Without the broader perspective that emotional capital provides, each negative relationship experience can take on greater significance within the relationship and thus undermine relationship happiness. Unfortunately, to our knowledge, only one empirical study has directly tested the vital role emotional capital may play in shaping responses to relationship threats (Feeney & Lemay, 2012). Therefore, the overarching goal of the current study was to provide a more comprehensive examination of how emotional capital may contribute to positive relationship outcomes.

EMOTIONAL CAPITAL AND REACTIVITY TO NEGATIVE RELATIONSHIP EVENTS

Though it has been suggested that the accumulation of shared positive moments can buffer couples from the adverse effects of negative relationship experiences

(Gottman, 1999), empirical studies supporting this idea are scarce. One recent study asked spouses to indicate the level of emotional capital accumulated in their marriage during the previous month as well as complete a seven-day daily diary task assessing spouses' everyday positive moments with their partner and their responses to daily relationship threats (Feeney & Lemay, 2012). Analyses of both between- and within-person variability in emotional capital generally supported the emotional bank account perspective. At the between-person level, results showed that compared to individuals reporting lower levels of chronic emotional capital during the previous month, those who reported accumulating more emotional capital exhibited lowered reactivity to a partner's daily negative behaviors during the diary period. Specifically, following days of relationship threat, these individuals reported more positive appraisals of both their partner and the relationship and were less likely to enact hurtful behaviors toward the partner. At the within-person level, results also revealed that daily accumulations of emotional capital exhibited similar effects. If individuals accumulated more emotional capital on a given day, they were less reactive to their partner's negative behaviors the following day. Therefore, higher levels of both chronic and recent emotional capital seemed to promote more stable levels of relationship well-being in the face of negative relationship experiences. Importantly, all results held when controlling for relationship commitment and trust, suggesting that the accumulation of shared positive moments can be key for successfully navigating relationship challenges.

Although this study provides initial support for the notable impact of emotional capital, the data utilized in this study were limited in two important ways. First, chronic

levels of emotional capital were assessed using a self-report measure that asked participants to reflect on how often their partner enacted a number of specific, concrete behaviors (e.g., “smiled at me” Feeney & Lemay, 2012 pg. 1006) during the previous month. Unfortunately, research has demonstrated that couples find it difficult to retrospectively tally these types of behaviors in an accurate manner; as a result, responses are often heavily influenced by spouses’ current mood or levels of relationship happiness, a process known as sentiment override (e.g., Weiss, 1980). For this reason, it is unclear whether a retrospective measure of chronic emotional capital can truly quantify the accumulation of small, positive events over time or whether it assesses a separate but related construct. Second, the consequences of emotional capital were examined during a brief interval of time (i.e., a one-week period); thus, the long-term effects of accumulated emotional capital for relationship functioning are unknown.

In light of these limitations, the first goal of the current study was to replicate and extend prior work by exploring the concurrent and longitudinal consequences of emotional capital using daily diary data collected at multiple time points during the first three years of marriage. Assessing the accumulation of emotional capital through daily diary assessments is advantageous as participants’ day-to-day reports of their shared positive moments are less likely to be influenced by retrospective biases and sentiment override processes (Bolger, Davis, & Rafaeli, 2003). Therefore we used these daily assessments to test the effects of concurrent emotional capital at the between-person as well as the within-person levels of analyses. These analyses tested whether spouses who recently accumulated more emotional capital would exhibit greater satisfaction on days

of greater relationship threat. Moreover, the use of repeated daily diaries collected at multiple time points enabled us to address issues of causality through the examination of the longitudinal effects of emotional capital on relationship functioning. These longitudinal analyses tested (a) the effects of the trajectory of emotional capital and (b) the importance of emotional capital for relationship well-being as the marriage progresses.

Previous research employing a diary methodology over the early years of marriage has shown that the trajectories of positivity and negativity influence relationship outcomes 13 year into the marriage (Huston, Caughlin, Houts, Smith, & George, 2001). As time passes, the balance between positivity and negativity within the relationship begins to shift; although negativity within the relationship tends to remain stable for the majority of couples, relationship positivity (i.e. expressions of love, affection, and perceived partner responsiveness) generally declines, and those couples exhibiting the steepest declines tend to be at greater risk of marital dissolution (Huston, et. al., 2001). The consequences of this shifting balance between positive and negative relationship experiences is further evidence that a lack of emotional capital can undermine relationship well-being, and suggests that emotional capital may be an even more critical buffer between the negative relationship experiences and relationship well-being as the marriage progresses. In other words, as expressions of love and affection naturally tend to wane over time, those small shared moments of positivity that do occur may become an even more important cushion against the detrimental effects of relationship threats. Consequently, the present study examined both whether the buffering effects of

emotional capital on reactivity to relationship threats (Feeney & Lemay, 2012) becomes stronger as the marriage progresses and whether the trajectory of emotional capital predicts later reactivity to relationship threats.

BEYOND THE BUFFERING EFFECT: EMOTIONAL CAPITAL AND ATTENTION TO NEGATIVE RELATIONSHIP EVENTS

Thus far, we have argued that greater accumulations of emotional capital should serve to lower reactivity when relationship threats are detected. However, the second goal of the current study was to extend prior research by examining whether emotional capital may not only reduce reactivity to detected threats, but also reduce the very likelihood that threats are detected in the first place. In other words, emotional capital may promote a biased view of the relationship in which relationship threats become less salient amongst the store of many positive experiences shared with one's partner.

Given the repeated finding that quality relationships are highly predictive of personal well-being, numerous theories argue that individuals have evolved a system for monitoring acceptance and rejection from others (e.g., sociometer theory; Leary, Tambor, Terdal & Downs, 1995; risk regulation theory; Murray, Holmes, & Collins, 2006). However, growing research also indicates that the sensitivity of this monitoring or threat detection system can vary across individuals (e.g. Byrne & Eysenck, 1995; Kim, Wilson, Anastousiou, Aleman, Oetzel, & Lee, 2015). For example, individuals who feel more valued by their partners appear to maintain a higher threshold for the detection of relational threats. In other words, when individuals feel positively regarded within the relationship, they exhibit less vigilance for their partner's negative behaviors.

Conversely, individuals who question their partner's regard exhibit a heightened sensitivity toward potential relationship threats. These individuals divert greater attention toward identifying a partner's negative behavior as a form of self-protection; if individuals are vigilant for relationship threats, they are better able to quickly enact defensive actions and minimize feelings of hurt (see Murray, Holmes, & Collins, 2006 for review). The current study examined whether the accumulation of shared positive experiences within a relationship may operate in a similar fashion. As individuals accrue greater emotional capital, any concerns regarding one's value within the relationship may be lessened, thereby lowering vigilance and the threshold for the detection of relationship threats. Thus, we predicted that a greater store of emotional capital would be associated with a reduced tendency to attentively track a partner's relational transgressions.

Chapter 2: Overview of the Current Study

Although the accumulation of small positive moments shared between spouses are thought to be highly beneficial for relationship outcomes (Gottman, 1999; Feeney & Lemay, 2012), to our knowledge, only one empirical study to date has explored the importance of emotional capital for relationship functioning. The current study aimed to replicate and extend these previous findings by examining the links between emotional capital and responses to relationship threat in a three-year longitudinal study of newlywed marriage. As part of a larger study of marital development, newly-married couples completed a 14-day daily diary survey at three different points during the early years of their marriage. Specifically, couples provided diary data within the first six months of marriage and again at one- and two-year follow up assessments; thus, couples were asked to complete a total of 42 days of daily measurements. These surveys assessed spouses' daily reports of marital satisfaction, shared positive moments, and negative behaviors exchanged with their partner.

Analysis of this data addressed three specific issues. First, we intended to conceptually replicate prior work showing that the accumulation of shared positive moments reduces individuals' reactivity to negative relationship experiences (i.e. Feeney & Lemay, 2012). Consistent with prior work, reactivity was defined as the within-person association between daily negative behaviors received from a partner and daily levels of marital satisfaction across the 42 diary days; a stronger negative association indicates greater reactivity to relationship threats. Given that emotional capital should promote a broader, more positive perspective on the relationship when evaluating a partner's

negativity, we predicted that emotional capital will moderate reactivity at both the within-person and between-person levels. Specifically, at the within-person level, we predicted that on days of greater relationship threat, those spouses who also accrued more positive moments with their partner on the previous day would report greater feelings of marital satisfaction compared to spouses who accrued fewer positive moments with their partner. At the between-person level, we predicted that individuals who generally accumulate greater levels of emotional capital across the entire diary period would exhibit lowered reactivity to their partner's daily negative behaviors compared to individuals who deposit fewer shared positive moments in their emotional bank account.

Second, we tested the longitudinal effects of emotional capital. We began by examining the effects of the trajectory of emotional capital on later relationship functioning in order to determine whether decreasing accumulations of emotional capital would have lasting effects on relationship processes. Along similar lines, we also examined whether the concurrent buffering effects of emotional capital would become stronger over time. As couples transition from the newlywed 'honeymoon' period into a more established long-term marriage, everyday positive moments shared between partners tend to become increasingly important for the health and stability of the relationship (e.g., Huston, et al., 2001). Therefore we predicted that (1) reduced accumulations of emotional capital over time would moderate later reactivity and (2) that the strength of the moderating effect of emotional capital on reactivity to relationship threats would increase over time. Again, the moderating effect of emotional capital was examined at both the within-person and between-person level.

Finally, drawing from prior work indicating that qualities of the relationship can reduce attention to relational threats (Murray et al., 2006), we examined whether emotional capital would not only reduce negative responses to perceived threats, but also reduce the tendency to detect threats in the first place. To examine this hypothesis, we used West and Kenny's statistical approach for modeling directional bias and tracking accuracy in perceptions (Truth & Bias Model; 2011). We predicted that individuals who accrued more emotional capital would exhibit a positive (directional) relationship bias when reporting their partner's negative behaviors; in essence these individuals would be more likely to generally underestimate their partner's negative behaviors compared to those who have accrued less emotional capital. Furthermore, we also predicted that, compared to those with less emotional capital, individuals with more emotional capital would exhibit lower tracking accuracy of their partner's negative behaviors over time. In other words, when individuals have accumulated more shared positive moments together, they would become less accurate in identifying the degree to which their partner's negative behaviors are varying across the diary periods.

Chapter 3: Method

PARTICIPANTS

The current study relied on a sample of newlywed couples participating in a broader study of the early years of marriage. Couples were recruited through advertisements placed in community newspapers, premarital counseling offices, local wedding vendors (e.g. bridal shops, flower shops, etc.), and online websites such as theknot.com and Facebook. Telephone interviews were used to screen interested couples to ensure they met the following eligibility requirements: (a) this was the first marriage for each partner, (b) the couple had been married less than six months, and (c) neither spouse had any children. A total of 171 couples (342 individuals) were recruited for the broader marital study; however, the current study utilized data from the 167 couples who completed at least a portion of daily diary task included in the broader study.

At the first wave of data collection, on average, husbands were 29.1 (SD = 5.1) years old and had received 16.0 (SD = 2.3) years of education. Seventy-six percent were employed full-time, and 14% were full-time students. Seventy-six percent of husbands identified themselves as White, 16.2% as Hispanic/Latino, 2.4% as African American, and 1.8% as Asian American. Wives averaged 27.1 (SD = 4.7) years old and had received 16.3 (SD = 1.8) years of education. Sixty-eight percent were employed full-time, and 13.8% were full-time students. Seventy-four percent of wives identified themselves as White, 15.6% as Hispanic/Latino, 3.6% as African American, and 2.4% as Asian American. The median combined income of couples was \$60,000.

Due to the longitudinal nature of the current study, there was some attrition. Of the 334 participants in this study, 222 provided responses in all diary periods. Participants who provided responses in all diary periods did not differ from those who missed one or more diary periods in age ($t(282) = 0.22, p = .83, b = 0.15, CI = -1.19-1.48, \text{effect size } r = 0.01$), income ($t(203) = 0.18, p = .86, b = 0.01, CI = -0.73-0.87, \text{effect size } r = 0.00$) or the Couples Satisfaction Index ($t(209) = 1.25, p = .21, b = 1.59, CI = -0.91-4.09, \text{effect size } r = 0.09$).

PROCEDURE

Within the first six months of marriage, newlywed couples were asked to complete a series of background questionnaires as well as attend a lab session which was not relevant to the current study. Following the lab session, couples were then asked to complete a daily diary task for 14 consecutive days. This procedure was repeated one and two years after the initial assessment. For the three diary tasks, participants were offered the option to either complete the daily surveys online or by pen and paper. Participants who opted to complete the surveys online were sent a unique identification code which they manually entered at the beginning of each survey each night; this allowed us to link their responses to those of previous days and background questionnaires. During the laboratory session, those participants who chose the paper version of these surveys were given a packet including all 14 surveys and prestamped envelopes. Participants completed one survey each night before going to bed and then mailed the completed survey back to us the morning directly following the night it was completed. Couples earned up to \$30 each time they fully completed the daily diary task.

DAILY DIARY COMPLIANCE

The majority of couples (73%) chose to complete the surveys online; importantly, the number of diary days completed did not differ between these couples and those couples who completed paper surveys. Across all three waves of daily diary collection, participants provided 11,054 (5,507 husbands, 5,548 wives) daily diary surveys.

Checking online submission times and postmark dates for the daily diaries revealed that 71% of the diaries were submitted on time.

Wave 1: Early Marriage

Three hundred twenty-nine (99%) spouses participated in the first wave of daily diary surveys, with 80% (129 husbands, 133 wives) of those participants completing all 14 diaries, and 2% completing less than three diaries. We collected a total of 2,144 diary days from husbands and 2,174 from wives.

Wave 2: One year follow up

Two hundred eighty-two (84%) spouses participated in the second wave of daily diary surveys, with 90% (123 husbands, 131 wives) of these participants completing all 14 diaries, and less than 2% completing less than three diaries. We collected a total of 1,909 diary days from husbands and 1,919 from wives.

Wave 3: Two year follow up

Two hundred thirty-four (72%) spouses participated in the third wave of daily diary surveys, with 70% (92 husbands, 93 wives) of these participants completing all 14 diaries, and approximately 6% (9 husbands, 5 wives) completing less than three diaries. We collected a total of 1,454 diary days from husbands and 1,491 from wives.

DAILY DIARY MEASURES

Daily emotional capital and daily negative behaviors

At all three waves, participants were presented with a checklist of 21 daily relationship behaviors and were asked to select all of the behaviors they experienced that day. Emotional capital was assessed using six of the positive behaviors in the checklist. Emotional capital items included behaviors such as “Spouse showed an interest in the events of your day” and “You enjoyed a leisure activity with your spouse.” Composite scores were calculated each day for each participant with scores ranging from 0 (no emotional capital) to 6 (high emotional capital) for that particular day. Daily negative partner behaviors were measured using four negative behaviors from the checklist, such as “Spouse criticized you” and “Spouse let you down or broke a promise.” Composite scores were again calculated each day for each participant with scores ranging from 0 (no negative behaviors) to 4 (many negative partner behaviors) for that particular day. Participants also responded to these same four negative items rephrased to represent their own negative behavior enacted towards their partner (e.g., “You criticized your spouse.”); again, a composite score of own negative behavior was calculated each day for each participant. Reports of own negative behavior were utilized in the analyses assessing bias and accuracy in participants’ perceptions of their partner’s behaviors.¹ See Appendix

¹ The remaining 7 items assessed behaviors outside the scope of this project, including acts of emotional suppression (e.g., “You did not express your feelings to avoid a conflict”; e.g, Gross & Levenson, 1993) and instrumental support behaviors received from and enacted toward a partner (e.g., “You helped your spouse with something important”; e.g., Wills & Shinar, 2000). As instrumental support is generally enacted in response to a negative or stressful event and may or may not be effective in helping the recipient, reports of these behaviors do not necessarily capture the same type of shared positive moments as were included in the emotional capital construct.

A for full emotional capital, own negative behavior, and partner negative behavior measures.

Due to the nested nature of daily diary methodology, we used the emotional capital checklist to create two new variables which reflect each participant's (1) unique daily variations in emotional capital and (2) their average report of emotional capital across phases. In other words, we created a daily measure of emotional capital which varies within each person as well as a global measure which varies between each person. Daily emotional capital was within-person mean centered in each phase by subtracting individuals' average response to the checklist from their daily responses. This technique resulted in a measure which represents individuals' relative amount of emotional capital each day as if varies from their own typical daily response in that phase. Global emotional capital was grand-mean centered by subtracting the group average report of emotional capital in each phase from each participant's average report in that same phase. This technique resulted in a measure of individual differences in average reports of emotional capital in each phase. These calculations were repeated to separate the within- and between-person effects of negative partner behaviors, resulting in a daily negative partner behaviors measure (within-person) and a global negative partner behavior measure (between-person).

Daily relationship satisfaction

Three items taken from the Kansas Marital Satisfaction Scale (Schumm, et. al., 1986) were used to measure participants' daily level of satisfaction with their romantic relationships at all three waves. The three items were modified in order to assess daily

satisfaction. Participants responded to the items “How satisfied were you with your partner today?” “How satisfied were you with your relationship with your partner today?” and “How satisfied were you with your marriage today?” using a seven-point Likert scale from 1 (very unsatisfied) to 7 (very satisfied). Scores were averaged each day for each participant with scores ranging from 1 (low satisfaction) to 7 (high satisfaction) for that particular day.

BACKGROUND QUESTIONNAIRES

Relationship satisfaction

At each of the three waves of data collection, participants also completed a packet of questionnaires prior to completing the daily diary task. As part of this packet, global marital satisfaction was assessed using a version of the Couples Satisfaction Index (CSI; Funk & Rogge, 2007) to assess their overall level of marital satisfaction. The 16-item measure included questions such as “our marriage is strong” to which participants responded on a seven-point scale ranging from 0 (not at all true) to 6 (completely true). One item (“In general, how often do you think things between you and your partner are going well?”) required participants to respond on a six-point scale. Composite scores for each participant were calculated with possible scores ranging from 0 (low satisfaction) to 95 (high satisfaction).

Demographic Information

During the first wave of data collection participants were asked to report demographic information including their age and income.

Chapter 4: Results

DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS

The means and standard deviations of all variables for both husbands and wives in all three phases are presented in Table 1. In general across all three phases, spouses reported high levels of daily marital satisfaction and low levels of daily negative partner behaviors. Spouses reported daily emotional capital on approximately 92% of diary days and daily negative partner behaviors on approximately 21% of days. Table 2 presents the correlations for all daily diary variables. Daily satisfaction showed small positive correlations with both the daily and global measures of emotional capital, indicating that satisfaction tends to be higher on days when individuals experience more emotional capital, and individuals who generally experience more emotional capital than the average participant also experience higher levels of daily satisfaction. Conversely, daily satisfaction showed small negative correlations with both the daily and global measures of negative partner behaviors, indicating that satisfaction tends to be lower on days when individuals experience more negative partner behaviors, and individuals who generally experience more negative partner behaviors than the average participant also experience lower levels of daily satisfaction. Daily emotional capital and daily negative partner behaviors were negatively correlated such that on days which individuals reported experiencing more emotional capital, they reported fewer negative partner behaviors. Global emotional capital and global negative partner behaviors were positively correlated such that individuals who generally report experiencing more emotional capital also generally report more negative partner behaviors.

In order to examine how the variables assessed within the daily diary may have changed over time, the linear and quadratic effects of phase on all variables of interest were calculated using five independent models, with each model predicting one variable of interest (i.e., daily satisfaction, daily emotional capital, global emotional capital, daily negative partner behaviors, global negative partner behaviors). The effects are presented in Table 3. In general, both husbands and wives exhibited linear declines in daily satisfaction. Wives also exhibited reduced global emotional capital and increased global negative partner behaviors across time. The quadratic effects of phase suggest that both husbands and wives experience steep initial declines in relationship satisfaction which level off over time. Husbands exhibited a gradual increase in global negative partner behaviors which becomes steeper over time, while wives' increasing global negative partner behaviors levels off. Lastly, wives also showed an initial increase in global emotional capital which reverses and becomes a decrease after the second wave of data collection.

ESTABLISHING REACTIVITY TO NEGATIVE PARTNER BEHAVIORS

In order to examine whether emotional capital may moderate spouses' reactivity to daily relationship threats, it was first necessary to model spouses' reactivity levels to daily negative partner behaviors. Due to the nested structure of the data, multilevel modeling analyses were conducted using the MIXED procedure in SAS 9.4 software (SAS Institute Inc., 2012). For the within-person level of analysis, daily satisfaction was modeled adjusting for the daily satisfaction of the previous day; therefore, we measured residualized changes in daily satisfaction predicted by daily negative partner behaviors.

Similar to the daily negative partner behaviors, previous day daily satisfaction was within-person mean centered; thus, the intercept represented each spouse's daily satisfaction when the same-day daily negative partner behavior and previous-day satisfaction were at the individual's average. We included individuals' global (grand-mean centered) report of negative partner behaviors in the model, in order to separate the within- and between-person effects of negative partner behaviors (Bolger & Laurenceau, 2013). Finally, we adjusted for day in the study to account for any linear changes in study variables across the diary periods.

The within-person equation is as follows:

$$S_{ijk} = (W_{ijk}) * (b_{owj} + b_{1wj}S_{ijk-1} + b_{2wj}DS_{ijk} + b_{3wj}N_{ijk} + e_{ijk}) + (H_{ijk}) * (b_{ohj} + b_{1hj}S_{ijk-1} + b_{2hj}DS_{ijk} + b_{3hj}N_{ijk} + e_{ijk}) \quad (1a)$$

The dependent variable S_{ijk} represents daily satisfaction for spouse i (when $i = 1$, the outcome is for the wife, and when $i = 0$, the outcome is for husbands), in couple j at time k . When the outcome is measured for the wife, $W_{ijk} = 1$ and $H_{ijk} = 0$, the first part of the model is selected with all of the b coefficients maintaining the subscript w . When the outcome is measure for the husband, $W_{ijk} = 0$ and $H_{ijk} = 1$, the second part of the model is selected with all of the b coefficients maintaining the subscript h . S_{ijk-1} represents daily satisfaction on the previous day; DS_{ijk} represents day in the study; N_{ijk} is same-day daily negative partner behaviors; and e_{ijk} is a residual component specific to individual i in couple j on day k . The coefficient b_{ojk} is the regression intercept for the individual i in couple j and represents daily satisfaction at the beginning of the study when previous-day

daily satisfaction and same-day daily negative partner behaviors are at their projected average level for each individual.

Examples of the between-person equations for the wives are:

$$b_{0wj} = \gamma_{00} + \gamma_{01}BN_{ij} + u_{0pj} \quad (1b)$$

$$b_{3wj} = \gamma_{30} + u_{3pj} \quad (1c)$$

$$b_{1wj} = \gamma_{10} \quad (1d)$$

Equation 1b represents the intercept of daily satisfaction for the wife which includes her global negative partner behaviors and a random effect. Again, global negative partner behaviors is grand-mean centered such that γ_{00} represents an individual who reports the sample average number of negative partner behaviors across the diary period. Equation 1c represents the effect of daily negative partner behaviors on same-day daily satisfaction and includes a random effect. Equation 1d represents the effect of previous-day daily satisfaction and does not include a random effect. The between person equation for the effect of day in the study follows the formula provided for Equation 1d. The equations for husbands followed the same formula patterns. On average, results indicated that daily negative partner behaviors inversely predicted same-day daily satisfaction for both husbands $t(4281) = -26.62, p < .001, b = -0.15, CI = -0.16-$ (-0.14) , effect size $r = 0.38$) and wives ($t(4511) = -29.62, p < .001, b = -0.19, CI = -0.20-$ (-0.18) , effect size $r = 0.40$), such that on days when individuals reported experiencing more negative partner behaviors, they reported lower levels of marital satisfaction compared to days with fewer negative partner behaviors.

THE MODERATING ROLE OF EMOTIONAL CAPITAL

To test the moderating role of emotional capital, we ran the previously outlined multilevel mixed model including both daily and global emotional capital in order to separate the within- and between-person effects. At the within-person level, we created a lagged daily emotional capital measure in order to determine whether daily emotional capital accumulated on the previous day is associated with lower reactivity to daily negative partner behaviors on a given day. At the between-person level, spouses' global emotional capital was included in order to test whether individuals who generally experience more emotional capital than the average individual across each diary period also exhibit reduced reactivity to daily negative partner behaviors. Daily and global emotional capital were included in the model as both main effects and interacted with daily negative partner behaviors.

The within-person equation was as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
 S_{ijk} = & (W_{ijk}) * (b_{0wj} + b_{1wj}S_{ijk-1} + b_{2wj}DS_{ijk} + b_{3wj}N_{ijk} + b_{4wj}E_{ijk} + \\
 & b_{5wj}N_{ijk}*E_{ijk} + e_{ijk}) + (H_{ijk}) * (b_{0hj} + b_{1hj}S_{ijk-1} + b_{2hj}DS_{ijk} + \\
 & b_{3hj}N_{ijk} + b_{4hj}E_{ijk} + b_{5hj}N_{ijk}*E_{ijk} + e_{ijk})
 \end{aligned} \tag{2a}$$

The coefficients are the same as Equation 1a with the addition of E_{ijk} which represents daily emotional capital, such that b_{4wj} represents the main effect of previous day daily emotional capital on daily satisfaction on a given day, and b_{5wj} is the interactive effect of daily negative partner behaviors and previous day daily emotional capital.

Examples of the between-person equations for the wives were:

$$b_{0wj} = \gamma_{00} + \gamma_{01}BN_{ij} + \gamma_{02}BE_{ij} + u_{0pj} \tag{2b}$$

$$b_{3wj} = \gamma_{30} + \gamma_{31}BE_{ij} + u_{3pj} \quad (2c)$$

$$b_{4wj} = \gamma_{40} + u_{4pj} \quad (2d)$$

$$b_{1wj} = \gamma_{10} \quad (2f)$$

Equation 2b represents the intercept for the wife, which includes her global negative partner behaviors, global emotional capital, and a random effect. Again, global negative partner behaviors and global emotional capital are grand-mean centered within each phase, such that γ_{00} represents an individual who reports an average number of negative partner behaviors and emotional capital across the diary period. Equation 2c represents the effect of same-day daily negative behaviors for the wives, which includes the wife's global emotional capital and a random effect such that γ_{30} represents an individual who reports an average amount of emotional capital across the diary period. Equation 2d represents the effect of previous-day daily emotional capital and includes a random effect. Equation 2f represents previous-day daily satisfaction, which does not include a random effect. The between person equation for the effect of day in the study, follows the formula provided for Equation 2f. The equations for husbands followed the same formula patterns.

The results for the moderating role of daily and global emotional capital are presented in Table 4. Results of the within-person analyses indicated that, contrary to predictions, previous-day daily emotional capital did not moderate the association between daily negative partner behaviors and same-day daily relationship satisfaction for husbands or wives. However, the between-person analyses indicated that global emotional capital did moderate the association between daily negative partner behaviors

and same-day daily relationship satisfaction for both husbands and wives, such that individuals who generally reported accumulating more emotional capital over each diary period exhibited lower reactivity to a partner's daily negative behaviors compared to individuals who generally reported accumulating less emotional capital.

BUFFERING EFFECT OF EMOTIONAL CAPITAL OVER TIME

In order to examine whether the buffering effect of emotional capital may grow stronger over time, further analyses examined whether the previous results were moderated by phase. Specifically, we predicted that phase would moderate the association between reactivity and both daily and global emotional capital. In order to test this prediction, we added phase as a main effect to model, as well as interacted phase with all variables of interest (e.g. daily negative partner behaviors, daily emotional capital, global emotional capital, and the interaction between daily negative partner behavior and both daily and global emotional capital). The results from these analyses are presented in Table 5. Contrary to predictions, results indicated that the buffering effects of daily and global emotional capital remained constant across phase. In other words, previous-day daily emotional capital remained a nonsignificant moderator of reactivity for husbands and wives, while global emotional capital continued to moderate this association for both spouses when phase was entered into the model. Moreover, phase did not significantly interact with either daily emotional capital or global emotional capital to predict reactivity.

In order to observe the changes in accumulations of emotional capital over time, we also examined whether the trajectory of spouses' global emotional capital across all

three diary phases predicted reactivity to daily negative partner behaviors in Phase 3 only. We predicted that individuals experiencing steeper declines in global emotional capital over the early years of marriage would exhibit a stronger association between daily negative partner behaviors and same-day relationship satisfaction at Phase 3 compared to individuals experiencing less steep declines. To obtain the global emotional capital trajectories, we conducted multilevel analyses in which phase was the only fixed and random effect. Specifically, the random effect of phase would be used to obtain a unique trajectory for each individual participant. Unfortunately this model failed to converge: individuals did not exhibit substantive variation in their trajectories of global emotional capital across the three phases of data collection. We were, therefore, unable to test our prediction that the trajectories of global emotional capital would moderate Phase 3 reactivity.

THE ROLE OF EMOTIONAL CAPITAL IN DIRECTIONAL BIAS AND TRACKING ACCURACY

In order to determine whether emotional capital predicts the degree of directional bias and tracking accuracy in perceptions of a partner's negative behaviors, we employed West and Kenny's Truth and Bias Model (2011), which estimates bias and accuracy within a single model. As previously stated, directional bias captures an individual's tendency to under or overestimate their partner's daily negative behaviors, while tracking accuracy is the ability to identify changes in these behaviors over time. First, we identified the degree of directional bias and tracking accuracy in spouses' perceptions of their partner's negative behaviors using the following basic model, which represents an example equation for one couple in which we are predicting the wife's bias and accuracy:

$$P_w = b_{0w} + b_{1w} * R_h + e_w \quad (3)$$

Both the wife's perception of her husband's daily negative behaviors each day (P_w , the outcome variable) and the husband's report of his own daily negative behaviors each day (R_h , the predictor variable) were centered around the grand mean of husbands' reports of own daily negative behaviors (i.e., all reports of own negative behavior from all husbands). In other words, this grand mean was subtracted from the wife's daily perception of her husband's (singular) daily negative behaviors (resulting in P_w) and from the husband's report of his own daily (singular) behaviors (resulting in R_h). Using this centering strategy allowed the intercept, b_{0w} , to represent a wife's tendency to under or overestimate her husband's daily negative behaviors relative to the average daily negative behaviors of husbands in the sample. In this case, a negative coefficient would indicate a positive directional bias, or a tendency to underestimate daily negative behaviors. This method of centering also allowed the slope, b_{1w} , to represent the degree to which the wife's perception was influenced by her husband's actual daily negative behaviors, or her tracking accuracy. A positive coefficient suggests that individuals are more attentively tracking the degree to which their partner's daily negative behaviors varied across the diary phases. Husbands' directional bias and tracking accuracy were estimated in the same fashion; however in this case, the outcome and predictor variables were centered around the grand mean of wives' reports of their own daily negative behaviors. Husbands' and wives' parameters were estimated simultaneously within a single model, which allowed for the examination of potential gender differences, though none were predicted.

Results indicated that, on average, husbands but not wives exhibited significant directional bias, such that husbands tended to overestimate their wives' daily negative behaviors across the diary phases (husbands: $t(153) = 3.12, p < 0.01, b = 0.15, CI = 0.05-0.25$, effect size $r = 0.24$; wives: $t(163) = -1.40, p = 0.16, b = -0.05, CI = -0.01-0.11$, effect size $r = 0.11$). Contrast analyses confirmed that this gender difference was significant ($F = 10.36, p < .01$). Results also indicated that, on average, both husbands and wives exhibited significant tracking accuracy, such that they accurately detected changes in their partner's daily negative behaviors across the diary phases (husbands: $t(4943) = 18.06, p < .001, b = 0.23, CI = 0.21-0.25$, effect size $r = 0.25$; wives: $t(4815) = 15.49, p < .001, b = 0.19, CI = 0.17-0.21$, effect size $r = 0.22$). Contrast analyses indicated that this tracking accuracy effect was significantly stronger for husbands than for wives ($F = 5.91, p < .05$).

We next examined whether global emotional capital may predict the degree of bias and accuracy in spouses' perceptions. To do this, global emotional capital was entered into the previous example equation at the between-person level, such that:

$$b_{ow} = \gamma_{00} + \gamma_{01} (BE_w) + u_{0w} \quad (4a)$$

$$b_{1w} = \gamma_{10} + \gamma_{11} (BE_w) + u_{1w} \quad (4b)$$

Recall from Equation 3, b_{ow} represents the wife's directional bias in her perceptions of her husband's daily negative behaviors; therefore, Equation 4a estimated the effect of the wife's report of global emotional capital (BE_w) on her directional bias. Also recall that b_{1w} represents the wife's accuracy for tracking changes in her husband's actual daily negative behaviors; therefore, Equation 4b estimates the effect of the wife's

report of global emotional capital (BE_w) on her tracking accuracy. Again, the between-person equations for the effects of global emotional capital on husbands' directional bias and tracking accuracy follow the same formula pattern.

We previously predicted that greater global emotional capital would be associated with a greater tendency to underestimate a partner's daily negative behaviors. Because we found that husbands, on average, tend to overestimate their wives' daily negative behaviors, it was expected that greater global emotional capital would reduce this tendency to overestimate negativity for husbands. Similarly, because wives showed no directional bias on average, it was expected that global emotional capital would be associated with a greater tendency to underestimate negativity for wives. In addition, we predicted that global emotional capital would be negatively associated with tracking accuracy across the diary period, such that individuals with more shared positive experiences would be less vigilant in tracking their partners' transgressions, thus exhibiting reduced accuracy. We did not predict any gender differences in the moderating role of emotional capital on either directional bias or tracking accuracy.

The results from these analyses are presented in Table 7. Husbands continued to show a significant directional bias and both husbands and wives continued to exhibit significant tracking accuracy when daily emotional capital was added to the model. Global emotional capital was associated with a weaker tendency to overestimate daily negative partner behaviors and marginally lower tracking accuracy for daily negative partner behaviors for husbands; however, global emotional capital was not associated with wives' bias or their tracking accuracy. Notably, however, contrast analyses revealed

no significant gender differences in the associations between global emotional capital and directional bias ($F(1,879) = 2.50, p = .11$) and tracking accuracy ($F(1,9826) = 1.63, p = .20$) suggesting that the results for husbands may not be particularly robust.

Chapter 5: Discussion

Couples inarguably share many types of daily experiences together, ranging from conflicts and disappointments, to mundane and routine activities, to pleasurable and joyful events. These latter positive shared experiences have been suggested and shown to be influential moments for relationship quality. The theory of emotional capital suggests that accumulating small joint positive experiences creates an emotional bank account which couples can rely on when facing relationship threats (Gottman, 1999). Research has supported this claim finding that emotional capital, or sharing joint positive experiences with one's partner, buffers the potential negative effects relationship threats have on marital satisfaction for newlywed couples (Feeney & Lemay, 2012). In the current study, we sought to conceptually replicate these previous findings as well as test the longitudinal effects of emotional capital as couples transition out of the newlywed honeymoon stage. Furthermore, we sought to determine whether emotional capital not only acts as a buffer against relationship threat, but also whether it is associated with individuals' threat detection systems.

The results from the current study provide some evidence for the buffering effects of emotional capital, indicating that accumulating more emotional capital does tend to benefit relationship experiences. Similar to previous research (Feeney & Lemay, 2012) we predicted that daily and average accumulations of emotional capital would moderate the association between next day negative partner behaviors and relationship satisfaction. The results from the current study did not support the buffering effect of daily accumulations of emotional capital; however, as predicted, when evaluating individuals'

average accumulations of emotional capital, those who generally accumulated more emotional capital showed reduced reactivity to relationship threat. In other words, individuals who tend to report sharing more joint positive experiences with their partner on average exhibit a weaker association between daily negative partner behaviors and same day relationship satisfaction compared to individuals who tend to report sharing fewer joint positive experiences. Therefore, spouses who generally share more small positive experiences are less affected by their partners' daily negative behaviors.

Although we sought to conceptually replicate previous research, our findings were less definitive. One explanation for our slightly weaker findings may lie in the operationalization of emotional capital; specifically, the items included in our measure of emotional capital were slightly different from prior work. While previous research included daily items that require spending quality time together (e.g., “We had an intimate conversation” and “We did something fun together”; Feeney & Lemay, 2012, p. 1007), the items included in our study did not necessarily require the same level of dyadic interaction. Four of the six behaviors that constituted emotional capital in the current study could be conceptualized as positive affirmations (e.g., “My spouse complimented me”) which do not require the same time commitment and mutual engagement that the previous research captured. These positive affirmations may be a weaker buffer because they lack a dyadic quality which may contribute more capital into the theoretical emotional bank account (Gottman, 1999).

It also seems that the type of emotional capital measured in the current study requires a more chronic accumulation in order to create the predicted buffer. Beyond the

reduced time commitment associated with exchanging positive affirmations, these behaviors may also require a cognitive process which is not necessary to reap benefits from sharing quality time. While having “an intimate conversation” and doing “something fun together” (Feeney & Lemay, 2012, p. 1007), are probably inherently pleasurable experiences, gaining pleasure from giving and receiving compliments may require individuals to interpret the reason behind the comments as well as perceive a certain genuineness behind them. Over time, the cognitive requirement may become less necessary as individuals become accustomed to such exchanges. So, although the positive affirmations exchanged in one day do not seem to reduce reactivity to threat, accumulating such experiences over weeks, months, or years does replicate the effects of previous research. Our methodology allowed us to test this prediction by assessing emotional capital across 14 consecutive days at three different time points throughout the first three years of marriage. We found that emotional capital does reduce reactivity when analyzed as an individual (average) difference variable rather than daily within-person fluctuation, supporting the idea that positive affirmations require accumulations across a longer span of time.

The second goal of the current study was to determine the longitudinal effects of emotional capital. Couples with the steepest declines in love and affection show poorer relationship outcomes compared to those with more stable levels of positivity (Huston, et al., 2001). Therefore, we predicted that decreasing trajectories of emotional capital would strengthen the association between daily negative partner behaviors and same day relationship satisfaction in Phase 3, making individuals more reactive to relationship

threats. Our hypothesis remains plausible; however, we were unable to complete this analysis because our sample exhibited too little variability in individual trajectories of emotional capital. Couples who do maintain stable or increasing accumulations of emotional capital may be less reactive to relationship threats when compared to couples with decreasing accumulations, but the results from the current study are inconclusive. Our results indicated that husbands' amount of emotional capital did not change over time. Wives also did not show a linear change over time, but rather global emotional capital increased from Wave 1 to Wave 2 of data collection and decreasing from Wave 2 to Wave 3. These findings coupled with the lack of variability in individual trajectories prevented us from reaching a conclusion.

Because couples tend to show decreasing that love and affection while maintaining stable (Huston, et. al., 2001) or increasing levels of negativity (current study), we also predicted that the buffering effect of emotional capital would become stronger as the marriage progresses. We expected that over time emotional capital would become a better buffer when it is present because it becomes rarer; however, the results from the current study did not support this prediction. Although we collected data from couples throughout the first three years of marriage with the goal of observing newlyweds' transitioning through and out of the honeymoon stage, this may not have been enough time to capture the true longitudinal effects of emotional capital if they do exist.

Lastly, in the current study we also sought to focus beyond the previously established buffering effect of emotional capital and test whether emotional capital

influences individuals' detection of relationship threat. First, we found that only husbands showed a directional bias. Contrary to our expectations that newlywed spouses would be positively biased and underestimate their partners' negative behaviors, husbands overestimated their wives negative behaviors. Wives did not over or underestimate their husbands' negative behaviors. When measuring spouses' ability to track changes in their partners' negative behaviors, both husbands and wives showed significant tracking accuracy.

Similar to previous research indicating that individuals who feel valued or highly regarded by their partner tend to exhibit reduced threat detection (Murray, Holmes, & Collins, 2006), we expected that spouses with more emotional capital would do the same. We predicted that individuals who generally report accumulating more emotional capital would exhibit (1) a positive directional bias, such that these individuals would be more likely to underestimate their partner's daily negative behaviors and (2) reduced accuracy in tracking daily changes in their partner's negative behaviors. Partially supporting our prediction, results indicated that husbands with more emotional capital were less likely to overestimate their wives' negative behaviors compared to husbands with less emotional capital; furthermore, husbands (but not wives) also exhibited reduced tracking accuracy to the extent that they accumulated more emotional capital. In other words, husbands who reported sharing more joint positive experiences with their wives were marginally less vigilant in tracking changes in their wives' negative behaviors over the diary phases. These superficial gender differences must be observed with caution; we did not find actual gender differences in the effects of emotional capital on directional bias or tracking

accuracy in this study. Future research is necessary to understand the potential effects of emotional capital on threat detection as the current results are still somewhat inconclusive.

FUTURE DIRECTIONS

The current study provided new insight to the theory of emotional capital; however there are still many unexplored areas of the theory which future research should explore. The current empirical research has solely focused on couple's reactivity to relationship threats, finding that emotional capital acts as a buffer. Future studies should consider other relationship experiences that emotional capital may benefit, such as reducing conflict or promoting positive partner attributions. Such outcomes could explain why and how emotional capital reduces reactivity and provide a mechanism for this phenomenon.

Similarly, both the current and past research has involved newlywed couples, which is only a small subset of romantic relationships. Future research should focus on couples in earlier and later stages of their relationships to determine the ultimate impact of emotional capital: is it essential for relationship survival? Furthermore, studying couples at various stages in their relationships could begin to answer the longitudinal questions established in the current study: does the buffering effect of emotional capital become stronger over time and do trajectories predict later reactivity?

The basic construct of emotional capital itself should also be explored in order to better understand how the emotional bank account is created in the first place. Findings from current study suggest that some shared experiences may create a stronger buffer

than others (i.e. dyadic quality time compared to positive affirmations). The theory of emotional capital could be strengthened through research informing the types of shared experiences which are the most beneficial and contribute the most capital to the theoretical emotional bank account. Furthermore, research should focus on the accumulation process as well. It is unclear how the bank account operates. It is possible that the accumulated capital has an expiration date, so couples in a sense must “use it or lose it.” It is also possible that it continues to compound, gaining interest as the relationship progresses. Future research should seek to determine how capital is accumulated and functions as a construct independent of how it relates to other relationship experiences.

Along the theme of improving the theory of emotional capital, future research should also consider whether the emotional bank account is the best analogy to describe the construct of emotional capital. Theoretically, couples make deposits into the account when they share positive experiences and make withdrawals when they encounter negative relationship experiences (Gottman, 1999). An account with a greater store of deposits would be less affected by a withdrawal; however, there has been no research focusing on how these supposed withdrawals are made. It is unclear whether there are any negative consequences for the bank account resulting from having a smaller store of capital after a withdrawal occurs. Emotional capital may operate more as a “force field” which is not compromised following a threat. Rather, the emotional force field remains a buffer against reactivity so long as the energy source (i.e., emotional capital) is continuously supplied. Before continuing to conceptualize emotional capital as a bank

account, research must first uncover a way to assess the presence and effects of “withdrawals” on the account.

CONCLUSIONS

The current study provides some evidence for the benefits of shared positive experiences, although not all hypotheses were supported. Using multiple waves of daily diary assessments which resulted in up to 42 days of responses from both spouses in new marriages, the present study illustrated that individuals who generally accumulate a greater store of emotional capital tend to be less reactive to relationship threats on a daily basis. This study replicated the popular finding that couples’ relationship satisfaction generally decreases over time (Umberson, Williams, Powers, Chen, & Campbell, 2005), while also finding that the strength of the buffering effect of emotional capital does not change. This highlights the importance of shared positive experiences for couples’ relationship functioning and exemplifies the necessity for continued research on emotional capital. Future research should address the many lingering questions regarding the concept of emotional capital itself as well as how it operates in different types of relationship and across various relationship experiences.

Appendix A

Tables

Table 1. Means and Standard Deviations of Daily Variables for Both Husbands and Wives in All Three Phases.

	<u>Phase 1</u>				<u>Phase 2</u>				<u>Phase 3</u>			
	<u>Husband</u>		<u>Wife</u>		<u>Husband</u>		<u>Wife</u>		<u>Husband</u>		<u>Wife</u>	
	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>
Daily Satisfaction	6.19	1.15	6.20	1.19	5.94	1.19	6.03	1.28	6.02	1.17	6.07	1.18
Daily Emotional Capital	3.65	1.74	3.71	1.80	3.24	1.67	3.31	1.70	3.26	1.76	3.25	1.69
Daily Negative Partner Behaviors	0.39	0.81	0.32	0.73	0.39	0.84	0.35	0.75	0.32	0.70	0.25	0.67

Note: Daily Emotional Capital and Daily Negative Partner Behaviors are raw measures and are not within person centered.

Table 2. *Correlations for All Daily Diary Variables*

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Daily Satisfaction	1.00				
Daily Emotional Capital	0.24***	1.00			
Global Emotional Capital	0.35***	0.02 ⁺	1.00		
Daily Negative Partner Behaviors	-0.28***	-0.14***	0.00	1.00	
Global Negative Partner Behaviors	-0.30***	0.00	0.03**	0.00	1.00

Note: n = 10221 – 12064; ⁺ $p < .10$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$

Table 3. Results from Five Independent Models Predicting the Linear and Quadratic Effects of Phase on Satisfaction, Emotional Capital, and Negative Partner Behaviors

Outcome Variable		Husbands					Wives				
		<i>b</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>DF</i>	<i>CI</i>	Effect Size <i>r</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>DF</i>	<i>CI</i>	Effect Size <i>r</i>
Satisfaction	Linear	-0.45***	-6.03	2320	-0.52-(-0.37)	0.12	-0.27***	-3.37	2251	-0.43-(-0.011)	0.07
	Quadratic	0.16***	4.48	2350	.09-0.23	0.09	0.08 ⁺	1.95	2286	0.00-0.16	0.04
Daily Emotional Capital	Linear	-0.14	-1.06	2783	-.040-0.12	0.02	-0.17	-1.26	2709	-0.43-0.09	0.02
	Quadratic	0.06	0.87	2797	-0.07-0.18	0.02	0.07	1.02	2728	-0.06-0.20	0.02
Global Emotional Capital	Linear	-0.06	-1.34	5812	-0.14-0.03	0.02	0.47***	10.56	5862	0.39-0.56	0.14
	Quadratic	-0.02	-0.88	5781	-0.06-0.02	0.01	-0.28***	-13.71	5836	-0.32-(-0.24)	0.18
Daily Negative Partner Behaviors	Linear	-0.04	-0.39	2766	-0.24-0.16	0.01	-0.03	-0.30	2830	-0.22-0.16	0.01
	Quadratic	0.02	0.38	2777	-0.08-0.12	0.01	0.01	0.27	2844	-0.08-0.11	0.01
Global Negative Partner Behaviors	Linear	-0.01	-0.35	5004	-0.07-0.05	0.00	0.10***	3.99	5376	0.05-0.15	0.05
	Quadratic	0.06***	3.95	4980	0.03-0.08	0.06	-0.02 ⁺	-1.94	5336	-0.05-0.00	0.03

⁺ $p < .10$; * $p < .001$

Table 4. *The Moderating Effects of Daily and Global Emotional Capital on the Association Between Daily Negative Partner Behaviors and Satisfaction*

	Husbands					Wives				
	<i>b</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>DF</i>	<i>CI</i>	Effect Size <i>r</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>DF</i>	<i>CI</i>	Effect Size <i>r</i>
Intercept	6.02***	114.89	230	5.92-6.12	0.99	5.97***	112.40	250	5.87-6.07	0.99
Day	0.01**	3.27	3974	0.00-0.02	0.05	0.02***	4.34	3866	0.01-0.02	0.07
Previous-Day Daily Satisfaction	-0.19***	-13.94	4461	0.17-0.22	0.20	-0.21***	-15.35	4676	0.18-0.24	0.22
Previous-Day Daily Emotional Capital	0.00	-0.43	4276	-0.01-0.01	0.01	0.01	1.05	4447	0.00-0.01	0.02
Global Emotional Capital	0.17***	8.95	6.04	0.13-0.20	0.34	0.24***	13.32	674	0.20-0.27	0.46
Daily Negative Partner Behavior	-0.15***	-26.62	4281	-0.16-(-0.13)	0.40	-0.19***	-29.62	4511	-0.20-(-0.17)	0.37
Global Negative Partner Behavior	-0.32***	-12.01	1091	-0.38-(-0.27)	0.34	-0.34***	-9.85	1231	-0.41-(-0.28)	0.34
Daily Negative Partner Behaviors x Previous-Day Daily Emotional Capital	0.00	-1.15	4155	-0.01-0.00	0.02	0.00	0.86	4266	0.00-0.01	0.01
Daily Negative Partner Behaviors x Global Emotional Capital	0.02***	6.56	4145	0.02-0.03	0.10	0.01***	4.11	4380	0.01-0.02	0.06

⁺ $p < .10$; * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$

Table 5. *The Moderating Effects of Daily and Global Emotional Capital on the Association Between Daily Negative Partner Behaviors and Satisfaction Across Phase*

	Husbands					Wives				
	<i>b</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>DF</i>	<i>CI</i>	Effect Size <i>r</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>DF</i>	<i>CI</i>	Effect Size <i>r</i>
Intercept	6.14***	97.54	461	6.01-6.26	0.98	6.01***	92.54	540	5.89-6.14	0.97
Day	0.01	1.05	2699	-0.01-0.02	0.02	0.02***	3.47	2563	0.01-0.03	0.07
Previous-Day Satisfaction	-0.15***	-7.72	4518	-.019-(-0.11)	0.11	-0.23***	11.54	4656	00.62-0.16	.017
Previous-Day Daily Emotional Capital	-0.01	-1.57	4351	-0.01-0.01	0.02	0.02*	2.20	4494	0.00-0.03	0.03
Global Emotional Capital	0.13***	5.88	834	0.09-0.17	0.20	0.21***	9.88	950	0.16-0.25	0.31
Daily Negative Partner Behavior	-0.18***	-21.73	4359	-0.19-(-0.16)	0.31	-0.19***	-19.90	4508	-0.20-(-0.17)	0.28
Global Negative Partner Behavior	-0.28***	-8.18	1335	00.34-(-0.21)	0.22	-0.34***	-7.94	1420	-0.43-(-0.26)	0.21
Daily Negative Partner Behaviors x Previous-Day Daily Emotional Capital	0.00	-0.24	4141	-0.01-0.01	0.000.06	0.00	0.21	4244	-0.01-0.01	0.00
Daily Negative Partner Behaviors x Global Emotional Capital	0.02***	3.79	4150	0.01-0.03	0.04	0.01**	2.61	4405	0.00-0.02	0.04
Phase	-0.12**	-3.01	1870	-0.19-(-0.04)	0.07	-0.04	-0.96	1797	-0.13-(-0.04)	0.02

⁺ $p < .10$; * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$

(Table 5 cont.)

	Husbands					Wives				
	<i>b</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>DF</i>	<i>CI</i>	Effect Size <i>r</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>DF</i>	<i>CI</i>	Effect Size <i>r</i>
Day x Phase	0.00	0.49	2414	-0.01-0.01	0.01	-0.01	-1.49	2306	-0.02-0.00	0.03
Previous-Day Satisfaction x Phase	-0.04*	-2.50	4414	-0.08-(-0.01)	0.04	0.03	1.50	4787	-0.01-0.06	0.02
Previous-Day Daily Emotional Capital x Phase	0.01 ⁺	1.78	4302	0.00-0.02	0.03	-0.01 ⁺	-1.93	4438	-0.02-0.00	0.03
Global Emotional Capital x Phase	0.03**	2.70	1458	0.01-0.06	0.07	0.04*	2.53	1469	0.01-0.06	0.07
Daily Negative Partner Behavior x Phase	0.03***	4.66	4273	0.02-0.05	0.07	0.00	-0.18	4470	-0.02-0.01	0.00
Global Negative Partner Behavior x Phase	-0.06*	-2.35	1538	-0.11-(-0.01)	0.06	0.01	0.14	1484	-0.06-0.07	0.00
Daily Negative Partner Behaviors x Previous-Day Daily Emotional Capital x Phase	0.00	-0.88	4140	-0.01-0.00	0.01	0.00	0.49	4292	-0.01-0.01	0.01
Daily Negative Partner Behaviors x Global Emotional Capital x Phase	0.00	1.22	4167	0.00-0.01	0.02	0.00	0.50	4367	0.01-0.01	0.01

⁺ $p < .10$; * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$

Table 6. *Directional Bias, Tracking Accuracy, and the Effects of Global Emotional Capital*

	Husbands					Wives				
	<i>b</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>DF</i>	<i>CI</i>	Effect Size <i>r</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>DF</i>	<i>CI</i>	Effect Size <i>r</i>
Similarity of Responses	0.62***	46.10	4938	0.59-0.64	0.55	0.59***	49.79	4928	0.57-0.61	0.58
Directional Bias	0.15**	3.07	149	0.06-0.25	0.24	-.05	-1.39	162	-0.12-0.02	0.11
Directional Bias x Global Emotional Capital	-.05*	-2.25	494	-0.08-(-0.01)	0.10	-0.02	-1.31	430	-0.05-0.01	0.06
Tracking Accuracy	0.23***	17.98	4941	0.21-0.26	0.25	0.19***	15.50	4831	0.17-0.21	0.22
Tracking Accuracy x Global Emotional Capital	-0.01 ⁺	-1.77	4919	-0.02-0.00	0.03	0.00	-0.66	4874	-0.02-0.01	0.01

Note: Similarity of responses is included in this model as a control (West & Kenny, 2011).

⁺ $p < .10$; * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$

Appendix B

Construct Specified Checklists of Daily Relationship Behaviors

Emotional Capital

1. Spouse said something that made you feel loved
2. Spouse showed an interest in the events of your day
3. You enjoyed a leisure activity with spouse
4. You showed an interest in the events of your spouse's day
5. You tried to make your spouse feel loved
6. You shared physical intimacy with spouse

Own Negative Behaviors

1. You criticized/blamed your spouse
2. You did not express your feelings to avoid conflict
3. You let your spouse down or broke a promise
4. You showed anger or impatience toward your spouse

Partner Negative Behaviors

1. Spouse criticized you
2. Spouse withdrew from a conversation
3. Spouse let you down or broke a promise
4. Spouse showed anger or impatience toward you

References

- Bolger, N., & Laurenceau, J. P. (2013). *Intensive Longitudinal Methods: An Introduction to Diary and Experience Sampling Research*. New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Bolger, N., Davis, A., & Rafaeli, E. (2003). Diary methods: Capturing life as it is lived. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 54, 579-616.
- Byrne, A., & Eysenck, M. W. (1995). Trait anxiety, anxious mood, and threat detection. *Cognition & Emotion*, 9, 549-562.
- Aron, A., Paris, M., & Aron, E. N. (1995). Falling in love: Prospective studies of self-concept change. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 69, 1102-1112.
- Campos, B., Graesch, A. P., Repetti, R., Bradbury, T., & Ochs, E. (2009). Opportunity for interaction? A naturalistic observation study of dual-earner families after work and school. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 23, 798-807.
- Doss, B. D., Rhoades, G. K., Stanley, S. M., & Markman, H. J. (2009). The effect of the transition to parenthood on relationship quality: an 8-year prospective study. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 96, 601-619.
- Feeney, B. C., & Lemay, E. P. (2012). Surviving Relationship Threats The Role of Emotional Capital. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 38, 1004-1017.
- Funk, J. L., & Rogge, R. D. (2007). Testing the ruler with item response theory: increasing precision of measurement for relationship satisfaction with the Couples Satisfaction Index. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 21, 572-583.
- Gottman, J. M. (1999). *The marriage clinic: A scientifically-based marital therapy*. New York, NY: WW Norton & Company.

- Gross, J. J., & Levenson, R. W. (1993). Emotional suppression: physiology, self-report, and expressive behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 64, 970-986.
- Huston, T. L., Caughlin, J. P., Houts, R. M., Smith, S. E., & George, L. J. (2001). The connubial crucible: newlywed years as predictors of marital delight, distress, and divorce. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 80, 237-252.
- Huston, T. L., & Holmes, E. K. (2003). Becoming parents. In A. L. Vangelisti (Ed.), *Handbook of Family Communication* (pp. 105-133). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Kelley, H. H. (1983). Love and commitment. In H. H. Kelley, E. Berscheid, A. Christensen, J. H. Harvey, T. L. Huston, G. Levinger, & D. R. Peterson (Eds.), *Close Relationships* (pp. 265-314). New York, NY: W. H. Freeman.
- Kim, M. S., Wilson, S. R., Anastasiou, L., Aleman, C., Oetzel, J., & Lee, H. (2009) The relationship between self-construals, perceived face threats, and facework during the pursuit of influence goals. *Journal of International Intercultural Communication*, 2, 318-343.
- Leary, M. R., Tambor, E. S., Terdal, S. K., & Downs, D. L. (1995). Self-esteem as an interpersonal monitor: The sociometer hypothesis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 68, 518-530.
- Murray, S. L., Holmes, J. G., & Collins, N. L. (2006). Optimizing assurance: the risk regulation system in relationships. *Psychological Bulletin*, 132, 641-666.
- Rusbult, C. E., Zembrodt, I. M., & Gunn, L. K. (1982). Exit, voice, loyalty, and neglect: Responses to dissatisfaction in romantic involvements. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 43, 1230-1242.

- SAS Institute. (2012). SAS 9.4 for Windows. Cary, NC: Author.
- Schumm, W. R., Paff-Bergen, L. A., Hatch, R. C., Obiorah, F. C., Copeland, J. M., Meens, L. D., & Bugaighis, M. A. (1986). Concurrent and discriminant validity of the Kansas Marital Satisfaction Scale. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 48, 381-387.
- Sternberg, R. J. (1997). Construct validation of a triangular love scale. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 27, 313-335.
- Tolmacz, R., & Mikulincer, M. (2011). The sense of entitlement in romantic relationships—Scale construction, factor structure, construct validity, and its associations with attachment orientations. *Psychoanalytic Psychology*, 28, 75-94.
- Weiss, R. L. (1980). Strategic behavioral marital therapy: Toward a model for assessment and intervention. *Advances in Family Intervention, Assessment and Theory*, 1, 229-271.
- West, T. V., & Kenny, D. A. (2011). The truth and bias model of judgment. *Psychological Review*, 118, 357-378.
- Wills, T. A., & Shinar, O. (2000). Measuring perceived and received social support. In S. Cohen, L. G. Underwood, & B. H. Gottlieb (Eds.), *Social Support Measurement and Intervention: A Guide for Health and Social Scientists* (pp. 86-135). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.