POST-TRAUMATIC GROWTH ACROSS PARTNERS AND IN RELATIONSHIPS

By

Mariah Faith Purol

A DISSERTATION

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

Psychology – Doctor of Philosophy

2024

ABSTRACT

Multiple theories have proposed the possibility of post-traumatic growth (PTG)—positive personality change occurring after an especially negative life experience (Jayawickreme & Blackie, 2014). Much PTG work documents the importance of close others in the expression and magnitude of this phenomenon. Romantic partners, in particular, appear to play an especially important role in PTG, sometimes facilitating/hindering growth and experiencing growth themselves—even when they do not directly experience a negative event. In three studies, each examining longitudinal samples from different countries (i.e., the United States, the Netherlands, and Switzerland), I examined trajectories of post-traumatic growth (i.e., increases in extraversion, conscientiousness, openness to experience, and agreeableness; decreases in neuroticism) among individuals and their romantic partners. Each study used growth curve modeling to parse apart patterns of personality change, determine if experiencing ostensibly negative life events (directly or vicariously) influences these patterns, and examine the role of potentially influential relationship characteristics. I found that, while individuals' own negative life events and the negative life events of their partners were occasionally associated with positive personality change, this was relatively rare, and the effect sizes of these potentially impactful life events were relatively small. The relationship variables examined in this series of studies (i.e., support, relationship satisfaction, responsiveness, and closeness) were largely unassociated with adaptive personality trait change, although, when examined as outcomes, I found some evidence of PTG on the dyadic level (i.e., relationships improving after a negative life event). The final study also modeled trajectories of both self and observer (i.e., partner) reported personality change, finding that individuals' perceptions of their personality change after a negative event varied slightly from their partners' perceptions of their change.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Study 1 uses HRS panel data, supported by the National Institute on Aging (NIA U01AG009740) and the Social Security Administration. Study 2 uses LISS panel data, which were collected by CentERdata (Tilburg University, The Netherlands) through its MESS project funded by the Netherlands Organization for Scientific Research. Study 3 uses CouPers panel data, collected by Alexander Grob, Robert Philip Burriss, Rebekka Weidmann, Janina Larissa Bühler, Jenna Wünsche, Fabienne Fend, Sabrina Brunner, and Rahel Hütten and funded by the Swiss National Science Foundation (SNSF, project number 162697).

I have so many people to thank, all of whom deserve pages and pages of acknowledgements.

Thank you to the members of my committee: William Chopik, Richard Lucas, Kevin Hoff, and Adrian Blow, for donating their time and perspectives to this project (and many others).

Extra thank-yous to my advisor, William Chopik. With the time and care you took to guide me through my time as a graduate student, you have opened doors for me that would have otherwise been closed forever. I will never have the words to thank you; I am forever proud to be your student.

And, perhaps, the biggest thank-yous to my network of close others who kept me happy and human throughout my PhD. Thank you to my dearest friends, Samantha DeNooyer, Erica Wilson, and Sydney Steele, and to my endlessly supportive parents, Patti and Bernie Purol. And, of course, thank you to my favorite close other, Blaise Nugent. May our next chapter be as sweet as our last; I can't wait to be your wife.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

Anecdotal and theoretical accounts of post-traumatic growth (PTG) suggest the possibility of positive personal changes (i.e., increases in extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, openness; decreases in neuroticism) reported by those who experience a strong negative life event (Infurna & Jayawickreme, 2019; Jayawickreme & Blackie, 2014; Jayawickreme et al., 2021). Close others, including romantic partners, are often implicated in this growth process, whether as active contributors or as beneficiaries of vicarious growth (Barre et al., 2023; Canevello et al., 2016; Schroevers et al., 2010; Zwahlen et al., 2010). In this dissertation, I proposed three studies to examine the incidence of PTG (e.g., partners' trajectories of PTG), how these trajectories compare to those of individuals who directly experience trauma themselves, and which relationship-level factors might influence this growth. Each of the three proposed studies used pre-existing longitudinal panel data with couples (two of which were nationally representative). The final study also explored the possibility that partner perceptions of an individual's PTG may vary from an individual's perceptions of their own PTG. Observer reports offer further nuance to the role of romantic partners in the phenomenon of PTG by assessing whether PTG or positive personality growth after adversity is "detectable" by close others. Taken together, this suite of studies seeks to offer new insight into the role of romantic partners in PTG.

Negative Life Events And Individuals' Personality Change

Inevitably, most people experience difficult, adverse, and/or painful challenges in their lives (i.e., negative life events). Some work on the topic suggests that over half of college-aged students (and some estimates suggest upwards of 84% of students) have already experienced at least one impactful negative life event in their lives (Smyth et al., 2008), such as the death of a

loved one, a physical or sexual assault, or a health scare. But do these experiences somehow *change* the individuals who live through them? Specifically, do negative life events have a lasting impact on an individual's personality?

To understand if and how individuals change in response to adversity specifically, it is important to characterize the nature of personality changes in the context of life events more broadly. Some theorists have posited that personality may change on the level of the broad, Big Five personality traits (i.e., extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, neuroticism, and openness to experience). In a review of the subject, Bleidorn, Hopwood & Lucas (2018) found that many negative life events have been at least somewhat linked to changes in Big Five personality traits, whether it be increases or decreases in ostensibly positive traits following an event. However, for most life events featured, there was no clear consensus on exactly *whether* and *how* these events change personality. The magnitude of trait changes, the direction of the effects, and even the specific traits implicated often varied across studies in ways that are not immediately straightforward (Bleidorn et al., 2018). For example, when examining divorce, Costa and colleagues (2000) found that men became less conscientious and more neurotic after divorce, while women became more extraverted and open. Other studies found post-divorce increases in agreeableness and conscientiousness for both men and women (Specht et al., 2011b). Yet other work found post-divorce decreases in extraversion specifically for both men and women (Allemand et al., 2015). How, then, does personality change after a life event like divorce? As Bleidorn and colleagues (2018) acknowledge, when examining the literature on personality change and divorce, the findings are unclear and, occasionally, incompatible with each other. Despite heterogeneity in the findings, the review highlighted a couple of life events that were at least more consistently associated with personality change across studies: the

transition to a first romantic relationship (i.e., it is associated with decreases in neuroticism and, occasionally, increases in extraversion) and the transition from high school to college or work (i.e., it is associated with increases in conscientiousness). Notably, these transitions are typically considered ostensibly *positive* life events. Negative life events, such as widowhood or unemployment, demonstrated fewer consistent effects on personality change, and their influence often varied based on demographic factors such as gender. All told, the literature concerning negative life events spurring Big Five personality change is a little murky.

Others have theorized that, after adversity, it is more likely that, at least for some people, socially valued and positive characteristics might increase—signaling a form of resilience or flourishing (i.e., "what doesn't kill you makes you stronger", Nietzsche & Levy, 1909). This sort of positive personality change is often referred to in the literature as post-traumatic growth (PTG; Jayawickreme & Blackie, 2014). In this framework, negative life events are conceptualized as catalysts for positive personal growth. The most commonly used measure in studies of PTG, the Post-Traumatic Growth Inventory (PTGI; Tedeschi & Calhoun, 1996), identifies five areas of growth that individuals report after an adverse life event: 1) new possibilities (in which individuals find new interests, callings, or opportunities after a time of crisis); 2) relating to others (in which individuals experience greater closeness and compassion for others after a time of crisis); 3) personal strength (in which individuals are more confident in their strengths and feel more competent after a time of crisis); 4) spiritual change: in which individuals feel more connected to a religious faith or spirit after a time of crisis; and, lastly, 5) appreciation of life: in which individuals have a newfound appreciation for their lives and may shift their priorities in life after a time of crisis.

However, in reviews of normative personality changes after life events, there is a great

deal of heterogeneity in whether personality changes in consistent ways. Thus, when frameworks began to emerge hypothesizing that personality can change in positive ways following adversity, some researchers advocated for the idea, while others were strongly skeptical about how common or possible PTG was. Indeed, both methodological and conceptual challenges have limited the work on successfully demonstrating PTG. For example, PTG (or any type of adjustment-related indicator) is often assessed only once (i.e., cross-sectionally) and *after* an event has already occurred. Further, the PTG literature has relied heavily on asking people to cognitively reflect on how they have grown in response to a negative experience. Others have noted that reflecting on change and negative events often requires a great deal of introspection on the part of participants to quantify their growth and how much of it is attributable to an adverse event (Tennen & Affleck, 1998).

In a review of the work on this topic, Jayawickreme and colleagues (2021) summarize how other, closely-related conceptualizations of growth after trauma (e.g., benefit-finding, psychological well-being, changes in life narratives, etc.; Helgeson et al., 2006; Joseph & Linley, 2005; Pals & McAdams, 2004) have characterized post-crisis change. The authors discuss changes in character strengths—moral personality traits—as one potential avenue to think about and demonstrate post-traumatic growth. There is compelling evidence that individuals' character strengths do, in fact, change after tragedy. For example, a study examining American participants' character strengths before and after the September 11th terrorist attacks found post-attack *increases* in gratitude, hope, kindness, leadership, love, spirituality, and teamwork (Peterson & Seligman, 2003). Interestingly, when measured again almost a year after the attacks, these character strengths were still elevated, although to a somewhat lesser degree (Peterson & Seligman, 2003). However, as Jayawickreme and colleagues point out, not all challenging events

are related to changes in character strengths, either. For example, health crises are inconsistently related to positive changes in character strengths (Gander et al., 2020). Similarly, in an examination of newly deployed U.S. soldiers, soldiers were largely stable in their character strengths across the deployment cycle, changing very little over time and only being negligibly related to traumatic combat experiences (Chopik et al., 2021).

Mangelsdorf and colleagues (2019) summarized much of the research on this topic in a meta-analysis of PTG and its counterpart, post-ecstatic growth (in which individuals experience positive personality change after positive life events). The project constituted a thorough review of over 150 studies, both longitudinal and post-hoc (i.e., in which personality change was reflected upon after the event). The research team examined several PTG-related outcomes—many of which suggested positive personality change after trauma. Although few studies included in the meta-analysis examined changes in personal strengths after negative events (with only one longitudinal study explicitly measuring strengths), the effect sizes depicting change were positive and stable over time (i.e., longitudinal window; all *d*s > .25). Other significant positive outcomes included increases in environmental mastery, autonomy, and self-esteem (Mangelsdorf et al., 2019). But people were heterogeneous in the exact characteristics that tended to change: for example, although some indicators improved after trauma experiences, others, such as a propensity for spiritual thoughts and experiences, were relatively unaffected by trauma experiences. Further, personal growth (an indicator suggesting psychological well-being) *decreased* after a negative event (although there was only one study in the meta-analysis that examined this outcome, Mangelsdorf et al., 2019). Clearly, there is no consensus surrounding personality change after a negative life event, whether measured as PTG or as a change in Big 5 traits or character strengths. However, at least some of this ambiguity might be attributable to a

lack of longitudinal, prospective data and applying methods that help identify whether subgroups within a population experience PTG (Jayawickreme et al., 2021).

Further, at least some of this variation in how people change following life events can be explained by how individuals interpret the life events they experience. After all, not all crises (and our interpretations of them) are created equal. As further discussed by Jayawickreme and colleagues, how traumatic or challenging a life event is judged to be likely relies on a unique interaction between the event and a person. Perhaps negative life events produce less consistent changes in personality (Bleidorn et al., 2018) because of this complex interaction: a divorce can prompt increases in extraversion or a bout of personal growth in one person, but it may debilitate another person individually and socially. A positive life event, like the start of a new relationship, may incite more universal effects. Recently, there has been a call to account for this kind of person-event interaction in studies of PTG to more accurately characterize the nature of post-traumatic personality change (Jayawickreme & Blackie, 2014; Jayawickreme et al., 2021). One answer to this call comes in the form of changing the methodological approaches for studying life events—measuring the *perceived impact* of a negative life event instead of the mere presence or absence of the event. Recently, Luhmann and colleagues developed and published the Event Characteristics Scale (ECS; Luhmann et al., 2020). The ECS measures characteristics of major life events in hopes of better explaining why psychological outcomes of life events can vary in their strength, direction, and duration. Specifically, the scale asks participants to describe a life event in terms of 9 perceived characteristics (each creating their own subscale): 1) valence, 2) impact, 3) predictability, 4) challenge, 5) emotional significance, 6) change in world views, 7) change in social status, 8) external control, and 9) extraordinariness. In the validation of this scale, Luhmann et al. found that, when examining the influence of life events on subjective well-

being, these perceived characteristics significantly accounted for individual differences in well-being trajectories after a life event. Further, this predictive effect remained after controlling for pre-existing personality traits, age, and gender as covariates. Specifically, the characteristics of valence and challenge were associated with levels of both retrospective and prospective subjective well-being: participants who perceived a life event as more negative or challenging reported lower well-being over time; participants who perceived a life event as changing their worldview reported higher well-being over time (Luhmann et al., 2020). Indeed, the perception of a negative life event may play a large role in if and how a person experiences PTG.

Negative Life Events and Close Others

Of course, negative life events—and individuals' experiences of them—do not occur in a vacuum. Often, when faced with challenges, individuals seek out social support from others (Taylor, 2011). In this way, close relationships, too, resemble a characteristic of the life event and may ultimately play a role in how individuals cope with or grow from trauma. Much research finds that social support plays an important buffering role in times of stress and that partner support, in particular, improves individuals' outcomes (e.g., lessens stress or anxiety). This effect has been documented across a variety of stressful contexts, including throughout pregnancy, amidst serious medical diagnoses, and when breaking addictions, such as smoking (de Jong Gierveld & Van Tilburg, 1987; Mermelstein et al., 1986; Racine et al., 2019; Rini et al., 2006; Talley et al., 2010).

Other work suggests that partner support may go beyond merely reducing the negative effects of stressful experiences; partner support may influence how individuals experience

positive change after a negative event (i.e., post-traumatic growth).[1]

Although work on partner and relationship characteristics affecting PTG is relatively rare, and often only examines relatively small groups of participants, it nevertheless offers some evidence that partners' social support may facilitate an individual's experience of PTG. This work could also be useful in explaining the heterogeneous findings seen in the life events literature. For example, in one recent study of growth among Korean women experiencing pregnancy loss, Yoon and colleagues (2022) found that partner support moderated the association between grief and PTG; in those with high partner support, more grief was related to higher PTG. However, in those with low partner support, grief was not as closely linked with PTG (Yoon et al., 2022). A similar conclusion was found in a 2013 study of stem cell transplant survivors. Specifically, social support from a spouse, particularly instrumental spousal support (i.e., assisting with tangible needs), positively predicted PTG (Nenova et al., 2013). Collectively, these and other nascent studies emphasize the positive influence that partners can have on individuals experiencing challenges and adverse circumstances.

In the current dissertation, I focused on the reverse relationship: how an individual's trauma or adversity can impact their partner or their relationship as a whole. Worth noting, this phenomenon, too, has received some attention in the literature. However, like work on individual personality change after trauma, the work done on this topic finds occasionally heterogeneous and contradictory results.

On one hand, stress or trauma experienced by one person does occasionally affect the

[1] Worth noting, even studies that critique the prospective influence of support on adjustment following negative life events acknowledge the role of support in encouraging better adjustment during the adaptation period in improving outcomes for individuals (Lucas & Chopik, 2021).

psychological functioning of their partner. This is most often evident in literature examining cross-over (from one person to another) or spill-over effects (from one context to another), such as vicarious experiences or work-life management. For example, after controlling for acts of discrimination experienced by individuals, acts of discrimination against a partner were negatively associated with an individual's self-rated health and positively associated with depressive symptoms (Wofford et al., 2019). These effects were explained (i.e., mediated) by the negative effects that these discrimination experiences have on relationship functioning. More generally, burdens experienced in one domain of life (or by a close other) might also "spill over" into close relationships, and individuals may find themselves indirectly experiencing a partner's stress (e.g., financial or job strain creating relationship difficulties; Norling & Chopik, 2020; Trail & Karney, 2012). Yet other work has found that the declining cognitive health of an individual can lead to poorer outcomes (i.e., increased loneliness) for their partners (Leggett et al., 2020). Such findings align with broader work on *vicarious* or *secondary* trauma. Vicarious or secondary trauma occurs when one incurs negative impacts of being close to someone who has experienced trauma, whether in a professional or personal setting, despite not personally experiencing the trauma. Sometimes described as the "contagion" of trauma (Gill-Emerson, 2015), a handful of studies have documented the negative effects (i.e., increased psychological distress) that can come from being close to someone who has experienced trauma (Gill-Emerson, 2015; Huggard et al., 2017; Smith et al., 2014). Other research on social networks suggests a comparable "spreading" of negative emotions and health problems primarily through people's interactions with one another (Christakis & Fowler, 2007; Rosenquist et al., 2011). Of course, the person directly navigating the trauma often has the most immediate and severe consequences. But it may be surprising that those who are close to traumatized individuals experience negative

"ripple" effects in the wake of that trauma. Indeed, negative emotions are often found to be "contagious" (Hancock et al., 2008; Hill et al., 2010; Kimura et al., 2008; Kramer et al., 2014; Prochazkova & Kret, 2017), especially among those who are very close to one another (Mazzuca et al., 2019).

However, trauma is not always associated with poorer outcomes for partners and relationships. In some cases, enduring a stressful event with a partner is associated with positive or resilient relationship outcomes. A longitudinal examination of couples found that after surviving a natural disaster, Hurricane Harvey, newlywed couples actually experienced a temporary *boost* in relationship satisfaction (Williamson et al., 2021). Other longitudinal work has found that partners of individuals experiencing a negative health event (e.g., a cancer diagnosis) demonstrate post-traumatic growth, often along with the diagnosed individual (Schroevers et al., 2010; Thornton & Perez, 2006; Weiss, 2004; Zwahlen et al., 2010). Some of this work suggests that partners' experiences of PTG in these scenarios are directly related. Partners' levels of PTG are often associated with one another (Hodges et al., 2005; Weiss, 2002, 2004; Zwahlen et al., 2010). Further, in cross-sectional examinations of both patients and their partners, a partner's PTG predicts an individual's own PTG over and above other growth-relevant variables (such as social/marital support, depth of commitment, and the intensity of the traumatic stressor; Weiss, 2004). Some of this research suggests that people's responses to their partner's adversity might be attributable to how their partner frames and experiences the adversity (thus setting the stage for partners to feed off or model positive growth seen in the individual experiencing personal PTG). Partners, then, appear to be susceptible not only to the negative ripple effects of an individual's trauma but also to positive changes or growth. However, this work is often limited to examining PTG with respect to well-being or specific

growth indicators and rarely examined with respect to personality traits.

Although there is some evidence for heterogeneous outcomes for partners, why are couples' post-traumatic outcomes linked in these ways in the first place? Several mechanisms can help partially explain the link between partners' shared experiences of PTG. Some researchers suggest that the mechanisms responsible for the shared experience of growth and positive emotion between partners after trauma may simply be the same broad mechanisms responsible for shared psychological distress (i.e., emotional contagion; Prochazkova & Kret, 2017; Zwahlen et al., 2010). Put simply, close others may experience more positive or negative emotions simply by interacting with partners who experience positive or negative emotions more frequently. Indeed, recent literature suggests that those who work closely with traumatized individuals, despite not being directly traumatized themselves, experience both vicarious growth and vicarious trauma (Barre et al., 2023). Other researchers suggest that there are more nuanced, couple-specific factors that influence how partners grow in response to each other's trauma. For example, some work suggests that vicarious PTG relies on the resiliency—the ability to maintain well-being in the face of adversity (Herrman et al., 2011)—of the partner who is not directly experiencing the challenge. Partners with higher levels of resiliency are more likely to experience PTG (as are *their* partners; Zhang et al., 2021). Perhaps having a partner who is especially emotionally stable or positive in challenging times (both hallmarks of resiliency) provides an environment that is more conducive to personal growth.

Other work points to the importance of partner responsiveness: partners' ability to "understand, value, and support each other in fulfilling important personal needs and goals" (Reis & Clark, 2013). Work by Canevello and colleagues (2016) suggests that there is no *direct* link between individual and partner PTG at all. Rather, it is more likely that an individual's PTG

leads them to become a more responsive partner, which, in turn, facilitates the PTG of their partner (Canevello et al., 2016). In this process, living through a challenge may prompt individuals to alter their priorities, shifting focus to caring for and validating their partner. This increased responsiveness is perceived by partners (Canevello & Crocker, 2010) and may prompt growth in many ways—perhaps encouraging trauma-specific disclosure and fostering cognitive processing (Calhoun & Tedeschi, 2014), reminding partners of positive coping techniques and strengths (Calhoun & Tedeschi, 2014; McMillen, 2004), or simply serving as a peer model for growth (Canevello et al., 2016; McMillen, 2004).

Other models offer potential explanations for how negative life events may influence relationships as a whole. The Vulnerability Stress Adaptation Model (Karney & Bradbury, 1995), for example, offers a broad framework for relationship satisfaction that incorporates negative life events. In this model, the quality of a relationship is directly influenced by a couple's ability to adapt to stressors (i.e., adaptive processes). This ability depends on each individual's particular vulnerabilities and the external stressors that they, as a couple, might be exposed to. In this model, negative life events, and how successfully couples can cope with them, are central to a couple's relationship satisfaction and stability. This model is especially helpful when attempting to explain potentially counterintuitive findings on relationship satisfaction and negative life events—such as the boost in satisfaction found after Hurricane Harvey (Williamson et al., 2021). Perhaps couple members who are, individually, less vulnerable (e.g., more resilient, more likely to use positive coping styles), are better able to cope with stressful events, resulting in successful adaptive processes (for them, their partner, and their relationship). Perhaps being able to successfully overcome hardship as a couple then boosts confidence and satisfaction in the relationship (e.g., "We can survive anything together", "I'm

glad I have my partner when things get hard"). Taken as a whole, the literature on negative life events and close others offers at least some speculative evidence that individual outcomes after negative life events, both good and bad, are influenced by the actions of partners. Inversely, an individual's adversity can also impact their partner or their relationship. However, again, it is not clear how common this experience is and whether it is seen in broader personality traits over time.

The State of the Literature & Methodological Considerations

While the current literature offers evidence that negative life events can potentially change individuals, partners, and relationships, the strength of this evidence is somewhat murky. As mentioned by Bleidorn, Hopwood & Lucas (2018), it is relatively unclear when and how we can expect negative life events to alter people and their relationships. At least some of this ambiguity comes from methodological complications that have come to characterize the PTG literature (Jayawickreme & Blackie, 2014; Jayawickreme et al., 2021). In a broad review of the state of PTG literature, Jayawickreme et al. (2021) point out several serious limitations to the methods typically used to answer questions about PTG. Reliance on cross-sectional data is one such limitation. In typical PTG studies, researchers often ask participants to recount a time that they endured a challenge and retroactively determine how they may have changed in response to this challenge. Of course, participants' memories are not completely reliable, and adverse memories may be even more difficult to accurately reflect upon (Sachschal et al., 2019; Van der Kolk & Fisler, 1995). Of course, only longitudinal data can be used to truly answer questions about changes over time. To determine if people and their partners genuinely experience positive change after a traumatic event, Jayawickreme and colleagues (2021) argue that researchers need data on individuals' personality characteristics both before and after an adverse event (sometimes

for many years after, as change can be slow to unfold; Schroevers et al., 2010). In this dissertation, I used prospective personality data from before to after adverse life events.

Jayawickreme et al. (2021) also advocate for researchers to be more intentional about the samples that they use, both in cultural variation (e.g., encouraging the use of nationally representative data and non-WEIRD samples) and in sample size (i.e., prospectively getting a large enough sample of people who have experienced a given event). It is understandably difficult to gather a nationally representative sample that is well-powered enough to quantitatively compare outcomes across people. To some degree, it is difficult to predict when people experience any particular life event, as many events have at least some element of randomness. One potential solution to this problem, Jayawickreme and colleagues suggest, is for researchers to take advantage of pre-existing longitudinal studies. While these datasets come with limitations of their own (i.e., they are often not designed to explicitly measure PTG), they can offer a well-powered data pool with nationally representative and prospective personality data. In this dissertation, I leveraged three large prospective studies from three different countries to assess how common PTG is.

Finally, when focusing on the topic of PTG in the context of close relationships, relatively few studies have examined the dyad as the unit of analysis. This may be surprising when considering that some examinations of PTG describe it as a process that cannot happen in isolation, envisioning growth as something that happens through conversations with close others (Cordova et al., 2001; Schroevers et al., 2010) and being dependent on partner support (Yoon et al., 2022). Some authors have explicitly advocated for PTG to be modeled as a couple-level factor (Ávila et al., 2017). However, to date, there have been very few longitudinal studies that model PTG as a dyadic process. One of the few exceptions, in a sample of couples in which one

member was a veteran of the Yom Kippur War, found patterns largely consistent with the cross-sectional literature (Lahav et al., 2017). But even this study found some conflicting results—wives (non-veterans) PTG experiences predicted their husbands' PTG over time, but husbands' PTG was largely unrelated to their wives' PTG over time. However, PTG was a mixed bag. Although wives' PTG predicted more PTG in their husbands over time, it also predicted more PTSD and worse relationship quality over time. As this study demonstrates, considering dyadic outcomes in examinations of PTG can help uncover important nuances that have not yet been thoroughly examined. In this dissertation, I used dyadic data—personality data from both partners—to examine whether adverse life events experienced either personally or vicariously are associated with positive personality change. Further, following work suggesting that positive relationship characteristics are essential for PTG, I examined whether relationship quality predicts the occurrence of PTG.

Finally, an important limitation of the work on PTG is that it relies exclusively on individuals providing self-reports of their life events and their personality characteristics. However, a great deal of personality research is dedicated to how personality affects important life outcomes, such as those found in close relationships (Roberts et al., 2007). There is also a practical limitation that repeatedly reflecting on one's own personality and how it might change in response to life events might also affect whether PTG is detected. In fact, such an idea—that PTG is gained through active reflection—is a foundational idea in narrative approaches to personality that posit people make sense of their life histories in ways that aid in emotion regulation and maximize well-being (McAdams et al., 2001; Syed & McLean, 2022). However, an important additional piece of information is whether personality change or growth is "observable" by close others. Although observer ratings have a long history in the field of

personality psychology (Paulhus & Vazire, 2007; Vazire, 2010), there are not as many examinations of observer ratings of personality change over longer periods (McCrae, 1993; Oltmanns et al., 2020; Schwaba et al., 2022; Watson & Humrichouse, 2006). In this dissertation, I supplement the traditional examination of PTG in individuals by examining whether it is also detectable or "seen" by romantic partners.

The Current Studies

The current dissertation examined patterns of personality change in three samples of couples—Study 1 was a 12-year longitudinal study conducted in the United States, Study 2 was a 14-year longitudinal study conducted in the Netherlands, and Study 3 was a 2-year study conducted in Switzerland but comprised of couples from Switzerland, Germany, and Austria. The studies sought to address the aforementioned methodological limitations and answer the following research questions:

RQ1: Do people exhibit positive personality change (PTG) after their partner experiences a negative life event (Studies 1-3)?

RQ2: If so, how do these changes compare to the PTG of the individual who experienced the negative life event themselves (Studies 1-3)?

RQ3: Do relationship characteristics (e.g., closeness, satisfaction) predict PTG for individuals and their partners (Studies 1-3)?

RQ4: Do partners perceive PTG in individuals who experience a negative life event (Study 3)?

As discussed above, longitudinal data, as well as large and representative samples, are especially important when answering questions about PTG. For this reason, the studies proposed to address these questions make use of three separate longitudinal panel studies. Each of these datasets (i.e., the HRS, LISS, and CouPers datasets) contained relevant variables, such as

personality traits, life event histories, and relationship quality indicators, measured over several time points.

Overview of the Dissertation Studies

Three studies assessed the prevalence and predictors of PTG in three samples of romantic partners followed over time.

Study 1 examined how experiencing a life event, both directly (as the primary individual the life event impacts) and indirectly (as the partner of an individual who is directly impacted) influences the trajectory of personality change. This study used data from the Health and Retirement Study (HRS, an English-language survey), a nationally representative panel of older adults in the United States. This study also examined how spousal support and spousal strain may further impact growth trajectories through their direct and interactive (with life event occurrence) effects on personality change trajectories.

Of course, this is not the only relationship-relevant variable that may influence growth, and in Study 2, an additional variable—relationship satisfaction—was integrated while I revisited this question using a nationally representative sample of the Dutch population (the Longitudinal Internet studies in the Social Sciences [LISS]; a Dutch-language survey). In Study 2, I determined if the trajectories of growth found in Study 1 replicated and whether relationship satisfaction affected personality change trajectories in a similar way as support and strain in Study 1.

Study 3 tested additional relationship-relevant variables, including support, responsiveness, and closeness, in a panel study of couples from Switzerland, Germany, and Austria (the Processes in Romantic Relationships and Their Impact on Relationship and Personal Outcomes [CouPers] study; a German-language survey). In addition to replicating the trajectories

found in the first two studies, Study 3 examined whether self-reported trajectories of growth differ from partner-reported trajectories on the same individuals. Comparing these informants helped determine if partners have a fundamentally different view of PTG than individuals. Because life events are experienced differently by each individual (i.e., what is distressing for one individual may be pleasant for another), Study 3 also allowed me to examine life events that were explicitly rated as negative by participants (the other studies only feature checklists of life events).

In total, this set of studies allowed me to address each of the research questions listed above and contribute to a growing body of work on the role of romantic partners in PTG.

CHAPTER 2: STUDY 1

Do people experience positive personality growth if their partner experiences a negative life event? Study 1 tested this possibility. The current literature on PTG within the context of close relationships suggests that partners can play important roles in the lives of those experiencing trauma, whether it be through buffering negative emotions or taking an active role in promoting growth. But which relationship-level mechanisms, specifically, are implicated in this process? Much of the work about partners and PTG centers around the support that partners provide in challenging times. Thus, Study 1 aimed to examine how partner support provision impacts individuals' trajectories of change after a challenging event.

Partner Support in PTG

One theory suggests that support provision within close relationships makes PTG possible. Multiple forms of partner support (i.e., emotional and instrumental support) are correlated with and predict PTG (Nenova et al., 2013; Schroevers et al., 2010). The literature on partners and PTG suggests that the effect sizes of partner support rival or surpass that of other growth-relevant variables, such as characteristics of the trauma (Nenova et al., 2013; Schroevers et al., 2010), other (e.g., religious) support, and grief intensity (Yoon et al., 2022). For example, in a longitudinal examination of cancer survivors and their partners, Schroevers et al. (2010) found that partner support was associated with cancer survivors finding more "silver linings" in their illness (e.g., "I appreciate life more because of my illness", "My illness strengthened my relationships with others"). Specifically, these effects of emotional support were seen in the short weeks and months following the diagnosis, a challenging time for many individuals and couples. Impressively, this association remained significant over longer periods—up to eight years after diagnosis (Schroevers et al., 2010).

In discussing this finding, the authors provide an important, albeit simple, explanation: merely talking about the adverse event with a close other provided opportunities for positive reflection about adversity. These conversations can facilitate positive reappraisal and coping skills, ultimately contributing to positive growth for the affected individual (Cordova et al., 2001; Luszczynska et al., 2005; Schulz & Mohamed, 2004). Other work examining the outcomes of distressed stem cell transplant survivors echoes these findings: instrumental support—the tangible assistance that partners provide (e.g., doing chores, running errands)—uniquely predicts PTG: having a reliable partner to take care of logistics alleviates daily stressors, giving the directly impacted individual the mental and emotional space to grow (Nenova et al., 2013). Occasionally, support from partners might not directly affect the likelihood of PTG, but, instead, might alleviate some of the hindrances to PTG. In a study of women experiencing pregnancy loss, for example, partner support altered the damaging effects that grief had on PTG (Yoon et al., 2022). Surprisingly, for those who had especially supportive partners, more grief was related to more PTG. Taken together, whether it is instrumental or emotional forms of support, this research suggests that partner support has the potential to facilitate PTG, although there is some uncertainty about what kinds of support are most important (and when) in this process—and why.

Interestingly, while emotional and instrumental support measure two distinct types of support and are independently associated with PTG, there is some evidence of synergistic effects. Specifically, the best well-being outcomes, for both the provider and the recipient of support, come from instrumental support that is *also* emotionally engaged (Morelli et al., 2015). With this in mind, the prosocial instrumental support provided by spouses, who assumedly care for their partner with a great deal of emotional investment, may be especially effective in

creating an environment for PTG.

Partner Strain in PTG

As Nenova et al. (2013) argue, perhaps partner support is so appreciated because it eliminates stressors or strain that would otherwise be too onerous to handle for individuals on their own. However, when partners are unable to successfully cope with a stressful situation, they may become sources of additional stress. While little work has been done to explicitly examine the role of partner strain on PTG, there is some work to suggest that partners who are especially stressed may impede the coping of someone directly impacted by a crisis.

In general, spousal strain, the feeling that a relationship carries many hassles or demands, is related to many negative outcomes, such as increased substance use (Brazeau & Lewis, 2021), loneliness (Saenz, 2021), and negative affect (DeLongis et al., 2004). This strain may be especially relevant in the context of relationships in which one or both partners are experiencing adversity, as partners of those who experience adversity often report intense feelings of stress or burden throughout the experience (Fredman et al., 2014; Greene et al., 2014; Verhaeghe et al., 2005). In a review of families of those with traumatic brain injuries, Verhaeghe (2005) found that partners are especially vulnerable to feelings of stress and strain after crisis, and, importantly, partners' ability to successfully cope is an important factor in the recovery of the individual with the injury. If a partner is unable to cope successfully, then, they may hinder both the recovery and the growth of the directly affected individual.

In Study 1, I examined trajectories of personality change in the face of life events experienced by people and their partners. I also examined the moderating role of support and strain in the effect that these life events had on trajectories.

Method

Participants

In Study 1, data was sourced from the Health and Retirement Study (HRS). The HRS, a longitudinal panel study administered by the University of Michigan, has surveyed a representative sample of approximately 20,000 Americans 50 years of age and older every two years since 1992. Every other wave (i.e., every four years), they are provided with an extended self-report questionnaire. From 2006 to 2020 (every four years, resulting in 4 total waves[2]), respondents and their spouses received a self-report psychosocial questionnaire that covers six broad areas: 1) subjective well-being; 2) lifestyle and experience of stress; 3) quality of social ties; 4) personality traits; 5) work-related beliefs; and 6) self-related beliefs[3]. Although response rates varied across wave and cohort, when considering all eligible respondents together, response rates for individuals were relatively high (i.e., all response rates were between 61.8-87.7%). Because the research questions I have proposed exist solely within the context of romantic relationships, I only used data from partnered participants. This resulted in a sample of 6,820 opposite-gender couples (N=13,640; 50% male, 50% female) with at least one assessment of personality. Participant age ranged from 25 to 67 (M_{age} = 62.16, *SD* = 10.27) and had an average education of 12.83 years (although this varied from less than 1 year of education to 17 years, *SD* = 3.18 years). As the dataset is nationally representative, participants were mostly White (71.4%), followed by Hispanic (12.7%), Black (12.3%), and other races (3.5%). Partners had

[2] In 2006, to ease participant burden, they randomly assigned one-half of the total sample the self-report questionnaire. In 2008, the other random half received the self-report questionnaire. Thus, two cohorts of participants were formed, Cohort 1 (assessed in 2006, 2010, 2014, and 2018) and Cohort 2 (assessed in 2008, 2012, 2016, and 2020). However, given the random splitting of the sample and the equidistant waves, they were combined into one larger sample, which is how many HRS users have used the data.

[3] Each of the following measures was sourced from this psychosocial questionnaire.

been together for an average of 32 years (although this, too, varied from less than 1 year to 70.5 years (*SD* = 16.14 years). Because household assets were measured with such a specific degree of fidelity (i.e., including a broad array of assets like income, social security, and property), I was able to operationalize wealth as the difference between assets and debts (M = $548,328.77, SD = $1,308,019.91).

Measures

Life Events

In the biannual waves (i.e., every two years from 2006-2020), participants were asked to indicate if they had experienced a particular life event since the last time they took the survey. Because the research questions I proposed exist solely within the context of romantic relationships, I only examined non-relationship-related life events (i.e., I excluded life events like marriages, bereavements, or divorces/separations from my analyses). Some life events were near universal (e.g., a negative change in health was experienced by almost 96% of the sample), while others were relatively rare (e.g., only 4.7% of the sample experienced unemployment; see frequencies of all life events in Table 1).

Personality

In each self-report wave (i.e., every four years), Big Five personality traits were assessed with the Midlife Development Inventory (MIDI; Lachman & Weaver, 1997). Participants were given a list of 26 adjectives that assessed levels of neuroticism (e.g., “moody”, “nervous”), conscientiousness (“organized”, “responsible”), extraversion (e.g., “outgoing”, “talkative”), openness (e.g., “creative”, “imaginative”), and agreeableness (e.g., “warm”, “helpful”) and then indicated how much each adjective described them on a scale ranging from 1 (*not at all*) to 4 (*a lot;* all $\alpha s > .87$). Means of each trait, as well as correlations between traits, are displayed in

Table 2.

Spousal Support and Strain

In each self-report wave (i.e., every four years), each participant was asked three questions about the support derived from their relationship with their spouse (e.g., "How much do they really understand the way you feel about things?") and four questions about the strain derived from their relationship (e.g., "How much do they let you down when you are counting on them?"). Participants responded to each question on a scale ranging from 1 (*a lot*) to 4 (*not at all*[4]). On average, participants reported feeling generally supported by their spouse ($M_{support}$ = 3.55, *SD* = .479) and did not feel especially strained (M_{strain} = 1.90, *SD* = .540). Spousal support (α = .86) and spousal strain (α = .86) were reliable and moderately stable over time.

Analytic Plan

To determine if and how life events experienced directly or vicariously impact the trajectory of personality, I employed a series of dyadic growth curve models in the context of multi-level modeling (see Kenny et al., 2006; one set of models for each Big 5 personality trait). I coded time such that the first wave was time zero. I estimated random intercepts and random slopes of time. In each model, I included actor and partner effects for all reported life events[5] that were not relationship-related (as my analyses required intact couples). Therefore, each GCM modeled actor and partner effects of the following life events as main effects: new chronic illness, negative health changes, positive health changes, death of a parent, new job, retirement, and unemployment. Each GCM also included a series of control variables commonly

[4] Strain responses were recoded so that higher levels indicated more strain.

[5] As highlighted in Table 3, some life events (i.e., moving, having a child, or experiencing the loss of a child) were highly (or perfectly) correlated, indicating that partners almost always experienced these life events together. For these life events, only the actor effects were modeled.

acknowledged as sources of variance in personality and close relationships research (Bernerth & Aguinis, 2016): age, gender[6], race, education, wealth, and relationship length[7]. Lastly, these models also included a series of life event by slope interactions (such that a significant interaction indicated that the occurrence of that life event has impacted the trajectory of a given trait).

Upon a significant interaction of an actor or partner life event with the slope of any personality trait, I completed an additional GCM. In these models, I included 1) the main effect of spousal support[8], 2) two-way interactions between support and all life events, 3) the two-way interaction between support and slope, and 4) three-way interactions between any significant actor/partner life event, slope, and support (such that a significant interaction indicates that the impact of that life event on slope depends on the level of support). For example, if only the actor effect of chronic illness was significant, the only new variables I added to the second GCM were 1) the main effect of spousal support, 2) interactions between support and life events, 3) a Support*Slope interaction, and 4) a Slope*Actor's chronic illness* Support interaction. Because of the complexity of these models, I adjusted the alpha level to .01 for a more conservative p-value to protect against false positive effects.

I originally planned to also model the moderating effects of strain on these effects as well. The motivation behind this plan was that support may engender personality growth and strain might hinder personality growth. However, upon running these analyses, I found the

[6] Gender was effect-coded so that women = -1 and men = 1.

[7] Wealth (i.e., household assets) and relationship length were log-transformed for these analyses.

[8] Support was centered on invariant, time 1 support for these analyses.

results for strain to be largely redundant with the effects seen for support. Thus, in the interest of parsimony, I report only the results for support, although I can provide the results for strain upon request. Nevertheless, following the recommendations from the committee, I also completed a life events analysis with support and strain as outcomes as well to show the effects of life events on these relational indicators outside the context of personality traits.

Below, I report the results of each model, organized by construct.

Results

Agreeableness

Growth curve model 1: life events only

The results of this model are presented in Table 4. The slope of agreeableness was not significant, indicating that agreeableness did not significantly change over time (b = .02, p = .144). Three life events demonstrated significant main effects on agreeableness. Those higher in agreeableness were more likely to get a new job (b =.05, p < .001), while those who were lower in agreeableness were more likely to experience a new chronic illness (b =-.02, p = .007) and unemployment (b =-.05, p = .007). Several control variables were also significant; people of color (b =-.02, p = .020) and those with longer relationships (b =-.11, p = .027) were slightly less agreeable, while women (b = -.14, p < .001) and those who had more education were slightly more agreeable (b = .01, p < .001)

There were also significant interactions between four life events and the slope of agreeableness. The actor effects of both negative health changes (b =-.03, p =.031) and positive health changes (b =-.01, p =.015) resulted in steeper negative slopes, indicating decreases in agreeableness over time. Those who experienced the death of their own parent (b = .10, p <.001) or whose partner began a new job (b = .01, p =.032) had stronger positive slopes for

agreeableness, indicating increases in agreeableness over time.

Growth curve model 2: life events and partner support

As described in the analytic plan, I completed a secondary growth curve model that included spousal support and three-way interaction terms to examine how support altered personality changes associated with life events (i.e., support x life event x time). However, following the recommendation of my committee, I ran a reduced model that restricted the tests to life events that were associated with personality change in the previous analysis. In other words, I examined support's moderating effect on *only* the life events that exerted an influence on personality change over time. In modeling these three-way interactions, I also modeled the constituent two-way interactions and I discussed them below as well.

The results of this growth curve are reported in Table 5. The main effect of spousal support was significant, such that those with more support were more agreeable (b = .28, p < .001). There were also three significant interactions between support and life events. Among those who had not experienced the death of a child, those who had more support were more agreeable. While this was still true among those who had experienced the death of a child, the gap between high and low-support participants in agreeableness was smaller (b = -.04, p < .001). A similar interaction occurred for those who had experienced a negative health event. Among those who had not experienced a negative health event, those who had more support were more agreeable. While this was still true among those who had experienced a negative health event, the gap between high and low-support participants in agreeableness was smaller (b = -.195, p = .004). Lastly, among those whose partner had *not* retired, those who had more support were more agreeable. While this was still true among those who had a partner retire, the gap between high and low-support participants in agreeableness was larger (b = .028, p = .004).

However, there were no significant three-way interactions between the slope, life events, and support.

Conscientiousness

Growth curve model 1: life events only

The results of this model are presented in Table 6. The slope of conscientiousness significant and positive, indicating that participants increased slightly in conscientiousness over time (b = .04, p = .008). Three life events demonstrated significant main effects on conscientiousness. Those who experienced a new chronic illness (b = -.04), as well as those who had partners who experienced a new chronic illness (b = -.04), were lower in conscientiousness (ps < .001). Those who got a new job were higher in conscientiousness (b = .06, p < .001). Four control variables also demonstrated significant main effects on conscientiousness. Women (b = -.06, p < .001), as well as those with more wealth (b = .03, p < .001) and education (b = .02, p < .001) tended to be more conscientious on average, and older adults tended to be less conscientious (b = -.01, p < .001).

Lastly, there were several significant interactions between life events and the slope. Life events that were associated with a steeper positive slope (indicating steeper gains in conscientiousness over time) included the actor and partner effects of a parent's death (b = .01, p < .001; b = .01, p = .019 respectively) and the partner effect of getting a new job (b = .01, p < .001). Life events that were associated with a steeper negative slope (indicating shallower increases in conscientiousness over time) included the death of a child (b = -.01, p = .002), and the actor and partner effects of a new chronic illness (b = -.01, p <.001; b = -.01, p = .017, respectively). The actor effect of a negative health change was also associated with a steeper negative slope (indicating decreases in conscientiousness over time; b = -.05, p = .002).

Growth curve model 2: life events and partner support

As described above, I completed a second model that included the support variable and support interaction terms. The results of this model are outlined in Table 7. While the main effect of support was significant, such that people with higher spousal support were more conscientious on average (b = .19, p = .008), there were no significant two- or three-way interactions between support, the slope, and a given life event.

Extraversion

Growth curve model 1: life events only

The results of this model are displayed in Table 8. The slope of extraversion was not significant, indicating that extraversion did not significantly change over time (b = .02, p = .101). Five life events demonstrated significant main effects on extraversion. Those who began a new job (b = .11, p = .001) or retired (b = .02, p = .020) tended to be higher in extraversion, while those who had developed a new chronic illness (b = -.03, p = .001), had a partner retire (b = -.03, p = .010) or had a partner become unemployed (b = -.05, p = .039) tended to be lower in extraversion. Every control variable was associated with extraversion; older adults and those with a longer relationship duration tended to be lower in extraversion (b = -.002, p = .003; b = -.02, p = .003, respectively) while women (b = -.06, p < .001), people of color (b = .06, p < .001), those with more education (b = .01, p < .001), and those with more wealth (b = .02, p < .001) tended to be higher in extraversion.

Lastly, four life events demonstrated significant interactions with slope. Those who had experienced a new chronic illness or negative health change tended to have steeper negative slopes, indicating drops in extraversion over time (b = -.01, p < .001; b = -.04, p = .008, respectively). Those who experienced the death of their own parent (b = .02, p < .001) or had a

partner who began a new job (b = .01, p = .008) tended to have steeper positive slopes, indicating increases in extraversion over time.

Growth curve model 2: life events and partner support

As described above, I completed a second model that included the support variable and support interaction terms. The results of this model are outlined in Table 9. While the main effect of support was significant, such that people with higher spousal support were more extraverted on average (b = .22, p = .009), there were no significant two or three-way interactions between support, the slope, and a given life event.

Neuroticism

Growth curve model 1: life events only

The results of this model are displayed in Table 10. The slope of neuroticism was significant and negative, indicating that neuroticism decreased slightly over time (b = -.08, p < .001). Seven life events demonstrated significant main effects on neuroticism; those who directly or vicariously experienced a new chronic illness (b = .07, p < .001; b = .03, p = .012, respectively), as well as those who directly or vicariously experienced unemployment (b = .08, p = .001; b = .05, p = .040, respectively) tended to be higher in neuroticism on average. Those who began a new job (b = -.06, p < .001), experienced the death of a child (b = -.04, p < .001), or had a partner who retired (b = -.02, p = .026) were lower in neuroticism. Several control variables also demonstrated main effects; older adults (b = -.01, p < .001), people of color (b = -.10, p < .001), more educated people (b = -.02, p < .001), and wealthier people (b = -.03, p < .001) all tended to be less neurotic. Women tended to be slightly more neurotic on average (b = -.06, p < .001).

Lastly, there were a series of significant interactions between life event and the slope.

Those who had experienced the birth of a child (b = -.01, p = .039), a positive health change (b = -.01, p = .008), the death of a parent (b = -.01, p < .001), or direct (b = -.02, p < .001) or vicarious (b = -.02, p = .002) unemployment tended to have steeper negative slopes, indicating more dramatic declines in neuroticism over time. Meanwhile, those who experienced a new chronic illness (b = .01, p < .001) or a direct (b = .04, p = .005) or vicarious (b = .02, p = .036) negative change in health tended to have more positive slopes, indicating more shallow decreases in neuroticism over time.

Growth curve model 2: life events and partner support

As described above, I completed a second model that included the support variable and support interaction terms. The results of this model are outlined in Table 11. While the main effect of support was significant, such that people with higher spousal support were less neurotic on average (b = -.34, p < .001), there were no significant two or three-way interactions between support, the slope, and a given life event.

Openness

Growth curve model 1: life events only

The results of this model are displayed in Table 12. The slope of openness was not significant, indicating that openness did not significantly change over time (b = .01, p = .359). Three life events demonstrated significant main effects of openness. Those who moved (b = .02, p = .023), started a new job (b = .07, p < .001), or became unemployed (b = .06, p = .004) tended to be higher in openness. Most of the control variables also demonstrated significant main effects: older adults (b = -.004, p < .001) and those who had been married for longer (b = -.04, p < .001) tended to be less open. People of color (b = .05, p < .001), those with more education (b = .04, p < .001), and those with more wealth (b = .03, p < .001) tended to be higher in openness.

Lastly, there were several significant interactions between the slope and life events. Those who had experienced a negative health change (b = -.03, p = .033) or a partner's new chronic illness (b = -.01, p = .026) tended to have more negative slopes, indicating decreases in openness over time. Meanwhile, those who experienced the direct (b = .01, p < .001) or vicarious (b = .01, p = .040) passing of a parent, as well as a direct (b = .01, p = .038) or vicarious (b = .01, p < .001) acquisition of a new job tended to have more positive slopes, indicating increases in openness over time.

Growth curve model 2: life events and partner support

As described above, I completed a second model that included the support variable and support interaction terms. The results of this model are outlined in Table 13. The main effect of support was significant, such that people with higher spousal support were more open on average (b = .30, p <.001). The interaction between slope and support was significant and positive, indicating that those with higher spousal support reported increases in openness over time (b = .08, p =.005).

There was also a significant two-way interaction between one life event and support: among those who had not experienced a negative health change, those who had more support were more open. While this was still true among those who had experienced a negative health change, the gap between high and low support participants in openness was smaller (b = -.20, p = .009).

Lastly, there was a significant three-way interaction between the slope of openness, an actor's negative health change, and support. To decompose this interaction, I estimated the two-way support X slope effect among those who experienced a negative health change versus not. Among those who did not experience a negative health change, the interaction between slope and

support was significant and positive (b = .14, p = .003), indicating that those higher in support tended to experience increases in openness over time. Among those who did experience a negative health change, the interaction between slope and satisfaction was not significant (b = -.002, p = .665), indicating that those higher in support did not experience significant gains in openness over time if they had also experienced this life event.

Spousal Support and Strain

In addition to the GCMs of personality traits, I also completed separate GCMs for spousal support and spousal strain as outcomes (reported in Tables 14 and 15, respectively). Each of these models were identical to the trait models above; support or strain was merely swapped for as the dependent variables. Each of these models estimated intercepts and slopes, main effects of the same actor/partner life events, main effects of the same control variables, and the same series of life event by slope interactions (such that a significant interaction indicates that the experience of that life event altered the trajectory of support or strain).

Support

The results of this model are outlined in Table 14. The slope of support was significant and positive, suggesting that participants felt more support over time (b = .07, p < .001). Many life events were associated with less spousal support, including the death of a child (b = -.05, p = .002), directly (b = -.05, p < .001) or vicariously (b = -.02, p = .022) experiencing a new chronic illness, a partners' positive health change (b = .-.04, p = .004), and direct (b = -.06, p = .005) or vicarious (b = -.07, p = .002) unemployment. Men (b = .01, p < .001) and those with more wealth (b = .02, p < .001) and education (b = .004, p = .022) tended to feel more supported, while people of color tended to feel less supported (b = -.05, p < .001).

Lastly, two life events interacted with the slope. Those who had a partner experience a

negative health change tended to have more negative slopes, indicating shallower gains in support over time (b = -.03, p = .009). Those who started a new job tended to have more positive slopes, indicating steeper gains in support over time (b = .01, p = .029).

Strain

The results of this model are outlined in Table 15. The slope of strain was significant and negative, indicating that participants felt less strain in their relationships over time (b = -.07, p = .001). Five life events demonstrated positive main effects of strain; those who directly (b = .06, p < .001) or vicariously (b = .04, p < .001) experienced a new chronic illness, directly (b = .08, p = .002) or vicariously (b = .10, p < .001) experienced unemployment, or had a partner experience a positive health change (b = .05, p = .004) all tended to report higher strain. People of color (b = .11, p < .001), women (b = -.04, p < .001), and those in longer-lasting relationships (b = .03, p < .001) also tended to report higher strain, while older people (b = -.002, p = .004) and wealthier people (b = -.02, p < .001) tended to report lower strain.

Lastly, there were two significant interactions between life events and the slope of strain. Those who experienced the death of a child tended to have more negative slopes, indicating steeper drops in strain over time (b = -.01, p = .040). Those who had a partner experience a negative health change tended to have more positive slopes, indicating shallower decreases in strain over time (b = .05, p < .001).

Growth mixture modeling

Lastly, as introduced in the proposal of this dissertation, I completed a series of growth mixture models for each personality trait in an attempt to identify and predict latent classes of personality change. The analytic approach and results of these analyses are detailed in Appendix

D.[9]

Discussion

In Study 1, I examined if and how individuals' own life events, as well as the life events of their partners, influenced the trajectory of their personality changes. Additionally, I examined how spousal support was implicated in this process: does having an especially supportive spouse facilitate more adaptive responses to negative life events? Lastly, I also examined trajectories of support and strain to determine if experiencing a given life event influenced relationship functioning. All these questions were answered using HRS data, a representative sample of older adults in the United States.

Patterns of PTG

As discussed in the introduction, despite being an inherently longitudinal phenomenon, PTG is rarely examined with longitudinal data. Even rarer *still* is an examination that uses large and representative longitudinal data. With this in mind, my first goal in this study was to simply look for any evidence of PTG.

This sort of evidence could mostly clearly be found in the interactions between life events and the slope of personality changes in each model. In an adaptive response, supportive of the theory of PTG, an ostensibly negative life event would have a positive interaction with adaptive traits (i.e., agreeableness, conscientiousness, extraversion, or openness) and a negative interaction with maladaptive traits (i.e., neuroticism). This would reflect a relationship in which participants are actively "growing" in positive ways when exposed to a particular life event. As

[9] These results are only available for the HRS sample (Study 1). As communicated to the committee, these models could not be completed in the other two studies due to interpretability issues (i.e., dominance of 1-class solutions).

summarized in Table 16, this was occasionally the case. Some negative life events, such as events that made participants less healthy (i.e., negative health changes and new chronic illnesses), were consistently related to maladaptive changes in personality (i.e., decreases in agreeableness, conscientiousness, extraversion, and openness and increases in neuroticism). For these types of events, there was no evidence of PTG. However, other ostensibly negative life events, such as the death of a parent, were consistently related to adaptive changes in personality (i.e., increases in agreeableness, conscientiousness, extraversion, and openness and decreases in neuroticism). This offers some evidence of positive change in the wake of tragedy or trauma.

Perhaps this effect, however, is unique to the sample: older adults. Perhaps, at this life stage, when a parent's death is far more normative and can sometimes come with an alleviation of emotional, physical, or financial burden (Bialon & Coke, 2012; Johnson, 2007), personal growth is more feasible. Surprisingly, there was also some evidence of PTG when examining unemployment (which was coded independently of retirement), a life event often found to be especially negative (Bleidorn et al., 2018; Lucas et al., 2004). If individuals or their partners had experienced unemployment, they tended to decline more steeply in neuroticism. There are many possible explanations for this somewhat counterintuitive finding. One lies in the sample: perhaps when an older adult loses their job and a return to work feels unlikely (Kanfer & Bufton, 2015), unemployment serves as a sort of proxy for retirement (eliminating worries about work or finding another job). Alternatively, perhaps those who decline more steeply in neuroticism begin to like work less or burn out quicker (Bianchi, 2018; McCann, 2018), ultimately culminating in being let go from a job. Or, perhaps, this is simply a demonstration of PTG, whereby a typically negative life event is met with personal coping and reframing skills, ultimately leading to growth.

Other life events that were more ambiguous, such as getting a new job, were also related to adaptive outcomes (i.e., steeper increases in agreeableness, conscientiousness, extraversion, and openness). Getting a new job, especially in older adulthood, is likely ambiguous on both the between and within person level (where each individual may have mixed feelings and different individuals may feel very different about it; Kanfer & Bufton, 2015). While this pattern does not offer strong support either for or against PTG, it does suggest that starting a new job in late life may be connected to positive personality change.

Actors and Partners

A second goal of this study was to discover if participants experienced vicarious growth: positive personality change explained by a partner's experience rather than their own. In general, individuals' own experiences were far more influential than those of their partners; only about a third of the significant effects detailed in Table 18 are partner effects. A smaller subset of those effects, yet, are reflective of *positive* vicarious growth. The strongest partner life event by slope interaction can be attributed to a partner's new job (which was associated with steeper inclines in agreeableness, conscientiousness, extraversion, and openness). However, as discussed above, a new job is not typically considered to be a negative or potentially traumatic life event, and this interaction ultimately offers little support for the theory of vicarious PTG. Only two stereotypically negative life events experienced by a partner were significant: unemployment and the death of a parent. Those whose partners had lost a job saw steeper drops in neuroticism over time; those whose partners had lost a parent saw steeper increases in conscientiousness and openness over time. Interestingly, each of these partner effects was always accompanied by the same type of actor effect (e.g., a significant partner effect of unemployment on neuroticism was always accompanied by a significant actor effect of unemployment on neuroticism). These

findings would fit well within a framework that posits vicarious PTG as quite literally living your own experience via someone else. Perhaps individuals are only (or best) capable of growing through a partner's life event when they have grown through the same event themselves. Or, perhaps, these life events simply exert the most influence in a dyad, and their effect is more likely to be felt across partners.

Support and Strain

Lastly, this study attempted to uncover the role of partner support in PTG. Some theories have suggested that partner support should be influential in PTG; those with more supportive partners may be more capable of positive personality change. However, this study did not find evidence to support that claim. While spousal support was a significant predictor of each personality trait (such that those who reported receiving more support were higher in agreeableness, conscientiousness, extraversion, and openness and lower in neuroticism), there was only a single significant three-way interaction between life event, slope, and support (i.e., between an actor's negative health change, support, and openness), although this was not consistent with a pattern of PTG. Overall, however, how much support a participant received did not influence how a given life event impacted personality trajectories. The same was true for spousal strain.

This finding may be surprising when considering the wealth of literature that implicates partner support in the adaptive processes of coping, reframing, and growth (Cordova et al., 2001; Luszczynska et al., 2005; Nenova et al., 2013; Schroevers et al., 2010; Schulz & Mohamed, 2004; Yoon et al., 2022). These effects could certainly be interpreted as null results. Perhaps life events or spousal support are relatively unimportant in personality change, especially when considering the heritable nature of personality and its tendency to remain so stable over time

(Bleidorn et al., 2022; Vukasović & Bratko, 2015). However, some recent work suggests that "invisible" support (i.e., support that is not detected and labeled as support by the receiver) may be the type of support that is more commonly linked to these sorts of positive outcomes (like adaptation and goal achievement; Girme et al., 2018; Girme et al., 2013). Perhaps invisible support, which cannot be captured with self-report measures of received support, is more likely to impact these kinds of trajectories.

When examining support as an outcome, one typically negative life event—a partner's negative health change—interacted with slope (such that those who had experienced this saw shallower increases in spousal support). This is an intuitive finding; experiencing these things might make it more difficult for partners to provide support, ultimately leading to lowered levels of felt support. However, this effect is not aligned with patterns of dyadic PTG—where a negative event improves the relationship or its functioning in some way.

When examining strain as an outcome, the same life event (a partner's negative health change) interacted with slope (such that those with a partner who experienced a negative health change saw shallower declines in spousal strain). Again, experiencing a negative health change might make it more difficult for partners to provide support, ultimately leading to lowered levels of felt support—creating a pattern that is not reflective of dyadic PTG. However, this study did uncover a small piece of evidence for the experience of dyadic PTG: those who experienced the death of a child event saw steeper decreases in strain. Work on child bereavement suggests that relational outcomes for parents can vary dramatically after this life event (Albuquerque et al., 2016). If interpreted as support for dyadic PTG, this effect suggests that couples who experience the death of a child may take special care not to be a strain on their partner in a particularly vulnerable time (Schwab, 1998). Alternatively, if child bereavement is the result of a prolonged

illness or a process associated with a large amount of stress, these declines could be a function of there being initially very high levels of strain at the start of the study among these couples.

Overall, Study 1 found some evidence for PTG. Traditionally negative life events (i.e., the death of a parent and unemployment) were occasionally related to positive personality changes (i.e., adaptive changes in agreeableness, conscientiousness, extraversion, neuroticism, and openness). However, it was more common for negative life events to be associated with maladaptive change. Spousal support, while consistently related to mean levels of traits, appeared to be relatively uninfluential in adaptive *changes* in personality traits. There was some evidence of dyadic PTG though—those who experienced the death of a child saw steeper decreases in spousal strain.

In evaluating the results of Study 1 more holistically, it is worth reflecting on the strength of evidence that life events affect personality development among couples. Specifically, the effects of life events (experienced both personally and vicariously) on personality development were a bit underwhelming in terms of their magnitude and how close some of the p-values were close to .05 (see Benjamin et al., 2018). Given the complexity of some of these models, it would have been reasonable to impose a more conservative alpha correction than the one I did. If I had done so, some of the effects reported above may not have reached statistical significance. More broadly, some of the more conservative takeaways from Study 1 are that personality is fairly stable, mean levels are relatively slow to change on average, and some negative life events may influence (improving or harming) relationship outcomes.

In evaluating the design and results of Study 1, Study 2 had the opportunity to improve on several limitations. Specifically, Study 2 examines some of these same questions but in a large sample of couples from the Netherlands. Additionally, the samples in Study 1 and Study 2

offer a sample that is more age diverse (rather than the older adult sample used in Study 1). Further, given that the demographic composition of Study 2 is different from that of Study 1 (i.e., younger, with more assessment points to see whether a longer time frame is necessary to observe personality changes, and from a country whose social safety net might alter the effects of life events on psychological development), I had the opportunity to revisit this question of PTG more robustly.

CHAPTER 3: STUDY 2

In Study 1, I examined trajectories of personality change in a nationally representative sample of U.S. older adults. In Study 2, I attempted to replicate these trajectories with a new nationally representative sample followed over a longer period with shorter intervals, albeit participants from Study 2 came from the Netherlands. In addition, I examined how a different relationship-relevant factor, relationship satisfaction, was related to these trajectories of growth.

Relationship Satisfaction After Trauma

Perhaps unsurprisingly, adverse and traumatic events are typically related to decreases in relationship satisfaction (Bakhurst et al., 2018; Fayed et al., 2021; Vanbergen et al., 2020). Some work finds that, once an individual has experienced an adverse event, it can take intense intervention to even maintain relationship satisfaction, but relationships may never ultimately bounce back to pre-adversity levels (Fayed et al., 2021). Overall, stress is damaging to relationships and marital satisfaction (Randall & Bodenmann, 2009; Randall & Bodenmann, 2017), and negative life experiences are often characterized as extremely stressful.

In a seminal review of stress and close relationships, Randall & Bodenmann (2009) interpret stress in a relational context, finding that stress' impact on relationship satisfaction depends on the locus of control (i.e., external: from outside of the relationship vs. internal: from within the relationship), intensity (i.e., major: critical experiences requiring adaptation vs. minor: everyday hassles), and duration (i.e., acute: temporary, lasting only a few days vs. chronic: lasting serval months or more) of the stressor. Within this framework, most negative or traumatic life events can be considered external, major stressors (whether they are considered temporary or long-lasting varies a bit). It may seem intuitive to assume that these types of stressors, which are relatively uncontrollable and require long-term adaptation, have the strongest negative effect on

relationship satisfaction. However, Randall & Bodenmann (2009) found that external, *minor*, and chronic stressors had the strongest negative impact on relationship satisfaction. These findings fit well within the authors' "stress-divorce model," which posits that small, external, daily hassles contribute to stress spillover (as briefly discussed in the introduction), ultimately undermining relationship satisfaction. So, while negative or traumatic life events are typically bad for relationships, they may not be as damaging as the everyday struggles faced by most couples.

There are some couples who, perhaps counterintuitively, report *higher* relationship satisfaction after enduring a major adverse event. As discussed in the introduction, Williamson et al. (2021) found that newlyweds who experienced Hurricane Harvey together reported increased relationship satisfaction immediately after the event. Other work highlights the existence of remarkably resilient couples in the face of major stressors. For example, a small study of parents in Finland found that, when comparing couples who had children during the COVID-19 pandemic to couples who had children during non-pandemic times (i.e., 2015), pandemic couples reported being just as happy in their relationships (Isokääntä et al., 2023). The same is true of romantic couples more generally during the COVID-19 pandemic (Williamson, 2020). In a qualitative examination of couples raising children with autism spectrum disorder, many couples indicated that a sense of "being in it together" (Sim et al., 2019) helped them maintain relationship satisfaction—a sentiment that may keep the satisfaction of many couples afloat in challenging times and in the face of profoundly stressful events.

What makes some couples so resilient or even grow/flourish in response to negative life events? Two possible mechanisms include *self-pruning*—identifying and decreasing negative traits—and *sacrificing with satisfaction*—the genuine desire to self-sacrifice for the well-being of a partner or relationship. Aydogan & Dincer (2020) found a direct relationship between a

couple's resilience after a negative life event and their ability to self-prune: couples who were better able to self-prune were more resilient. This relationship was partially mediated by a couple members' satisfaction with sacrificing: partners who participated in self-pruning more often were also more satisfied with sacrificing, and, in turn, more resilient (Aydogan & Dincer, 2020). With all of this in mind, it is possible that, while negative life events are not typically predictive of increased relationship satisfaction, couple members most likely to grow might be uniquely satisfied with their relationships when faced with challenges.

Relationship Satisfaction and PTG

In some cases, relationship satisfaction may also serve as an indicator of PTG. For example, in a recent examination of couples who recently had a premature birth, Okay & Güler (2021) found that relationship satisfaction and PTG were positively correlated—parents who were happier in their relationships also reported higher PTG. These parents were also less stressed, depressed, and anxious. Interestingly, parents who described themselves as more emotionally dependent during this time were also higher in PTG, perhaps emphasizing the need for partner support in challenging times. Other work finds that couples who see personal and relationship growth after negative events are somewhat atypical. In a cluster analysis of parents whose children underwent stem cell transplants, Riva et al. (2014) found that parents tended to fall into one of four categories: 1) a low distress and low PTG group (~20% of the sample), 2) a high distress group (~15% of the sample), 3) a low distress/some PTG group (~39% of the sample), and 4) a high PTG group (~25% of the sample). Relationship satisfaction was highest for parents in the high PTG cluster than others (i.e., those with low and high distress).

Qualitative analyses of military couples echo the notion that, while not every couple member finds themselves or their relationship growing after adversity, a small subgroup of

couples may. In these interviews, Wick & Goff (2014) found that post-deployment, couples tended to fall into two subgroups: those with high relationship satisfaction and those with low relationship satisfaction. Couples who reported positive relationship functioning (e.g., effective communication, good conflict management, and partner support) also reported higher relationship satisfaction and higher levels of PTG. So, while increases in relationship satisfaction and PTG may not be a universal experience after trauma, some literature suggests that a subgroup of couples does indeed experience positive post-traumatic outcomes, and that, for these couples, relationship satisfaction is often connected to the experience of PTG.

Method

Participants

In this study, data was sourced from the Longitudinal Internet Studies for the Social Sciences (LISS) panel, which followed a representative, probability household sample of the Dutch population from 2008 to 2022, selected from the Netherlands' population register (those without Internet or computer access were provided access to these resources). This online panel follows roughly 5,000 households (~ 7,500 individuals) over time, with each participant completing monthly questionnaires, as well as a core series of online questionnaires once a year. This dataset has a relatively low attrition rate from year-to-year (~10%); with 80% of household members participating in the surveys and roughly half of the dataset identifying as married (i.e., 45.7%, 45.3%, and 44.8% in 2008, 2009 and 2010).

This resulted in a sample of 3,481 opposite-sex couples (N= 6,962, 50% male, 50% female). The sample was predominately (i.e., 97.4%) Dutch. As outlined in my proposal, I had initially intended to include race/ethnicity as a control variable. However, with only 2.6% of this sample being non-Dutch, I ultimately did not have enough diversity to examine the effects of

ethnicity and excluded this variable. Participant age ranged from 18 to 99 years old, with an average age of 48.33 (*SD* = 14.53). Participants had been in a relationship with their partners for an average of 15.72 years, although this ranged from under 1 year to 63 years (*SD* = 15.77). 39.8% of the sample indicated that their highest level of education was high school or less, while 25.5% attended a vocational or junior college, 24.4% attended college, and 10.2% attended university.

Measures

Life events

Throughout the study, panel members were asked if they had experienced a series of life events. As in Study 1, because my research questions relate solely to partnered people, I only examined non-relationship-related life events. Unlike the HRS sample, no life event was nearly universal; the most experienced event was a negative change in health, reported by 43.3% of the sample (see frequencies of all life events in Table 17). The rarest life event by far was getting a first job, experienced by only .3% of the sample. In my proposal, I mentioned excluding events that were experienced by a very small subset of the sample. Thus, I excluded getting a first job from the following analyses.

Personality

In all waves, the Big Five personality traits were assessed with the 50-item International Personality Item Pool (IPIP) version of the Big Five Inventory (Goldberg, 1992). Participants were asked to indicate how accurate they found descriptor sentences of themselves (e.g., for extraversion, "I am the life of the party"). Responses were measured on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (*very inaccurate*) to 5 (*very accurate*; average α across waves > .76 for all traits). Means of each trait, as well as correlations between traits, are displayed in Table 18. Traits were

extremely stable over time.

Relationship satisfaction

In all waves, relationship satisfaction was measured with a single item: "How satisfied are you with your current relationship?" The answer categories ranged from 0 (*entirely dissatisfied*) to 10 (*entirely satisfied,* αs > .96). In general, participants were very satisfied with their relationships (M_{sat} = 8.35, *SD* = 1.35).

Analysis Plan

The analysis plan for Study 2 follows the same structure as Study 1. For each trait, I completed a series of dyadic growth curve models in the context of multi-level modeling (see Kenny et al., 2006). Each GCM included: 1) a series of actor and partner life events[10] (i.e., the birth of a child, death of a child, death of a parent, a negative health change, a positive health change, a new chronic illness, retirement, and unemployment), 2) a series of control variables (i.e., age, gender, relationship length, and level of education), and 3) a series of life event by slope interactions. Life events that had significant interactions with slope were carried through to a second GCM, which added the following predictors to the model: 1) these three-way life event*Slope*Relationship satisfaction interactions[11], 2) two-way interactions between relationship satisfaction and each life event, 3) the two-way interaction between relationship satisfaction and slope, and 4) the main effect of relationship satisfaction. Because of the complexity of these expanded models with several two- and three-way interactions, I adjusted the alpha level to .01 for a more conservative p-value to protect against false positive effects.

[10] As highlighted in Table 19, some life events (i.e., having a child or experiencing the loss of a child) were highly (or perfectly) correlated, indicating that partners almost always experienced these life events together. For these life events, only the actor effects were modeled.

[11] Relationship satisfaction was centered on the invariant time 1 mean for these analyses.

Results

Agreeableness

Growth curve model 1: life events only

The results of this model are reported in Table 20. The slope was significant and negative, indicating that participants generally decreased in agreeableness over time (although this effect was very small; $b = -.01$, $p < .001$). Two life events had main effects of agreeableness: those who experienced a negative health change or new chronic illness tended to be more agreeable on average ($b = .04$, $p = .026$; $b = .04$, $p = .025$, respectively). Older participants ($b = .004$, $p < .001$), women ($b = -.17$, $p < .001$), and those with more education ($b = .03$, $p < .001$) also tended to be higher in agreeableness.

Two life events interacted with the slope (although each of these effects were small and close to $p = .05$): those who had experienced the birth of a child tended to have more positive slopes, indicating shallower decreases in agreeableness over time ($b = .01$, $p = .041$); those who had experienced the death of a child tended to have more negative slopes, indicating more dramatic decreases in agreeableness over time ($b = -.01$, $p = .044$).

Growth curve model 2: life events and relationship satisfaction

As described above, I completed a second model that included relationship satisfaction and its associated interaction terms. The results of this model are displayed in Table 21. The main effect of relationship satisfaction was positive and significant, indicating that those high in agreeableness also tended to be satisfied with their relationship ($b = .04$, $p < .001$). Somewhat surprisingly, the interaction between satisfaction and the slope was significant and negative, indicating that those higher in relationship satisfaction tended to experience steeper decreases in agreeableness over time (although this effect was very small, $b = -.002$, $p < .001$). Only one other

interaction with support was significant: the 3-way interaction between the slope, death of a child, and satisfaction (b = -.007, p < .001).

To decompose this interaction, I estimated the two-way relationship satisfaction x slope interaction among those who experienced child bereavement versus those who did not. Among those who did *not* experience the death of a child, the interaction between slope and satisfaction was significant and negative (b = -.002, p < .001), indicating that those higher in relationship satisfaction tended to experience slightly steeper decreases in agreeableness over time. Among those who did experience the death of a child, the interaction between slope and satisfaction was also significant and negative, although slightly stronger (b = -.008, p < .001), indicating that those higher in relationship satisfaction tended to experience *even steeper* decreases in agreeableness over time if they had also experienced this life event.

Conscientiousness

Growth curve model 1: life events only

The results of this model are reported in Table 22. The slope was not significant, indicating that participants did not significantly change in conscientiousness over time (b = .00, p =.800). Three life events demonstrated main effects of conscientiousness: those who experienced a positive health change tended to be higher in conscientiousness (b = .07, p < .001), while those who retired (b = -.05, p = .011) or had a partner experience the death of a parent (b = -.04, p = .037) tended to be lower in conscientiousness. Older adults (b = .003, p =.001), women (b = -.04, p < .001), those in longer relationships (b = .002, p = .022), and those with more education (b = .02, p < .001) also tended to be higher in conscientiousness.

Lastly, four life events interacted with the slope. Those who had a partner experience the death of a parent tended to have more positive slopes, indicating increases in conscientiousness

over time (although this effect was very small; b = .003, p = .049). Those who had experienced a negative health change (b = -.004, p = .037), a new chronic illness (b = -.003, p = .048), or the retirement of a partner (b = -.01, p < .001) tended to have more negative slopes, indicating decreases in conscientiousness over time.

Growth curve model 2: life events and relationship satisfaction

As described above, I completed a second model that included relationship satisfaction and its associated interaction terms. The results of this model are displayed in Table 23. The main effect of relationship satisfaction was positive and significant, indicating that those high in conscientiousness also tended to be satisfied with their relationship (b = .04 p < .001). However, there were no interactions between satisfaction, the slope, and life events.

Extraversion

Growth curve model 1: life events only

The results of this model are reported in Table 24. The slope was negative and significant, indicating that participants slightly decreased in extraversion over time (b = -.01, p = .014). Three life events had main effects on extraversion. Those who experienced unemployment tended to be more extraverted on average (b = .10, p = .004), while those who directly (b = -.05, p = .005) or vicariously (b = -.04, p = .035) experienced a new chronic illness tended to be lower in extraversion. Those with more education also tended to be higher in extraversion (b = .03, p < .001).

Lastly, there were two significant interactions between life events and the slope. Those who experienced a positive health change tended to have more positive slopes, indicating shallower declines in extraversion over time (b = .01, p = .001). Those who had experienced a negative health change (b = -.01, p = .002) tended to have more negative slopes, indicating

steeper decreases in extraversion over time.

Growth curve model 2: life events and relationship satisfaction

As described above, I completed a second model that included relationship satisfaction and its associated interaction terms. The results of this model are displayed in Table 25. The main effect of relationship satisfaction was positive and significant, indicating that those high in extraversion also tended to be satisfied with their relationship (b = .05 p < .001). However, there were no interactions between satisfaction, the slope, and life events.

Neuroticism

Growth curve model 1: life events only

The results of this model are reported in Table 26. The slope was negative and significant, indicating that participants slightly decreased in neuroticism over time (b = -.02, p < .001). Three life events had main effects on neuroticism. Those who had experienced a new chronic illness (b = .11, p < .001) tended to be more neurotic on average, while those who experienced a positive health change (b = -.08, p = .001) or a partner's retirement (b = -.05, p = .036) tended to be less neurotic. Those with longer relationships (b = -.002, p = .020) and more education (b = -.05, p < .001) also tended to be less neurotic, while women tended to be more neurotic (b = -.12, p < .001).

Lastly, there were four significant interactions between life events and the slope. Those who experienced a negative health change (b = .01, p < .001) or a new chronic illness (b = .01, p = .001) tended to have steeper positive slopes, indicating shallower declines in neuroticism over time. Those who had experienced a positive health change (b = -.01, p = .028) or unemployment (b = -.01, p = .006) tended to have steeper negative slopes, indicating steeper decreases in neuroticism over time.

Growth curve model 2: life events and relationship satisfaction

As described above, I completed a second model that included relationship satisfaction and its associated interaction terms. The results of this model are displayed in Table 27. The main effect of relationship satisfaction was negative and significant, indicating that those low in neuroticism also tended to be satisfied with their relationship (b = -.08 p < .001).

The interaction between satisfaction and the slope was significant and positive, indicating that those higher in relationship satisfaction tended to experience more shallow declines in neuroticism over time (although this effect was near zero, b = .004, p = .009). There was also a significant two-way interaction between childbirth and relationship satisfaction (b = .08, p =.002): among those who had *not* experienced the birth of a child, those who were satisfied in their relationship tended to be less neurotic. However, among those who had experienced the birth of a child, those high and low in relationship satisfaction were similarly high in neuroticism.

However, there were no significant three-way interactions between the slope, life events, and relationship satisfaction.

Openness

Growth curve model 1: life events only

The results of this model are reported in Table 28. The slope was negative and significant, indicating that participants slightly decreased in openness over time (b = -.01, p = .002). Four life events had main effects on openness. Those who had experienced a positive health change (b = .05, p = .003), a partner's retirement (b = .05, p = .012), or unemployment (b = .08, p < .001) tended to be higher in openness on average. Those who experienced a partner's negative health change (b = -.03 p = .035) tended to be lower in openness. Men (b = .03, p <

.001) and those with more education (b = .10, p < .001) tended to be higher in openness, while those in longer relationships tended to be lower in openness (b = -.004, p < .001).

There were three significant interactions between life events and the slope. Those who experienced a negative health change (b = -.01, p = .012) tended to have more negative slopes, indicating steeper decreases in openness over time. Those who had experienced the birth of a child (b = .01, p = .003) or a positive health change (b = .01, p < .001) tended to have more positive slopes, indicating less dramatic declines in openness over time.

Growth curve model 2: life events and relationship satisfaction

As described above, I completed a second model that included relationship satisfaction and its associated interaction terms. The results of this model are displayed in Table 29. In this model, neither the main effect of relationship satisfaction nor any of its interactions were significantly associated with openness.

Relationship Satisfaction

Growth curve model: life events only

The results of this model are reported in Table 30. The slope was negative and significant, indicating that participants slightly decreased in their relationship satisfaction over time (b = -.05, p < .001). Three life events had main effects of relationship satisfaction. Those who experienced a new chronic illness (b = -.11, p = .002) or a partner's unemployment (b = -.15, p = .011) tended to be less satisfied with their relationships, while those who retired felt more satisfied with their relationships (b = .20, p < .001).

There were four significant interactions between life events and the slope of relationship satisfaction. Those who experienced the birth of a child (b = -.02, p = .006) tended to decline more dramatically in relationship satisfaction over time. Those who experienced the direct (b =

.01, p = .007) or vicarious (b = .02, p = .005) death of a parent, as well as those whose partners retired (b = .01, p = .002) tended to have more positive slopes, indicating less dramatic declines in relationship satisfaction over time.

Discussion

Patterns of PTG

As in Study 1, the first goal in this study was to simply look for any evidence of PTG. Again, evidence could mostly clearly be found in the interactions between life events and changes in personality. In an adaptive response, supportive of the theory of PTG, an ostensibly negative life event would have an interaction (i.e., promoting linear growth) with changes in adaptive traits (i.e., agreeableness, conscientiousness, extraversion, or openness) and a negative interaction (i.e., promoting more dramatic declines) with changes in maladaptive traits (i.e., neuroticism). This would reflect a relationship in which participants are actively "growing" in positive ways when exposed to a particular life event. As summarized in Table 31, this was very rarely the case. As in Study 1, negative life events that impacted participant health (i.e., negative health changes and new chronic illnesses) were consistently related to maladaptive changes in personality (i.e., decreases in conscientiousness, extraversion, and openness and increases in neuroticism). For these types of events, there was no evidence of PTG. The same is true of positive life events (i.e., positive health changes) which were consistently related to adaptive responses (i.e., increases in extraversion and openness, decreases in neuroticism). No evidence of PTG is found in these patterns.

However, two ostensibly negative life events were occasionally related to adaptive changes in personality: the death of a partner's parent (i.e., increases in agreeableness) and unemployment (decreases in neuroticism). Interestingly, these negative life events indicated

similarly adaptive change in Study 1, although the effects found here were less consistent (i.e., only influencing a single trait). In discussing Study 1, I framed these results in the context of the sample: perhaps, for older adults, the death of a parent is normative, and perhaps the loss of a job serves as a proxy for retirement at later stages of life. However, this sample was notably younger than the HRS sample (i.e., M_{age} = 48.3 in LISS vs 62.2 in HRS) and likely in a different life stage (e.g., middle adulthood vs. late adulthood). Certainly, the death of a parent in middle-to-late adulthood is still a normative event that may be accompanied by changes in (or even reductions in) emotional, physical, or financial burdens. However, in this sample, losing a job is less likely to be a retirement proxy. As mentioned in Study 1, perhaps those who decline more steeply in neuroticism begin to like work less or burn out quicker (Bianchi, 2018; McCann, 2018), ultimately culminating in being let go from (or quitting) a job. Alternatively, this could be interpreted as a demonstration of PTG, whereby a typically negative life event does indeed lead to growth. Some work in sociology examines job loss as a "status passage"—an ongoing process in which one reevaluates goals or identity (Ezzy, 1993). Perhaps, in this state of reevaluation, individuals are given space to re-prioritize what they want in their work life. Indeed, this may include shifting away from things that bring them anxiety (like struggling in a stressful job), ultimately reducing neuroticism. Of course, the ability to relax or self-expand after unemployment is a privilege, typically only afforded by those with stronger financial resources and without significant financial strain (like the strain of having children; Backhans & Hemmingsson, 2011). The size of this effect, in both Study 1 and Study 2, is very small, suggesting that, if this were the case, there were very few people privileged enough to participate in this growth.

Actors and Partners

A second goal of this study was to discover if participants experienced vicarious growth: positive personality change explained by a partner's experience rather than their own. In this study, there was only one significant interaction between slope and a partner's life event—the death of their parent. This result, too, was found in Study 1: participants with partners who had lost a parent had steeper increases in conscientiousness. Perhaps this reflects the uptick in responsibilities that occur after the death of a parent or parent figure. Alternatively, it could be the case that when an individual experiences the loss of a parent, their partner participates in more conscientious behaviors to give them space to grieve and heal, alleviating daily responsibilities and logistics (as noted by Nenova et al., 2013). Interestingly, and unlike Study 1, the actor effect of a parent's death was not significant. Perhaps because the death of a partner's parent includes more psychological distance, the negative event feels less proximal, creating more favorable grounds for growth.

Relationship Satisfaction

Lastly, this study attempted to uncover the role of relationship satisfaction in possibly cultivating PTG. Some theories suggest that high relationship satisfaction can serve as an indicator of PTG, with especially happy couples reporting more PTG (Okay & Güler, 2021; Purol & Chopik, 2024; Riva et al., 2014), or negative life events making couples feel closer or happier together (Williamson, 2020; Williamson et al., 2021). Largely, this study did not find much evidence to support that claim. The main effect of relationship satisfaction was significant for all traits except openness, with more satisfied participants reporting higher agreeableness, conscientiousness, and extraversion, and lower neuroticism. There were also two interactions between satisfaction and the slope: those happier with their relationships tended to have

shallower declines in neuroticism over time but decreased more dramatically in agreeableness over time—although these effects were both very small (both *b*s < |.005|). The only life event to have a significant interaction with relationship satisfaction was the birth of a child: participants who were particularly happy in their relationships and had a new child tended to be as high in neuroticism as those who were lower in relationship satisfaction. Although this particular analysis was not designed for causal explanations (i.e., this was a two-way interaction pooled across waves), this finding does align with work suggesting that the birth of a child can increase stress, worry, and anxiety, even among happy couples (components of neuroticism; Bleidorn et al., 2016; van Scheppingen et al., 2018). Overall, however, relationship satisfaction was most commonly associated with mean levels of personality traits, rather than modulating how personality changed over time; it was rarely associated with adaptive or positive change.

When examining relationship satisfaction as an outcome, two negative life events had positive impacts on the slope of relationship satisfaction: the death of one's own or of a partner's parent. As discussed in the previous sections, this life event was one of the few that was also associated with positive personality change across the Big 5 traits in Studies 1 and 2. There's little literature that offers explanations for why a parent's death, in adulthood, would improve relationship outcomes in their children's relationship, specifically. If this is to be interpreted as dyadic PTG—improved outcomes on the *couple* level after a negative event—the PTG literature might suggest that couples who experienced this life event were able to successfully cope and grow, perhaps relying on positive relationship qualities (e.g., effective communication, good conflict management, and partner support; Wick & Nelson Goff, 2014).

Summary

Overall, Study 2 found only a small amount of evidence for PTG. Two effects consistent

with PTG from Study 1 were replicated in Study 2: actor's unemployment and the death of a partner's parent were both associated with positive personality changes (i.e., decreases in neuroticism and increases in conscientiousness, respectively). In general, when compared to Study 1, Study 2 found fewer actor and partner life events that were implicated in the process of personality change. Relationship satisfaction appeared to play little role in adaptive personality change, although it tended to be associated with positive traits on the mean level. There was some evidence that relationship satisfaction improved after couples experienced the death of a parent (regardless of which couple member lost the parent), which could be interpreted as evidence for dyadic PTG. Holistically, however, Study 2 found that evidence for PTG was relatively rare.

One of the largest limitations to both Study 1 and Study 2 is that study personnel simply measured the experience (i.e., yes or no) of a life event rather than the perceived impact of that event. Study 3 improves upon this limitation, using only life events that participants reported as explicitly negative or distressing—a more direct assessment of predictions made from the PTG literature. Additionally, the first two studies were also limited in that they focused exclusively on self-reports and perceptions of personality. In thinking about PTG and personality change within the context of close relationships, a natural question is whether personality changes in response to life events are observable across partners. Knowing whether life events change partner reports of personality can shed some light on the impact that these events could have on relationship functioning. For example, if an individual perceives that their partner is growing in ostensibly positive ways after a life event (either their own or one that happens to an individual), presumably this might also be evidence of PTG in that it could enhance relationship functioning (by cultivating more positive personality traits in partners). Thus, Study 3 moves past self-

reports, examining how participants see their partner changing as they experience these life events. Study 3 also examined some of the same questions as Studies 1 and 2 (but with even more fine-grained assessments of a few months apart from each other), as well as improving upon these limitations, in a new sample of Swiss, German, and Austrian couples.

CHAPTER 4: STUDY 3

Why might close others be so central in an individual's experience of PTG? Although there have been a few demonstrations of PTG being possible in the context of relationships, In Study 3, I hope to advance the study of this phenomenon by examining three major relationship-relevant mechanisms that might facilitate growth within and across people—support, partner responsiveness, and closeness.

Additionally, I hope to overcome two methodological limitations that are often present in previous work on PTG: implicit categorization of certain life events as negative and reliance on self-report measures of personality.

Relationship-relevant Mechanisms

As discussed in Study 1, partner support is one of the most commonly proposed mechanisms in the discussion of PTG within the context of close relationships. Partner support, both emotional and instrumental, has been connected to many positive relationships outcomes, including higher PTG (Cordova et al., 2001; Nenova et al., 2013; Schroevers et al., 2010; Yoon et al., 2022). However, other mechanisms, such as partner responsiveness, offer alternative explanations for the relationship between partners and PTG.

Responsiveness—a partner's ability to demonstrate that they understand and value an individual's needs—has been long-linked to relationship and life satisfaction (Reis, 2012; Reis & Clark, 2013; Selcuk et al., 2016). Indeed, in the field of relationship science, responsiveness is often considered the cornerstone on which all positive relationships are built (Reis, 2012). Although having a responsive partner is good for relationships when neither partner is experiencing a crisis, it may have extra benefits during challenging times. Responsiveness to mutual disclosures is thought to be one of the primary mechanisms that builds intimacy between

individuals over time and is why some dyads transition from strangers to intimate partners (Reis & Shaver, 1988). This is especially salient in the context of adversity. Being sensitive to and understanding of a partner's needs during a time when they may feel especially vulnerable is important immediately after experiencing adversity—perhaps occasionally more important than providing instrumental support (Dagan et al., 2014). In an examination of patients with colorectal cancer and their partners, partners' emotional responsiveness (e.g., understanding and validation) was more important in predicting patients' depressive symptoms than other, more pragmatic dimensions (i.e., their partners' caring behavior; Dagan et al., 2014). Other work has found that perceived partner responsiveness is associated with fewer reports of physical pain in veterans (this same relationship was not found for non-veteran partners; O'Neill et al., 2020).

While responsiveness appears to be an important factor in maintaining well-being in stressful situations, others suggest that partner responsiveness is also key in understanding PTG (Canevello & Crocker, 2010; Canevello et al., 2016). Canevello and colleagues suggest that the correlation between an individual's PTG and their partner's PTG is not due to a direct causal link. Rather, they propose a pathway where an individual's PTG leads them to become a more responsive partner, thereby ultimately facilitating the PTG in their partner (Canevello et al., 2016). In these studies, some of the key components predicting growth across partners are whether romantic partners adopt compassionate goals to better understand and listen to their partners (Jiang et al., 2022). These feelings of compassion after adversity might be necessary preconditions for even believing positive outcomes are possible (Canevello & Crocker, 2011). In this process, living through a challenge may prompt individuals to shift their priorities, offering more focus on the care and validation of their partner. This increased responsiveness may prompt growth in many ways—perhaps reminding partners of positive coping techniques and strengths

(Calhoun & Tedeschi, 2014; McMillen, 2004), encouraging trauma-specific disclosure and fostering cognitive processing (Calhoun & Tedeschi, 2014), or serving as a peer model for growth (Canevello et al., 2016; McMillen, 2004).

The relationship between individual and partner PTG is further complicated by a sense of shared identity that partners often report (i.e., a shared sense of self that overlaps; Aron & Aron, 1996). Feeling close to others has been connected to PTG in the literature as those who report greater closeness (with a particular close other or with people in general) tend to report higher PTG (Baník et al., 2022; Hall et al., 2010). This may not be surprising considering that greater closeness or connectedness with others has been conceptualized as a feature of PTG itself (i.e., closeness sometimes also serves as a measure of PTG; Cann et al., 2010; Tedeschi & Calhoun, 1996). For partners who are vicariously experiencing trauma or adversity, closeness is also likely important. Negative emotions commonly experienced after adversity, like stress and depression, are often considered "contagious" in that they can be jointly experienced by people sharing a social network (Hancock et al., 2008; Hill et al., 2010; Kimura et al., 2008; Kramer et al., 2014; Prochazkova & Kret, 2017). This is especially the case among people who are very close (Mazzuca et al., 2019). There is a large body of literature on the vicarious adversity experienced by those close to a directly affected person but ultimately not directly impacted by it, such as healthcare workers and caretakers (Baird & Kracen, 2006; McNeillie & Rose, 2021). Indeed, working closely with individuals navigating adversity can have negative psychological consequences for others in their network, and gerontology and healthcare scientists often study caregiver burden as a salient example of vicarious adversity. However, some work suggests that these individuals also experience vicarious *growth* when in the presence or social network of someone experiencing adversity. One meta-analysis on the subject posits that, in merely

witnessing clients' resilience and growth, therapists may experience personal growth and development themselves (McNeillie & Rose, 2021). Because emotional contagion is often strong in romantic couples (Mazzuca et al., 2019), it is possible that couple members higher in closeness report growth when their partner does. However, again, most of the evidence for this phenomenon comes from retrospective and introspective assessments of growth, rather than prospective measures of psychological characteristics.

Methodological Limitations: Life Event Perceptions and Self-reports of Personality

In addition to the care provided by partners, how an individual perceives a life event is also important for PTG trajectories. What is a devastating event for one person may be a joyous event for another (e.g., an unexpected pregnancy). Luhmann et al. (2020) found that valence—perceiving an event as negative or positive—is integral for understanding trajectories of growth: participants who perceived life events as more negative or challenging reported lower well-being over time after those events. However, although the perception of a negative life event may play a large role in whether a person experiences PTG, it is rarely examined as a predictor of prospective personality change in this context (although see recent work by Haehner et al., 2022). In the previous studies in this dissertation, life event valence was not explicitly measured and was left to be assumed (e.g., I assume that unemployment is a negative life event and categorized it as such; positive health changes are likely positive). Of course, this may not always be the case as some life events may be a little more ambiguous in terms if they are considered a blessing or a curse (Rakhshani et al., 2022). The participant's perspective on a life event, as Luhmann et al. (2020) capture with the Event Characteristics Scale, can more accurately characterize the impact and features of life events. The data used in Study 3 also directly assessed participants' perceptions of the valence of life events.

Past work has also overlooked at least one way in which romantic partners can further the study of PTG. Namely, partners may not solely serve as facilitators or beneficiaries of growth, but as *observers* of growth. Partners, who typically spend a great deal of time with the directly impacted individual, can offer unique insight that may help determine when—or, even, if—individuals do indeed change after adversity. Some have argued that PTG is merely a positive illusion that individuals use after the fact to cope with adversity (Infurna & Jayawickreme, 2019; Kunz et al., 2019; Sumalla et al., 2009). Perhaps the point of view of someone close to an individual who has experienced adversity—but is not the individual themselves or has not experienced the adversity directly— may be valuable in determining if individuals have undergone personality change. In other words, people who experience the life event themselves may be "too close" to the event to meaningfully introspect about variation in their personalities.

Romantic partners are often close enough to the impacted individual to detect meaningful changes in personality and may have enough psychological distance from the event to provide a more objective measure of change. People are certainly not completely objective observers of their partner's traits (Purol & Chopik, 2022), and they tend to evaluate each other more positively than others might. However, individuals are indeed capable of at least somewhat accurately identifying their partner's personality traits (Fletcher, 2015; Fletcher & Kerr, 2010; Neff & Karney, 2005; Purol & Chopik, 2022), especially when the trait they are reporting on has some relative consensus or a set of criterion behaviors (e.g., people generally agree on what makes someone physically attractive or extroverted; Bashour, 2006; Eisenthal et al., 2006). Long-term partners are also capable of providing observer ratings of personality change over longer periods, something that is relatively rare in the personality change literature (McCrae, 1993; Oltmanns et al., 2020; Schwaba et al., 2022; Watson & Humrichouse, 2006). With all of

this in mind, partner reports of PTG may help determine if individuals' perceptions of their own PTG vary from the perceptions of those around them. In this study, I examined whether these relationship mechanisms might explain personality change in response to life events and whether personality changes are observable across romantic partners.

Method

Participants

In this study, data was sourced from The CouPers Study (Couples and Personality; Processes in Romantic Relationships and Their Impact on Relationship and Personal Outcomes), an online study funded by the Swiss National Science Foundation (SNSF) which tracked couples for four waves over two years (with the first two follow-up waves occurring 4-6 months after the previous ones, and the final wave 10-12 months after the last). This sample afforded 482 opposite-gender couples (after filtering for couples who had been together for the entire duration of the study; N= 964, 50% male, 50% female). Participant age ranged from 18-81, with the average age being 39.35 (*SD* = 17.72). On average, couples had been together for 8.5 years, although this ranged from under 1 year to 67 years (*SD* = 10.79). Most participants reported having education beyond high school (43.7% reported attending a university, 6.3% reported attending a technical school), although many people in the sample reported high school (31.8%) or levels below high school (18%) as their highest level of education. Most of the sample (35.2%) reported making the equivalent[12] of $0-22,743 annually, followed by $23,880-45486 (22.9%), and, then, no income (13.7%); 2.5% of the sample reported making over $136,459 (the highest income category listed on the closed-response item).

[12] Converted from Swiss francs and rounded to the nearest US dollar.

Measures

Life events

While this panel study did not measure prospective life events, it did retrospectively capture some negative experiences that overlap with much of the life event literature. In Wave 4 (i.e., the final wave), participants were asked if they had experienced a series of life events during the study duration, and, if they had, how meaningful (where 1 = very negative and 5 = very positive) and distressing (where 0 = not all at and 10 = very much) each event was. Life events rated as negative (i.e., 4 and higher on the meaningfulness scale) or distressing (6 and higher on the distress scale) were included in the following analyses. As in the first two studies, I only examined non-relationship-status-related life events. These events include the birth of a child, the birth of a grandchild, graduation, retirement, unemployment, change in career, moving residences, children moving out of the house, the onset of a health problem, loss (of a non-partner close other), miscarriage, and abortion. This study also included a free-response option, where participants could choose to disclose another significant change in their life not captured by the preceding list of life events. The frequency of life events is displayed in Table 32. Unlike the previous frequency tables, this is *only* the prevalence of life events that participants found either *negative or distressing* (e.g., a frequency of 0 for the life event of "having a grandchild" does not indicate that no one in the sample had a grandchild, rather, it indicates that no one in the sample had a grandchild *and* identified that event as negative or distressing). The most common life event reported here was the death of a close other, experienced and indicated as negative by 24.3% of the sample. Some life events, when experienced, were almost never indicated as negative or distressing (i.e., having a grandchild, retiring, becoming an empty-nester, or having an abortion; all frequencies < 1%). As in previous studies, these extremely rare life events were

excluded from the following analyses. Correlations between life events within a couple are displayed in Table 33.

Personality

In all waves, personality traits were assessed with the Big Five Inventory (BFI; John & Srivastava, 1999). This 45-item assessment asked participants to indicate how much they felt certain personality descriptors applied to them (e.g., for extraversion, "I see myself as someone who is full of energy") on a scale of 1 (*disagree strongly*) to 5 (*agree strongly;* α across waves >.85 for all traits). Means of each trait, as well as correlations between traits, are displayed in Table 34. Traits were extremely stable over time.

Partner Description of Personality[13]

In all waves, participants were also asked about the Big Five traits of their partner. For this assessment, the short form of the BFI was used (John & Srivastava, 1999). For this 21-item measure, partners were asked how much they felt certain personality descriptors applied to their partner (e.g. for extraversion, "He/she is outgoing, sociable") on a scale of 1 (*disagree strongly*) to 5 (*agree strongly;* α across waves >.81 for all traits). Means of and correlations between each trait are displayed in Table 35. Traits were extremely stable over time. Correlations between self and partner-reported personality are reported in Table 36.

Relationship-level factors

Bivariate correlations among the Big Five traits and these relationship-level factors can be seen in Tables 34 and 35.

[13] Two variables capture the first measurement of partner report of personality: one measured on the first day of Wave 1 data collection, and one measured on the last day of Wave 1 data collection (14 days later). All other waves have single measurements. For the sake of consistency, the first day's measurements are used for Wave 1 in the following analyses.

Responsiveness. In all waves, perceived partner responsiveness was measured with a scale by Laurenceau et al. (2005). This 6-item scale asked participants to indicate how responsive their partner was that day (e.g., "Today I felt validated by my partner") on a scale from 1 (*very little*) to 5 (*a great deal;* $\alpha = .91$). In general, participants felt their partners were very responsive ($M = 3.95$, $SD = .65$).

Received support. In all waves, received support was measured with a scale by Shrout et al. (2006). This scale includes 4 items, 2 of which asked if they received emotional support from their partner that day and 2 of which asked if they received practical support from their partner that day (recoded as 1= yes, 0= no). These items were averaged over time to create a variable that represented the proportion of days participants reported felt support. Because practical and emotional support were consistently correlated across waves (all *r*s between practical and emotional support in each wave were significant and greater than $r = .61$), I combined these variables into a single support variable. On average, participants reported feeling some type of support approximately 36% of the time across the 14-day duration of each wave of the study (or for about 5 of the 14 days).

Interpersonal closeness. In all waves, interpersonal closeness was assessed with the Inclusion of Other in Self Scale (Aron et al., 1992). This visual scale consists of a series of seven images: two circles (one labeled "self" and one labeled "partner"), which begin as separate from one other (1) and slowly get closer until they are almost completely overlapping in the final image (7). Participants are asked to choose the picture that best describes their relationship with their partner, with higher values (i.e., pictures in which the circles share more overlap) indicating more interpersonal closeness ($\alpha = .65$). In general, participants felt very close to their partners, although there was a considerable amount of variance in this rating ($M = 6.30$, $SD = 3.17$).

Analysis Plan

The analysis plan for Study 3 follows the same structure as Studies 1 and 2. For each trait, I completed a series of dyadic growth curve models in the context of multi-level modeling (see Kenny et al., 2006). Each GCM included: 1) a series of actor and partner life events (i.e., the birth of a child, graduation, a change in job, moving, the death of a close other, miscarriage, and "other"—the free-response option), 2) a series of control variables (i.e., gender, age, education level, income, and relationship length) and 3) a series of life event by slope interactions. Life events that had significant interactions with slope were carried through to a second series of GCMs. These analyses added three relationship variables[14] to the model: support, responsiveness, and closeness (each relationship variable was modeled independently, resulting in three total follow-up analyses). In these follow-up models, the following predictors were added to the model: 1) these three-way life event by slope by relationship variable interactions, 2) two-way interactions between relationship variables and each life event, 2) the two-way interaction between relationship variables and the slope, and 4) the main effect of a given relationship variable. Because of the complexity of these expanded models, I adjusted the alpha level to .01 for a more conservative *p*-value to protect against false positive effects.

As in Studies 1 and 2, I also completed CGM for each relationship variable (i.e., support, responsiveness, and closeness) as an outcome. Given that these variables were correlated at small to moderate levels, they were examined as separate predictors (i.e., not combined). These models each included 1) the main effect of the same series of life events, 2) the same series of control variables, and 3) a series of slope * life event interactions.

[14] Each relationship variable was centered on the invariant, time 1 mean of that variable.

Finally, I re-ran the first set of GCMs on each partner report of personality for each trait. These models were identical to the models containing self report of personality, although the interpretation is slightly different. In these models, a significant interaction between an actor's life event and slope indicates that when an *individual* experiences a particular life event, they perceive their *partner's* personality changing in a particular way. Similarly, a significant interaction between a partner's life event and slope indicates that when a *partner* experiences a particular life event, individuals perceive their *partner's* personality changing in a particular way (i.e., the outcome is the person's rating of their partner's personality).

Results

Agreeableness

Growth curve model 1: life events only

The results of this model are reported in Table 37. The slope was significant and negative, indicating that participants generally decreased in agreeableness over time (although this effect was very small; b = -.01, p = .017). One life event had a main effect of agreeableness: those who experienced a move tended to be more agreeable on average (b = .14, p = .011). Those who had been in a relationship for longer tended to be lower in agreeableness (b = -.005, p = .002).

Only one life event interacted with the slope (although this effect was small and p = .05): those with a partner who had experienced the death of a close other tended to have more negative slopes, indicating steeper decreases in agreeableness over time (b = -.02, p = .050). Although this effect was on the edge of significance, I carried it through to the next series of analyses.

Growth curve model 2: life events and support

The results of this model are reported in Table 38. Neither the main effect of support nor

any of its interactions with life events and the slope were significant.

Growth curve model 3: life events and responsiveness

The results of this model are reported in Table 39. Neither the main effect of responsiveness nor any of its interactions with life events and the slope were significant.

Growth curve model 4: life events and closeness

The results of this model are reported in Table 40. Neither the main effect of closeness nor any of its interactions with life events and the slope were significant.

Conscientiousness

Growth curve model 1: life events only

The results of this model are reported in Table 41. The slope was significant and negative, indicating that participants generally decreased in conscientiousness over time (although this effect was very small; b = -.01, p = .034). Only one control variable demonstrated a significant main effect on conscientiousness: older people tended to be slightly less conscientious (b = -.003, p = .022). However, no life event had a significant impact on the intercept or slope of conscientiousness. Thus, as a result, I did not examine the moderating effect of any of the relationship variables on life event-induced personality changes (because there were not any significant effects).

Extraversion

Growth curve model 1: life events only

The results of this model are reported in Table 42. The slope was not significant, indicating that participants did not significantly change in extraversion over time (b = .001, p = .918). Two control variables had a significant main effect on extraversion: women and those with higher incomes tended to be higher in extraversion (b = -.14, p = .007; b = .05, p = .026,

respectively). However, no life event had a significant impact on the intercept or slope of extraversion. Thus, as a result, I did not examine the moderating effect of any of the relationship variables on life event-induced personality changes (because there were not any significant effects).

Neuroticism

Growth curve model 1: life events only

For this model, I experienced some convergence problems, likely caused by the high stability in neuroticism and the uneven distribution of some of the life events. In diagnosing the source of the issues, the culprit was the low degree of variance in the slopes for men and women. I was able to get the models to run by removing these random effects and their covariances across partners. This also occurred for partner-reported agreeableness (see below).

The results of this model are reported in Table 43. The slope was not significant, indicating that participants generally did not significantly change in neuroticism over time (b = -.018, p = .223). One life event had a significant main effect on neuroticism: those who had a partner experience the death of a close other were slightly lower in neuroticism (b = -.122, p = .049). Women tended to be higher in neuroticism (b = -.219, p < .001), while older people and those with higher incomes tended to be lower in neuroticism (b = -.01, p = .029; b = -.03, p = .008, respectively). No life event had a significant impact on the slope of neuroticism. Thus, as a result, I did not examine the moderating effect of any of the relationship variables on life event-induced personality changes (because there were not any significant effects).

Openness

Growth curve model 1: life events only

The results of this model are reported in Table 44. The slope was not significant,

indicating that participants generally did not change in openness over time (b = -.004, p = .406). Only one control variable demonstrated a significant main effect on openness; more educated people in the sample tended to be slightly more open (b = .02, p = .038). However, no life event had a significant main effect on openness. There was one significant interaction between life event and the slope of openness. Namely, those who had a miscarriage tended to have more positive slopes, indicating increases in openness over time (b = .08, p = .009).

Growth curve model 2: life events and support

The results of this model are reported in Table 45. Neither the main effect of support nor any of its interactions with life events and the slope were significant.

Growth curve model 3: life events and responsiveness

The results of this model are reported in Table 46. Neither the main effect of responsiveness nor any of its interactions with life events and the slope were significant.

Growth curve model 4: life events and closeness

The results of this model are reported in Table 47. Neither the main effect of closeness nor any of its interactions with life events and the slope were significant.

Support

Growth curve model 1: life events only

The results of this model are reported in Table 48. The slope was significant and negative, indicating that partner support gradually decreased over time (b = -.05, p < .001). Women (b = -.11, p < .001), older participants (b = .01, p = .002), and those with more education (b = .03, p = .001) all reported higher levels of received support. While no life event indicated a main effect of support, two life events did interact significantly with the slope of support. Those who had a partner experience a negative health event (b = .03, p = .023) or the death of a close

other (b = .02, p = .031) tended to have a more positive slope, indicating a shallower decrease in support over time.

Responsiveness

Growth curve model 1: life events only

The results of this model are reported in Table 49. The slope was not significant, indicating that felt responsiveness did not change significantly over time (b = -.01, p = .126). One life event demonstrated a main effect of responsiveness: those who had a partner who experienced a negative health event felt as though their partner was less responsive (b = -.22, p = .042). One life event demonstrated an interaction with slope: those who experienced a negative health event themselves tended to have steeper positive slopes (b = .05, p < .001), indicating an increase in felt responsiveness over time.

Closeness

Growth curve model 1: life events only

The results of this model are reported in Table 50. The slope was significant and negative, indicating that closeness gradually decreased over time (b = -.34, p = .002). Men tended to report higher levels of felt closeness (b = .17, p < .001), while older participants (b = -.02, p = .039) and those with more education (b = -.05, p = .048) tended to report lower levels of closeness. However, no life event was significantly related to the intercept or slope of closeness.

Partner Reports: Agreeableness

For this model, I again needed to adjust the model by removing some of the random effects to achieve convergence. The results of this model are reported in Table 51. The slope was not significant, indicating that participants generally saw their partners as not changing in agreeableness over time (b = -.01, p = .301). Five life events demonstrated main effects of

perceived agreeableness: those who had a partner experience a graduation (b = -.14, p = .012) or the death of a close other (b = -.12, p = .009) tended to see those partners as less agreeable. Those who had a partner experience a miscarriage (b = .35, p = .031) or other negative life event (b = .21, p = .006) tended to see those partners as more agreeable. Those who experienced a miscarriage themselves tended to see their partner as less agreeable (b = -.37, p = .016).

There was one significant interaction between life event and the slope: those who experienced a miscarriage themselves tended to have steeper positive slopes of perceived agreeableness (b = .17, p = .014), indicating that they saw their partner as increasing in agreeableness over time.

Partner Reports: Conscientiousness

The results of this model are reported in Table 52. The slope was not significant, indicating that participants generally saw their partners as not changing in conscientiousness over time (b = .01, p = .143). Men tended to see their partners as slightly more conscientious (b = .15, p = .002). While no life event demonstrated main effects of perceived conscientiousness, one life event interacted with the slope. Those who had experienced a miscarriage themselves tended to have steeper positive slopes (b = .10, p = .143), indicating that they saw their partner increasing in conscientiousness over time.

Partner Reports: Extraversion

The results of this model are reported in Table 53. The slope was not significant, indicating that participants generally saw their partners as not changing in extraversion over time (b = .001, p = .586). Men tended to see their partners as slightly more extraverted (b = .16, p = .014). However, no life event had a main effect on perceived extraversion nor interacted with the slope.

Partner Reports: Neuroticism

The results of this model are reported in Table 54. The slope was not significant, indicating that participants generally saw their partners as not changing in neuroticism over time (b = -.01, p = .497). Men (b = .37, p < .001) and those in longer relationships (b = .01, p = .045) tended to see their partners as more neurotic (although the 95% C.I. for relationship length had a lower bound of zero). Those with more education tended to see their partners as less neurotic (b = -.05, p = .042). However, no life event had a main effect on perceived extraversion nor interacted with the slope.

Partner Reports: Openness

The results of this model are reported in Table 55. The slope was not significant, indicating that participants generally saw their partners as not changing in openness over time (b = -.003 p = .674). Men (b = .22, p < .001) tended to see their partners as more open. However, no life event had a main effect on perceived extraversion nor interacted with the slope.

Discussion

Patterns of PTG

As in Studies 1 and 2, the first goal in this study was to simply look for any evidence of PTG. Again, evidence could mostly clearly be found in the interactions between life events and changes in personality. In an adaptive response, supportive of the theory of PTG, an ostensibly negative life event would have a positive interaction (i.e., promoting linear growth) with changes in adaptive traits (i.e., agreeableness, conscientiousness, extraversion, or openness) and a negative interaction (i.e., promoting more dramatic declines) with changes in maladaptive traits (i.e., neuroticism). This would reflect a relationship in which participants are actively "growing" in positive ways when exposed to a particular life event. As summarized in Table 56, this was

rarely the case. This study only identified two life events as having a significant impact on slope: the death of a partner's close other and an actor's miscarriage.

Interestingly, while Studies 1 and 2 found *adaptive* changes in response to a partner losing a presumably close other (i.e., a parent), this was not the case in Study 3, where participants reported steeper declines in agreeableness when their partner lost a close other. The only life event in Study 3 that was associated with *adaptive* changes was experiencing a miscarriage. Participants who experienced a miscarriage that they found negative or distressing tended to have positive slopes in openness, becoming more open over time. This is a pattern consistent with PTG: positive change after an explicitly negative event. Some previous work links positive post-miscarriage outcomes (like relationship satisfaction and healthy coping) to a sense of openness, although this is often conceptually broader than the openness implicated in Big Five personality traits (Hiefner, 2021; Kiełek-Rataj et al., 2020). The authors of this work suggest that openness is a key component of effective communication and coping within dyads. Perhaps in the face of this particular life event, couples must become more communicative to handle a shared sense of loss, ultimately allowing them to grow in openness.

Aside from this effect, however, there were no patterns of change consistent with PTG. While Studies 1 and 2 found a handful of potentially influential life events implicated in both adaptive and maladaptive change, this study found only two life events were relevant. Although there are many explanations for this phenomenon (including demographic differences in the sample, like culture or age; Costa Jr et al., 2001; McCrae et al., 1999), it is also possible that differences between the studies are methodological or related to sampling variability.

One explanation lies in the nature of the data. This dataset spanned the shortest amount of time (i.e., only 2 years to HRS' 12 and LISS' 14). And, although the sample size was still

considerably large, it also included the smallest sample of couples (i.e., 482 couples to HRS' 6,820 and LISS' 3,481). Even among the larger samples, the effect sizes for life events tended to be very, very small. It is possible that to detect such small effects—that are occurring for such stable variables—the data needs to capture a very large sample of couples over a very long period. Indeed, some traits did not even have enough variation to estimate the random effects.

Another explanation lies in how the life events were coded within this sample. Unlike the previous two studies, this data included some qualitative characteristics of life events (i.e., its valence). Perhaps eliminating life events that were not considered negative or distressing influenced this pattern of results (or that life events impacted people even if they were not considered particularly distressing). For example, in Studies 1 and 2, I assumed that experiencing the death of a parent was a negative life event. However, while this life event may have prompted negative emotion, if participants had been asked if the passing of their parent was negative or distressing, as they were asked in Study 3, they may have indicated that it was not (especially in an older sample where death sometimes marks the end of a period of struggle or suffering). In that case, it would be *less* accurate to categorize that response as a pattern of PTG (as the life event was not inherently negative or stressful).

Partner-reported patterns of PTG

A secondary goal of this study was to look for any evidence of PTG within partner reports of personality change. Perhaps partners have unique perspectives on how individuals grow over time. Interestingly, partner reports of personality were slightly different than self-reports. For example, the slope of partner-reported personality was never significant, suggesting that while individuals saw their own personality as changing slightly, their partners saw it as not changing much at all.

When examining the relationship between life events and mean levels of personality traits, the only large discrepancies between self and other reports were in agreeableness. Most of these effects were partner effects: participants rated partners who had experienced a graduation or the death of a close other as less agreeable and partners who had experienced a miscarriage or other negative/distressing event as more agreeable. However, overall, participants and their partners appeared to have similar perspectives on when life events accompanied personality change: extremely rarely (see Table 56). Only one life event interacted significantly with the slope of partner-reported traits: the actor effect of miscarriage. Those who had a miscarriage reported that their partners became more agreeable and conscientious over time. The partner effect of miscarriage for these traits was not significant in the self-report models, suggesting that participants did not see themselves as becoming more agreeable and conscientious when facing miscarriage; this was a change only perceived by partners. Parts of this finding align well with previous work. Partners may indeed engage in more agreeable or conscientious behaviors when their partner is directly experiencing a negative life event (i.e., being especially kind or handling logistics; Nenova et al., 2013). However, why this is a change perceived only by partners and *not* the participants themselves is more of an open question. Perhaps people experiencing miscarriages become especially sensitive to the agreeable and conscientious behaviors of their partners as they search for cues of support (Pickett et al., 2004; Sejourne et al., 2010), leading them to report increases in these traits. Alternatively, perhaps participants are making these small changes to their personality outside of their awareness. Or, perhaps, participants are thinking about their personality as a whole when answering the self-report measure, and not of their personality in the context of their relationship (as their partner is likely doing; McCrae et al., 1998).

Actors and Partners

Another goal of this study was to discover if participants experienced vicarious growth: positive personality change explained by a partner's experience rather than their own. In this study, there was only one significant interaction between slope and a partner's life event—the death of their parent. And, unlike the previous two studies, this was a maladaptive change; participants who had a partner experience the death of a close other experienced steeper declines in agreeableness. This pattern does not align with one of PTG.

As discussed above, this could be due to Study 3's inclusion of *only* negative or distressing life events. This sample was younger than the samples in the previous two studies (i.e., M_{age} 39.35 in CouPers vs.. 48.3 in LISS and 62.2 in HRS). In this sample, a parent's death is certainly less normative and, possibly, more likely to be perceived negatively. Perhaps, when deaths are perceived as negative and distressing, they are less likely to lead to positive reframing, growth, or positive personality change**.**

Relationship variables

Lastly, this study attempted to uncover the role of three relationship-relevant variables in the cultivation of PTG. Support, responsiveness, and closeness have all been theoretically implicated in this process. Having a partner who is especially supportive or responsive may create more favorable grounds for growth, providing important resources for coping. Having a partner who you feel especially close to may make the experience of vicarious growth more likely, as the negative event is more proximal. However, this study found little support for any of these proposed processes.

Support

Neither the main effect of support nor any of its interactions with slope and life events

were significant. These results echo that of Study 1. How much support a participant reported receiving was unrelated to the trajectory of their personality. As in Study 1, there are two possible explanations for these types of effects. On one hand, they could certainly be interpreted as a null result: perhaps life events or spousal support are relatively unrelated to personality change, especially when considering the heritable and stable nature of personality (Bleidorn et al., 2022; Vukasović & Bratko, 2015). On the other hand, as discussed in Study 1, some work implicates "invisible" support (i.e., support that is not detected and labeled as support by the receiver) in positive outcomes (Girme et al., 2018; Girme et al., 2013). Perhaps invisible support is more likely to impact these kinds of trajectories.

Support was also examined as an outcome. When examined in this way, there was some evidence for PTG on the dyadic level (i.e., where experiencing a negative event is good for the relationship as a whole). Those who had a partner experience a negative health event or the death of a close other tended to have a more positive slope of support, indicating a shallower decrease in support over time. This is interesting when considering literature that suggests that experiencing these things might make it *more difficult* for partners to provide support, ultimately leading to lowered levels of felt support (as it may have in Study 1). Perhaps these negative life events served as an especially salient cue for support, reminding both partners to engage in support behaviors. Alternatively, when one partner provided support for the other (in response to a negative life event), it may have begun a reciprocal chain of support, leading to more support behavior from both partners (much like the responsiveness chain theorized by Canevello et al., 2016).

Responsiveness

Neither the main effect of responsiveness nor any of its interactions with slope and life

events were significant. As discussed in the introduction to Study 3, responsiveness is central to many theories of relationship satisfaction and growth, especially surrounding growth after trauma (Dagan et al., 2014; Reis & Shaver, 1988). It is intuitive that responsiveness—the ability to identify and meet a partner's needs—might be important in a post-crisis scenario. Some work has situated responsiveness as a necessary precondition for even believing positive outcomes are possible (Canevello & Crocker, 2011).

One possible explanation for these results lies in the way that responsiveness was measured; participants were asked about how responsive they felt their partner had been *that day*. This is in contrast to the personality assessments, which occurred over longer intervals of time. While responsiveness was relatively stable across waves, it is possible that a trait measure of responsiveness, or a measure that specifically captured a partner's responsiveness in a crisis context, would yield different results. Another interpretation is that responsiveness is less related to personality change, especially when considering, as mentioned earlier, the heritable and stable nature of personality (Bleidorn et al., 2022; Vukasović & Bratko, 2015). Perhaps having a close other anticipate and meet needs, while important for relationship outcomes, is simply not as influential in altering personality.

Responsiveness was also examined as an outcome. When examined in this way, there was some evidence for PTG on the dyadic level (i.e., where experiencing a negative event is good for the relationship as a whole). Those who experienced a negative health event tended to have a more positive slope of responsiveness, indicating an increase in responsiveness over time. This finding fits well within the responsiveness literature, which would predict a rise in responsiveness to meet a new need (quite literally in *response* to a negative life event, Canevello et al., 2016).

Closeness

As was the case for support and responsiveness, neither the main effect of closeness nor any of its interactions with slope and life events were significant. Those who felt especially close to their partners were not any more or less likely to experience vicarious growth (i.e., there were no three-way interactions between the slope, closeness, and a partner's life event). Although this finding is contrary to theoretical models which suggest closeness would be important for vicarious growth (Hancock et al., 2008; Hill et al., 2010; Kimura et al., 2008; Kramer et al., 2014; Prochazkova & Kret, 2017), it aligns with the larger pattern of results in this study (where relationship variables tended to be unimportant in personality change processes) and in all three studies (where partner effects of life events were considerably rarer than actor effects of life events). If a partner's life events are rarely important for an individual's patterns of personality change, it is likely that other factors, such as the characteristics of the event itself (e.g., its salience, its impact, etc.), would be more likely to drive a significant partner effect.

Closeness was also examined as an outcome. However, unlike support and responsiveness, closeness never interacted significantly with any life events. Factors like support and responsiveness likely play a more central role in coping or reframing, processes that are more likely to occur after a negative life event (and, perhaps, lead to relationship growth). Closeness, then, may be a more ancillary variable, related to relationship processes and outcomes broadly, but not in the specific context of trauma.

Summary

Overall, Study 3 found very little evidence for PTG. Only one life event, miscarriage, predicted adaptive personality change (i.e., increases in openness). In general, when compared to Studies 1 and 2, Study 3 found far fewer actor and partner life events that were implicated in the

process of personality change. This pattern was largely consistent over self and partner reports, although participants who experienced a miscarriage did tend to see their partners as becoming more agreeable and conscientious over time—a change partners did not see in themselves. Support, responsiveness, and closeness all appeared to play little (to no) role in adaptive personality change. However, there was some evidence that relationship outcomes (i.e., support and responsiveness) improved after couples experienced negative life events (i.e., either partners' negative health event or the death of a partner's parent), which could be interpreted as evidence for dyadic PTG. Overall, while Study 3 did find some evidence for dyadic PTG, this study found little support for PTG on the individual level.

CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSIONS AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS

The PTG framework has been used as a way to characterize why some individuals and couples grow in the face of adversity. My approach leveraged insights from the study of life events potentially leading to personality change, theories about how negative life events might cultivate introspection and enhance relationship functioning, and addressed several methodological limitations that have plagued previous research.

As discussed in the introduction of this dissertation, there is no clear consensus on *when*, *how*, or even *if* PTG exists. When conceptualized very broadly, as changes in Big 5 personality traits, increases in character strengths, gains in resilience, changes in narratives, or benefit-finding, there is some evidence that this phenomenon does exist (Bleidorn et al., 2018; Helgeson et al., 2006; Joseph & Linley, 2005; Pals & McAdams, 2004). The literature contains many reports of participant growth in the aftermath of trauma or negative life events (e.g., finding increases in qualities like gratitude, hope, kindness, leadership, and love after tragedies such as the September 11th terrorist attacks; Peterson & Seligman, 2003). However, these findings are far from consistent across the literature. Different studies find different results even when examining the same life event, occasionally producing incompatible results. For example, experiencing divorce is associated with both increases and decreases in conscientiousness, depending on the literature consulted (Costa et al., 2000; Specht et al., 2011a). In a meta-analysis of the topic, Mangelsdorf and colleagues (2019) found some evidence of what they called "genuine" PTG: positive, stable increases in personal strengths, autonomy, and self-esteem after negative events. However, these changes were very heterogeneous, suggesting that the average meta-analytic estimate might not necessarily characterize many of the samples included. Some indicators of well-being did have positive trajectories on average, suggesting an increase in

adaptive traits after a negative event. Other indicators tended not to change at all, while others decreased after negative events (Mangelsdorf et al., 2019).

One avenue to exploring this heterogeneity lies in the social context of the life event, particularly whether it is experienced in the context of a close relationship or even vicariously. Much work suggests that close others, particularly romantic partners, may play an important role in growth after a negative life event. Indeed, many frameworks position partners as active contributors, hurdles, or beneficiaries to growth processes (e.g., the Vulnerability-Stress-Adaptation Model; Karney & Bradbury, 1995; Purol & Chopik, 2024). Some work suggests that partners provide the emotional and practical support required for individuals who have experienced a negative event to grow (e.g., having conversations that facilitate coping, offering logistic or task-basked assistance, responding to new needs, etc.; Calhoun & Tedeschi, 2014; Canevello & Crocker, 2010; Canevello et al., 2016; Jiang et al., 2022; McMillen, 2004). Yet other work focuses on the "emotional contagion" of trauma—how one partner's trauma may influence one's own outcomes, and those of their partner, for better or worse (Gill-Emerson, 2015). While work on spillover effects documents how partners' negative experiences may impact individuals negatively (Hancock et al., 2008; Mazzuca et al., 2019), there is also some work to suggest that, when partners grow, individuals grow along with them (experiencing "vicarious growth"); when individuals report PTG, their partners are also more likely to report PTG (even when they are not directly experiencing the negative event; Hodges et al., 2005; Weiss, 2002; Zwahlen et al., 2010). Yet other work positions positive change in a relationship more deliberately as an outcome (instead of positive change within an individual), finding that negative life events are sometimes associated with increased relationship satisfaction or sense of closeness (Williamson et al., 2021)

However, most work on PTG, whether it is examined as an individual-level outcome or as a couple-level outcome, has suffered from a host of methodological limitations (Jayawickreme & Blackie, 2014; Jayawickreme et al., 2021). One of the most glaring limitations of this work is its reliance on cross-sectional data. In typical PTG studies, participants are asked to recall a time that they endured a challenge and retroactively determine how much they have changed (for the better) in response to that challenge. Participant memories, of course, are not completely reliable (especially when considering that accurately remembering traumatic events is difficult for many people; Sachschal et al., 2019; Van der Kolk & Fisler, 1995). Likewise, people also find it difficult to make such attributions of how they have changed in response to a traumatic event. For example, people may be motivated to report positive changes as a way of reducing cognitive dissonance (that something good must have come out of a bad situation). Also, it is a difficult assessment partially because it is cognitively taxing (e.g., quantifying how much they changed and then assigning a certain amount of that change to the event versus how they would have changed in the absence of the event). What is needed is a simpler, albeit more difficult, approach in which people are asked about their psychological characteristics prospectively. Unfortunately, few studies examine PTG with longitudinal data. Even fewer studies examine PTG longitudinally within the context of close relationships, despite, theoretically, partners playing such an important role in the process (Purol & Chopik, 2024). The small amount of work that has done this suggests that, although psychological changes can be related within couples, exactly how and any why partners' personality changes are connected are very nuanced and requires more exploration (Lahav et al., 2017).

There are other limitations to measuring PTG in this traditional way. In simply asking participants if a life event has occurred or not, researchers often make assumptions about the

characteristics of a given life event (e.g., that it was negative, impactful, etc.). However, the participant's perception of the event (e.g., its valence, predictability, normativity, etc.) is important information to integrate into the analysis when trying to predict how they may change in response to it (Haehner et al., 2022; Rakhshani et al., 2022). This method of examining PTG also relies on self-report, largely ignoring if and when others' perceptions of an individual's personality change may vary from their own.

Overall, when considering the methodological limitations typical of this work and the heterogeneity of the effects seen in the literature, there are many unanswered questions surrounding how individuals, partners, and relationships change in the wake of negative life events.

Research Questions and Primary Conclusions

In evaluating the literatures on the impact of life events on the potential for psychological change, the potential for individual and dyadic PTG, and the methodological limitations of both literatures, I examined three longitudinal data sets in which couples' personalities were assessed over time and modeled as a function of life events experienced by both individuals and their partners. Specifically, this dissertation tried to answer the following research questions in three studies:

RQ1: Do people exhibit positive personality change (post-traumatic growth; PTG) after their partner experiences a negative life event?

This question was examined in all three studies. Study 1 found the most evidence of a partner's negative life event occurring alongside adaptive change in personality (i.e., the death of a partner's parent and a partner's unemployment were related to adaptive changes in conscientiousness, neuroticism, and openness). Study 2 found only one negative life event that

followed a similar pattern; the death of a partner's parent was related to adaptive changes in conscientiousness. Study 3 found no life events that followed this pattern. No single life event of a partner predicted positive personality change in all three studies. While these studies offer some evidence that this type of growth is possible—and does occur in some couples—the pattern is not consistent.

RQ2: If so, how do these changes compare to the PTG of the individual who experienced the negative life event themselves (Studies 1-3)?

This question was examined in all three studies. By far, an actor's life events were more influential in changes in personality than partner effects. Again, Study 1 found the most evidence of an individual's negative life event occurring alongside adaptive change in personality (i.e., the death of a parent and unemployment were related to adaptive changes in all 5 traits). Study 2 replicated one of these effects (i.e., unemployment was related to adaptive changes in neuroticism). Study 3 identified a new life event associated with positive change: experiencing a miscarriage was related to adaptive changes in openness. While these studies offer some evidence that this type of growth is possible—and is more commonly linked to one's own experiences, rather than a partner's—this effect, too, was inconsistent. It was more common for negative life events to be associated with maladaptive changes and for positive life events (e.g., positive changes in health, birth of a child) to be associated with adaptive changes.

RQ3: Do relationship characteristics (e.g., closeness, satisfaction) predict PTG for individuals and their partners (Studies 1-3)?

This question was examined in all three studies. The relationship characteristics examined here (i.e., support, relationship satisfaction, responsiveness, and closeness) were rarely associated with personality changes at all and never interacted with life events and slopes to

indicate *adaptive* change. However, when examined as outcome variables, these studies did find some evidence of dyadic PTG (relationships improving in response to a negative life event). In Study 1, those who experienced the death of a child saw adaptive changes in spousal strain. In Study 2, those who experienced the direct or vicarious death of a parent saw adaptive changes in relationship satisfaction. Finally, in Study 3, those who experienced a negative health event saw adaptive changes in responsiveness, while those who experienced a partner's negative health event saw adaptive changes in support. These studies suggest that relationship-level variables may not be influential in an individual's personality trajectories. However, when considered as outcomes in their own right, these patterns offer some evidence for the existence of dyadic PTG.

RQ4: Do partners perceive PTG in individuals who experience a negative life event (Study 3)?

This question was solely examined in Study 3. Overall, participants rarely perceived personality change in their partners at all; each slope of partner-reported personality was not significant. However, there was one life event that was associated with partner-reported personality change: those who experienced a miscarriage reported their partners becoming more agreeable and conscientious over time (a change partners did not report noticing in themselves). While participants rarely self-reported change associated with life events, the two life events that *were* associated with change (i.e., miscarriage and the death of a partner's close other) were not detected as influential by partners. This study suggests that, if PTG does occur on the trait level, partners may have a different perspective of this growth than individuals do themselves.

Limitations and Future Directions

The three studies presented here had several strengths. Together, the studies were able to overcome many of the limitations that often plague studies of PTG. These studies made use of three independent samples from different cultures, two of which were nationally representative.

They also sampled a wide variety of life events, with at least one study capturing the valence of those life events. The three studies featured dyadic data, incorporating romantic partners into the PTG process. One of these studies also included *partner* perceptions of PTG, something that (to my knowledge), has not yet been done. Lastly, they used longitudinal data and models to answer longitudinal questions—something rarely done in this work, particularly in the relationships literature.

Of course, however, these studies also had limitations. One such limitation was how personality was operationalized—as Big 5 personality traits. Much work on the Big 5 personality traits, as well as the studies in this dissertation themselves, emphasize the stability of traits. Put simply, they did not vary much over adulthood, which made it difficult to capture post-life-event change (Bleidorn et al., 2018; Bühler et al., 2023). Perhaps, then, traits are the wrong place to look for PTG, if it does, in fact, exist. Other levels of personality, such as an individual's goals or their life narratives (i.e., the stories people tell about their own lives; McAdams, 1996) may be a more fruitful place to look for these changes. In the study of life narratives, reports of PTG-like-phenomena are relatively common, especially in Western cultures (Goodson, 2012). Narrative patterns like *redemption sequences* (where participants report overcoming bad situations to arrive at good ones) and *self-improvement sequences* (where participants report changing themselves for the better) capture effects that align with PTG and predict outcomes we would expect to be associated with PTG, like well-being (Bauer et al., 2019; McAdams, 1989; McAdams & McLean, 2013). Importantly, life narratives often implicate close others. The storyteller's perception of other people and how they seek to build relationships are key themes in narrative storytelling (McAdams, 2005). Extracting reality (i.e., capturing "real" personality

change or “real” individual/dyadic PTG) from the retelling of a life is a challenging, but important, direction for future research (McAdams & McLean, 2013).

Another limitation of these studies is their lack of qualitative information about these life events—how people perceived the event itself. As acknowledged in the discussion of the Life Event Characteristics Scale (Luhmann et al., 2020), several characteristics can impact how an event influences a person (i.e., its valence, impact, predictability, challenge, emotional significance, etc.; Haehner et al., 2022; Rakhshani et al., 2022). I studied mostly discrete events (e.g. if someone experienced unemployment or not). However, additional detail would offer more context. For example, was the period of unemployment temporary? Was it financially ruinous? Was it buffered by having a partner with a lucrative or stable job? While some of this information (i.e., valence) was available in the CouPers sample, across studies I could not capture 1) the full context of each life event or 2) the full array of events that may be influential for people and their partners. One future direction could be assessing the qualitative impact of life events that happen to people in our social network.

Another potentially fruitful future direction lies in the differences between participant and partner perceptions of PTG. While the CouPers sample was an exploratory test of this question, it offered some evidence that perceptions of growth may vary between members of a couple. Although it would be difficult to test who has a more “accurate” view of personality change, partners might have a distance from their partner’s life events that help them evaluate it differently.

Final Conclusion

When introducing the topic of PTG in the introduction of this dissertation, I discussed the relative unreliability of this phenomenon (Infurna & Jayawickreme, 2019; Jayawickreme &

Blackie, 2014). Different work on the topic finds many mixed results, making it difficult to be confident about if the phenomenon exists, and, if so, under what conditions. The goal of this dissertation was to offer a stronger test of PTG than has historically existed and in a highly relevant context—that of close relationships. The findings detailed in this dissertation suggest that the occurrence of PTG is relatively rare and, when it does occur, the size of these effects s to be very small. And, while many of the relationship-relevant factors implicated in the process of growth did not have the anticipated effect, there was some evidence that relationships can improve alongside a negative event. While the results presented here are exploratory, future work exploring these results may help people identify and facilitate strengths in their relationships amidst challenging life experiences.

REFERENCES

Albuquerque, S., Pereira, M., & Narciso, I. (2016). Couple's relationship after the death of a child: A systematic review. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, *25*, 30-53.

Allemand, M., Hill, P. L., & Lehmann, R. (2015). Divorce and personality development across middle adulthood. *Personal Relationships*, *22*(1), 122-137.

Aron, A., & Aron, E. N. (1996). Self and self-expansion in relationships. *Knowledge structures in close relationships: A social psychological approach*, 325-344.

Aron, A., Aron, E. N., & Smollan, D. (1992). Inclusion of other in the self scale and the structure of interpersonal closeness. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, *63*(4), 596.

Aydogan, D., & Dincer, D. (2020). Creating resilient marriage relationships: Self-pruning and the mediation role sacrifice with satisfaction. *Current Psychology*, *39*(2), 500-510. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-019-00472-x

Backhans, M. C., & Hemmingsson, T. (2011). Unemployment and mental health—who is (not) affected? *European Journal of Public Health*, *22*(3), 429-433. https://doi.org/10.1093/eurpub/ckr059

Baird, K., & Kracen, A. C. (2006). Vicarious traumatization and secondary traumatic stress: A research synthesis. *Counselling Psychology Quarterly*, *19*(2), 181-188.

Bakhurst, M., McGuire, A., & Halford, W. K. (2018). Trauma symptoms, communication, and relationship satisfaction in military couples. *Family process*, *57*(1), 241-252.

Baník, G., Dědová, M., & Vargová, L. (2022). The Co-occurrence of Posttraumatic growth (PTG) and Posttraumatic stress disorder (PTSD) in cancer survivors from a network perspective.

Barre, K., De Boer, S., & Guarnaccia, C. (2023). Vicarious trauma and posttraumatic growth among victim support professionals. *Current Psychology*, 1-14.

Bashour, M. (2006). An objective system for measuring facial attractiveness. *Plastic and Reconstructive Surgery*, *118*(3), 757-774.

Bauer, J. J., Graham, L. E., Lauber, E. A., & Lynch, B. P. (2019). What growth sounds like: Redemption, self-improvement, and eudaimonic growth across different life narratives in relation to well-being. *Journal of personality*, *87*(3), 546-565.

Benjamin, D. J., Berger, J. O., Johannesson, M., Nosek, B. A., Wagenmakers, E.-J., Berk, R., . . . Camerer, C. (2018). Redefine statistical significance. *Nature human behaviour*, *2*(1), 6-10.

Bernerth, J. B., & Aguinis, H. (2016). A critical review and best-practice recommendations for control variable usage. *Personnel psychology*, *69*(1), 229-283.

Bialon, L. N., & Coke, S. (2012). A study on caregiver burden: stressors, challenges, and possible solutions. *American Journal of Hospice and Palliative Medicine®*, *29*(3), 210-218.

Bianchi, R. (2018). Burnout is more strongly linked to neuroticism than to work-contextualized factors. *Psychiatry Research*, *270*, 901-905.

Bleidorn, W., Buyukcan-Tetik, A., Schwaba, T., van Scheppingen, M. A., Denissen, J. J. A., & Finkenauer, C. (2016). Stability and Change in Self-Esteem During the Transition to Parenthood. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, *7*(6), 560-569. https://doi.org/10.1177/1948550616646428

Bleidorn, W., Hopwood, C. J., & Lucas, R. E. (2018). Life events and personality trait change. *Journal of personality*, *86*(1), 83-96.

Bleidorn, W., Schwaba, T., Zheng, A., Hopwood, C. J., Sosa, S. S., Roberts, B. W., & Briley, D. (2022). Personality stability and change: A meta-analysis of longitudinal studies. *Psychological bulletin*, *148*(7-8), 588.

Brazeau, H., & Lewis, N. A. (2021). Within-couple health behavior trajectories: The role of spousal support and strain. *Health Psychology*, *40*(2), 125.

Bühler, J. L., Orth, U., Bleidorn, W., Weber, E., Kretzschmar, A., Scheling, L., & Hopwood, C. J. (2023). Life events and personality change: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *European Journal of Personality*, 08902070231190219.

Calhoun, L. G., & Tedeschi, R. G. (2014). *Handbook of posttraumatic growth: Research and practice*. Routledge.

Canevello, A., & Crocker, J. (2010). Creating good relationships: responsiveness, relationship quality, and interpersonal goals. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, *99*(1), 78.

Canevello, A., & Crocker, J. (2011). Changing relationship growth belief: Intrapersonal and interpersonal consequences of compassionate goals. *Personal Relationships*, *18*(3), 370-391.

Canevello, A., Michels, V., & Hilaire, N. (2016). Supporting close others' growth after trauma: The role of responsiveness in romantic partners' mutual posttraumatic growth. *Psychological trauma: theory, research, practice, and policy*, *8*(3), 334.

Cann, A., Calhoun, L. G., Tedeschi, R. G., Taku, K., Vishnevsky, T., Triplett, K. N., & Danhauer, S. C. (2010). A short form of the Posttraumatic Growth Inventory. *Anxiety, Stress, & Coping*, *23*(2), 127-137.

Chopik, W. J., Kelley, W. L., Vie, L. L., Oh, J., Bonett, D. G., Lucas, R. E., & Seligman, M. E. P. (2021). Development of character strengths across the deployment cycle among U.S. Army soldiers. *Journal of Personality*, *89*(1), 23-34. https://doi.org/10.1111/jopy.12564

Christakis, N. A., & Fowler, J. H. (2007). The spread of obesity in a large social network over 32 years. *New England journal of medicine*, *357*(4), 370-379.

Cordova, M. J., Cunningham, L. L., Carlson, C. R., & Andrykowski, M. A. (2001). Posttraumatic growth following breast cancer: a controlled comparison study. *Health psychology*, *20*(3), 176.

Costa Jr, P. T., Terracciano, A., & McCrae, R. R. (2001). Gender differences in personality traits across cultures: robust and surprising findings. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, *81*(2), 322.

Costa, P. T., Herbst, J. H., McCrae, R. R., & Siegler, I. C. (2000). Personality at midlife: Stability, intrinsic maturation, and response to life events. *Assessment*, *7*(4), 365-378.

Dagan, M., Sanderman, R., Hoff, C., Meijerink, W. J. H. J., Baas, P. C., Van Haastert, M., & Hagedoorn, M. (2014). The interplay between partners' responsiveness and patients' need for emotional expression in couples coping with cancer. *Journal of Behavioral Medicine*, *37*(5), 828-838. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10865-013-9543-4

de Jong Gierveld, J., & Van Tilburg, T. G. (1987). The partner as source of social support in problem and non-problem situations. *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality*, *2*(2), 191-200.

DeLongis, A., Capreol, M., Holtzman, S., O'Brien, T., & Campbell, J. (2004). Social support and social strain among husbands and wives: a multilevel analysis. *Journal of family psychology*, *18*(3), 470.

Eisenthal, Y., Dror, G., & Ruppin, E. (2006). Facial attractiveness: Beauty and the machine. *Neural Computation*, *18*(1), 119-142.

Ezzy, D. (1993). Unemployment and mental health: a critical review. *Social science & medicine*, *37*(1), 41-52.

Fayed, C., Bartle-Haring, S., & Vanbergen, A. (2021). Interpersonal Trauma, Therapeutic Alliance and Relationship Satisfaction: A Dyadic Examination. *Contemporary Family Therapy*. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10591-021-09606-5

Fletcher, G. J. (2015). Accuracy and bias of judgments in romantic relationships. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, *24*(4), 292-297.

Fletcher, G. J., & Kerr, P. S. (2010). Through the eyes of love: reality and illusion in intimate relationships. *Psychological bulletin*, *136*(4), 627.

Frankfurt, S., Frazier, P., Syed, M., & Jung, K. R. (2016). Using group-based trajectory and growth mixture modeling to identify classes of change trajectories. *The Counseling Psychologist*, *44*(5), 622-660.

Fredman, S. J., Vorstenbosch, V., Wagner, A. C., Macdonald, A., & Monson, C. M. (2014). Partner accommodation in posttraumatic stress disorder: Initial testing of the Significant Others' Responses to Trauma Scale (SORTS). *Journal of Anxiety Disorders*, *28*(4), 372-381. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.janxdis.2014.04.001

Gander, F., Hofmann, J., Proyer, R. T., & Ruch, W. (2020). Character strengths–Stability, change, and relationships with well-being changes. *Applied Research in Quality of Life*, *15*(2), 349-367.

Gill-Emerson, G. (2015). The Trauma Contagion. *Trauma*, *15*(1).

Girme, Y. U., Maniaci, M. R., Reis, H. T., McNulty, J. K., Carmichael, C. L., Gable, S. L., . . . Overall, N. C. (2018). Does support need to be seen? Daily invisible support promotes next day relationship well-being. *Journal of Family Psychology*, *32*(7), 882.

Girme, Y. U., Overall, N. C., & Simpson, J. A. (2013). When visibility matters: Short-term versus long-term costs and benefits of visible and invisible support. *Personality and social psychology bulletin*, *39*(11), 1441-1454.

Goldberg, L. R. (1992). The development of markers for the Big-Five factor structure. *Psychological assessment*, *4*(1), 26.

Goodson, I. F. (2012). *Developing narrative theory: Life histories and personal representation*. Routledge.

Greene, T., Lahav, Y., Bronstein, I., & Solomon, Z. (2014). The role of ex-POWs' PTSD symptoms and trajectories in wives' secondary traumatization. *Journal of Family Psychology*, *28*(5), 666.

Haehner, P., Rakhshani, A., Fassbender, I., Lucas, R. E., Donnellan, M. B., & Luhmann, M. (2022). Perception of major life events and personality trait change. *European Journal of Personality*, 08902070221107973.

Hall, B. J., Hobfoll, S. E., Canetti, D., Johnson, R. J., Palmieri, P. A., & Galea, S. (2010). Exploring the association between posttraumatic growth and PTSD: a national study of Jews and Arabs following the 2006 Israeli-Hezbollah war. *The Journal of nervous and mental disease*, *198*(3), 180-186.

Hancock, J. T., Gee, K., Ciaccio, K., & Lin, J. M.-H. (2008). I'm sad you're sad: emotional contagion in CMC. Proceedings of the 2008 ACM conference on Computer supported cooperative work,

Helgeson, V. S., Reynolds, K. A., & Tomich, P. L. (2006). A meta-analytic review of benefit finding and growth. *Journal of consulting and clinical psychology*, *74*(5), 797.

Herrman, H., Stewart, D. E., Diaz-Granados, N., Berger, E. L., Jackson, B., & Yuen, T. (2011). What is resilience? *The Canadian Journal of Psychiatry*, *56*(5), 258-265.

Hiefner, A. R. (2021). Dyadic coping and couple resilience after miscarriage. *Family Relations*, *70*(1), 59-76.

Hill, A. L., Rand, D. G., Nowak, M. A., & Christakis, N. A. (2010). Emotions as infectious diseases in a large social network: the SISa model. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, *277*(1701), 3827-3835.

Hodges, L., Humphris, G., & Macfarlane, G. (2005). A meta-analytic investigation of the relationship between the psychological distress of cancer patients and their carers. *Social science & medicine*, *60*(1), 1-12.

Huggard, P., Law, J., & Newcombe, D. (2017). A systematic review exploring the presence of Vicarious Trauma, Compassion Fatigue, and Secondary Traumatic Stress in Alcohol and Other Drug Clinicians. *Australasian Journal of Disaster & Trauma Studies*, *21*(2).

Infurna, F. J., & Jayawickreme, E. (2019). Fixing the growth illusion: New directions for research in resilience and posttraumatic growth. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, *28*(2), 152-158.

Infurna, F. J., & Luthar, S. S. (2016). Resilience to major life stressors is not as common as thought. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, *11*(2), 175-194.

Isokääntä, S., Koivula, K., Kokki, H., Palokangas, S., Tavast, K., Toivonen, I., & Kokki, M. (2023). Psychiatric symptoms and couple satisfaction in parents of newborns before and during the COVID-19 pandemic—A comparison of two prospective studies. *Nursing Open*, *10*(4), 2667-2677. https://doi.org/10.1002/nop2.1475

Jayawickreme, E., & Blackie, L. E. (2014). Post–traumatic growth as positive personality change: evidence, controversies and future directions. *European Journal of Personality*, *28*(4), 312-331.

Jayawickreme, E., Infurna, F. J., Alajak, K., Blackie, L. E., Chopik, W. J., Chung, J. M., . . . Frazier, P. (2021). Post-traumatic growth as positive personality change: Challenges, opportunities, and recommendations. *Journal of personality*, *89*(1), 145-165.

Jiang, T., Canevello, A., & Crocker, J. (2022). How Relationships Foster Growth: Compassionate Goals Predict Growth-Seeking Through Perceived Available Support Independent of Relationship Security. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 01461672221080949.

John, O. P., & Srivastava, S. (1999). The Big-Five trait taxonomy: History, measurement, and theoretical perspectives.

Johnson, R. W. (2007). *The burden of caring for frail parents*. Urban Institute.

Joseph, S., & Linley, P. A. (2005). Positive adjustment to threatening events: An organismic valuing theory of growth through adversity. *Review of general psychology*, *9*(3), 262-280.

Jung, T., & Wickrama, K. A. (2008). An introduction to latent class growth analysis and growth mixture modeling. *Social and personality psychology compass*, *2*(1), 302-317.

Kanfer, R., & Bufton, G. (2015). Job loss, job search, and reemployment in later adulthood. *Encyclopedia of Geropsychology*, 1-11.

Karney, B. R., & Bradbury, T. N. (1995). The longitudinal course of marital quality and stability: A review of theory, methods, and research. *Psychological bulletin*, *118*(1), 3.

Kenny, D. A., Kashy, D. A., & Cook, W. L. (2006). The analysis of dyadic data. In: New York, NY: Guilford Press.

Kiełek-Rataj, E., Wendołowska, A., Kalus, A., & Czyżowska, D. (2020). Openness and communication effects on relationship satisfaction in women experiencing infertility or miscarriage: a dyadic approach. *International journal of environmental research and public health*, *17*(16), 5721.

Kimura, M., Daibo, I., & Yogo, M. (2008). The study of emotional contagion from the perspective of interpersonal relationships. *Social Behavior and Personality: an international journal*, *36*(1), 27-42.

Kramer, A. D., Guillory, J. E., & Hancock, J. T. (2014). Experimental evidence of massive-scale emotional contagion through social networks. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, *111*(24), 8788-8790.

Kunz, S., Joseph, S., Geyh, S., & Peter, C. (2019). Perceived posttraumatic growth and depreciation after spinal cord injury: Actual or illusory? *Health Psychology*, *38*(1), 53.

Lachman, M. E., & Weaver, S. L. (1997). The Midlife Development Inventory (MIDI) personality scales: Scale construction and scoring. *Waltham, MA: Brandeis University*, *7*, 1-9.

Lahav, Y., Kanat-Maymon, Y., & Solomon, Z. (2017). Posttraumatic growth and dyadic adjustment among war veterans and their wives. *Frontiers in psychology*, *8*, 1102.

Laurenceau, J.-P., Barrett, L. F., & Rovine, M. J. (2005). The interpersonal process model of intimacy in marriage: a daily-diary and multilevel modeling approach. *Journal of family psychology*, *19*(2), 314.

Leggett, A. N., Choi, H., Chopik, W. J., Liu, H., & Gonzalez, R. (2020). Early cognitive decline and its impact on Spouse's loneliness. *Research in human development*, *17*(1), 78-93.

Loeys, T., Cook, W., De Smet, O., Wietzker, A., & Buysse, A. (2014). The actor–partner interdependence model for categorical dyadic data: A user-friendly guide to GEE. *Personal Relationships*, *21*(2), 225-241.

Lucas, R. E., Clark, A. E., Georgellis, Y., & Diener, E. (2004). Unemployment alters the set point for life satisfaction. *Psychological science*, *15*(1), 8-13.

Luhmann, M., Fassbender, I., Alcock, M., & Haehner, P. (2020). A dimensional taxonomy of perceived characteristics of major life events. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*.

Luszczynska, A., Mohamed, N. E., & Schwarzer, R. (2005). Self-efficacy and social support predict benefit finding 12 months after cancer surgery: The mediating role of coping strategies. *Psychology, Health & Medicine*, *10*(4), 365-375.

Mangelsdorf, J., Eid, M., & Luhmann, M. (2019). Does growth require suffering? A systematic review and meta-analysis on genuine posttraumatic and postecstatic growth. *Psychological bulletin*, *145*(3), 302.

Mazzuca, S., Kafetsios, K., Livi, S., & Presaghi, F. (2019). Emotion regulation and satisfaction in long-term marital relationships: The role of emotional contagion. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, *36*(9), 2880-2895.

McAdams, D. P. (1989). The development of a narrative identity. In *Personality psychology: Recent trends and emerging directions* (pp. 160-174). Springer.

McAdams, D. P. (1996). Personality, modernity, and the storied self: A contemporary framework for studying persons. *Psychological inquiry*, *7*(4), 295-321.

McAdams, D. P. (2005). Studying lives in time: A narrative approach. *Advances in Life Course Research*, *10*, 237-258.

McAdams, D. P., & McLean, K. C. (2013). Narrative identity. *Current directions in psychological science*, *22*(3), 233-238.

McAdams, D. P., Reynolds, J., Lewis, M., Patten, A. H., & Bowman, P. J. (2001). When bad things turn good and good things turn bad: Sequences of redemption and contamination in life narrative and their relation to psychosocial adaptation in midlife adults and in students. *Personality and social psychology bulletin*, *27*(4), 474-485.

McCann, S. J. (2018). US state resident big five personality and work satisfaction: The importance of neuroticism. *Cross-Cultural Research*, *52*(2), 155-191.

McCrae, R. R. (1993). Moderated analyses of longitudinal personality stability. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, *65*(3), 577.

McCrae, R. R., Costa, P. T., de Lima, M. P., Simões, A., Ostendorf, F., Angleitner, A., . . . Barbaranelli, C. (1999). Age differences in personality across the adult life span: parallels in five cultures. *Developmental psychology*, *35*(2), 466.

McCrae, R. R., Stone, S. V., Fagan, P. J., & Costa Jr, P. T. (1998). Identifying causes of disagreement between self-reports and spouse ratings of personality. *Journal of personality*, *66*(3), 285-313.

McMillen, J. C. (2004). Posttraumatic growth: What's it all about? *Psychological Inquiry*, *15*(1), 48-52.

McNeillie, N., & Rose, J. (2021). Vicarious trauma in therapists: A meta-ethnographic review. *Behavioural and Cognitive Psychotherapy*, *49*(4), 426-440.

Mermelstein, R., Cohen, S., Lichtenstein, E., Baer, J. S., & Kamarck, T. (1986). Social support and smoking cessation and maintenance. *Journal of consulting and clinical psychology*, *54*(4), 447.

Morelli, S. A., Lee, I. A., Arnn, M. E., & Zaki, J. (2015). Emotional and instrumental support provision interact to predict well-being. *Emotion*, *15*(4), 484.

Neff, L. A., & Karney, B. R. (2005). To know you is to love you: The implications of global adoration and specific accuracy for marital relationships. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, *88*(3), 480.

Nenova, M., DuHamel, K., Zemon, V., Rini, C., & Redd, W. H. (2013). Posttraumatic growth, social support, and social constraint in hematopoietic stem cell transplant survivors. *Psycho-oncology*, *22*(1), 195-202.

Nietzsche, F., & Levy, O. (1909). *The twilight of the idols* (Vol. 17). Allen & Unwin.

Norling, L. R., & Chopik, W. J. (2020). The association between coworker support and work-family interference: A test of work environment and burnout as mediators. *Frontiers in psychology*, *11*, 819.

O'Neill, A. S., Mohr, C. D., Bodner, T. E., & Hammer, L. B. (2020). Perceived partner responsiveness, pain, and sleep: A dyadic study of military-connected couples. *Health Psychology*, *39*(12), 1089.

Okay, İ., & Güler, Ç. Y. (2021). Relationship dynamics: the protective effect of relationship satisfaction and dependency on parents' mental health after having a preterm baby. *Health Psychology Report*, *9*(1).

Oltmanns, J. R., Jackson, J. J., & Oltmanns, T. F. (2020). Personality change: Longitudinal self-other agreement and convergence with retrospective-reports. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 118*(5), 1065.

Pals, J. L., & McAdams, D. P. (2004). The transformed self: A narrative understanding of posttraumatic growth. *Psychological Inquiry*, 65-69.

Paulhus, D. L., & Vazire, S. (2007). The self-report method. *Handbook of research methods in personality psychology*, *1*(2007), 224-239.

Peterson, C., & Seligman, M. E. (2003). Character strengths before and after September 11. *Psychological Science*, *14*(4), 381-384.

Pickett, C. L., Gardner, W. L., & Knowles, M. (2004). Getting a cue: The need to belong and enhanced sensitivity to social cues. *Personality and social psychology bulletin*, *30*(9), 1095-1107.

Prochazkova, E., & Kret, M. E. (2017). Connecting minds and sharing emotions through mimicry: A neurocognitive model of emotional contagion. *Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews*, *80*, 99-114.

Purol, M. F., & Chopik, W. J. (2022). Partner accuracy in humor perception and associations with relationship satisfaction. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 01461672221080950.

Purol, M. F., & Chopik, W. J. (2024). Do many hands make light work? The role of romantic partners and close relationships in post-traumatic growth. In. American Psychologist.

Racine, N., Plamondon, A., Hentges, R., Tough, S., & Madigan, S. (2019). Dynamic and bidirectional associations between maternal stress, anxiety, and social support: the critical role of partner and family support. *Journal of affective disorders*, *252*, 19-24.

Rakhshani, A., Lucas, R. E., Donnellan, M. B., Fassbender, I., & Luhmann, M. (2022). Personality traits and perceptions of major life events. *European Journal of Personality*, *36*(4), 683-703.

Ram, N., & Grimm, K. J. (2009). Methods and measures: Growth mixture modeling: A method for identifying differences in longitudinal change among unobserved groups. *International journal of behavioral development*, *33*(6), 565-576.

Randall, A. K., & Bodenmann, G. (2009). The role of stress on close relationships and marital satisfaction. *Clinical Psychology Review*, *29*(2), 105-115. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpr.2008.10.004

Randall, A. K., & Bodenmann, G. (2017). Stress and its associations with relationship satisfaction. *Current opinion in psychology*, *13*, 96-106.

Reis, H. T. (2012). Perceived partner responsiveness as an organizing theme for the study of relationships and well-being.

Reis, H. T., & Clark, M. S. (2013). Responsiveness.

Reis, H. T., & Shaver, P. R. (1988). Intimacy as an interpersonal process. In S. Duck, D. F. Hay, S. E. Hobfoll, W. Ickes, & B. M. Montgomery (Eds.), *Handbook of personal relationships: Theory, research and interventions* (pp. 367-389). Wiley.

Rini, C., Schetter, C. D., Hobel, C. J., Glynn, L. M., & Sandman, C. A. (2006). Effective social support: Antecedents and consequences of partner support during pregnancy. *Personal Relationships*, *13*(2), 207-229.

Riva, R., Forinder, U., Arvidson, J., Mellgren, K., Toporski, J., Winiarski, J., & Norberg, A. L. (2014). Patterns of psychological responses in parents of children that underwent stem cell transplantation. *Psycho-Oncology*, *23*(11), 1307-1313.

Roberts, B. W., Kuncel, N. R., Shiner, R., Caspi, A., & Goldberg, L. R. (2007). The power of personality: The comparative validity of personality traits, socioeconomic status, and cognitive ability for predicting important life outcomes. *Perspectives on Psychological science*, *2*(4), 313-345.

Rosenquist, J. N., Fowler, J. H., & Christakis, N. A. (2011). Social network determinants of depression. *Molecular psychiatry*, *16*(3), 273-281.

Sachschal, J., Woodward, E., Wichelmann, J. M., Haag, K., & Ehlers, A. (2019). Differential effects of poor recall and memory disjointedness on trauma symptoms. *Clinical Psychological Science*, *7*(5), 1032-1041.

Saenz, J. L. (2021). Spousal Support, Spousal Strain, and Loneliness in Older Mexican Couples. *The Journals of Gerontology: Series B*, *76*(4), e176-e186. https://doi.org/10.1093/geronb/gbaa194

Schroevers, M. J., Helgeson, V. S., Sanderman, R., & Ranchor, A. V. (2010). Type of social support matters for prediction of posttraumatic growth among cancer survivors. *Psycho-Oncology*, *19*(1), 46-53.

Schulz, U., & Mohamed, N. E. (2004). Turning the tide: Benefit finding after cancer surgery. *Social science & medicine*, *59*(3), 653-662.

Schwab, R. (1998). A child's death and divorce: Dispelling the myth. *Death studies*, *22*(5), 445-468.

Schwaba, T., Bleidorn, W., Hopwood, C. J., Manuck, S. B., & Wright, A. G. (2022). Refining the maturity principle of personality development by examining facets, close others, and comaturation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*.

Sejourne, N., Callahan, S., & Chabrol, H. (2010). Support following miscarriage: what women want. *Journal of Reproductive and Infant Psychology*, *28*(4), 403-411.

Selcuk, E., Gunaydin, G., Ong, A. D., & Almeida, D. M. (2016). Does Partner Responsiveness Predict Hedonic and Eudaimonic Well-being? A 10-Year Longitudinal Study. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 78*(2), 311-325. https://doi.org/10.1111/jomf.12272

Shrout, P. E., Herman, C. M., & Bolger, N. (2006). The costs and benefits of practical and emotional support on adjustment: A daily diary study of couples experiencing acute stress. *Personal Relationships, 13*(1), 115-134.

Sim, A., Cordier, R., Vaz, S., & Falkmer, T. (2019). "We are in this together": Experiences of relationship satisfaction in couples raising a child with autism spectrum disorder. *Research in Autism Spectrum Disorders*, *58*, 39-51.

Smith, K. V., & Ehlers, A. (2020). Cognitive predictors of grief trajectories in the first months of loss: A latent growth mixture model. *Journal of consulting and clinical psychology*, *88*(2), 93.

Smith, L. E., Bernal, D. R., Schwartz, B. S., Whitt, C. L., Christman, S. T., Donnelly, S., . . . Kish, J. (2014). Coping with vicarious trauma in the aftermath of a natural disaster. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development*, *42*(1), 2-12.

Smyth, J. M., Hockemeyer, J. R., Heron, K. E., Wonderlich, S. A., & Pennebaker, J. W. (2008). Prevalence, type, disclosure, and severity of adverse life events in college students. *Journal of American College Health*, *57*(1), 69-76.

Specht, J., Egloff, B., & Schmukle, S. C. (2011a). Stability and change of personality across the life course: the impact of age and major life events on mean-level and rank-order stability of the Big Five. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, *101*(4), 862.

Specht, J., Egloff, B., & Schmukle, S. C. (2011b). Stability and change of personality across the life course: The impact of age and major life events on mean-level and rank-order stability of the Big Five. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *101*(4), 862-882. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0024950

Sumalla, E. C., Ochoa, C., & Blanco, I. (2009). Posttraumatic growth in cancer: reality or illusion? *Clinical psychology review*, *29*(1), 24-33.

Syed, M., & McLean, K. C. (2022). Who gets to live the good life? Master narratives, identity, and well-being within a marginalizing society. *Journal of Research in Personality*, *100*, 104285.

Talley, A., Molix, L., Schlegel, R. J., & Bettencourt, A. (2010). The influence of breast cancer survivors' perceived partner social support and need satisfaction on depressive symptoms: a longitudinal analysis. *Psychology and Health*, *25*(4), 433-449.

Taylor, S. E. (2011). Social support: A review.

Tedeschi, R. G., & Calhoun, L. G. (1996). The Posttraumatic Growth Inventory: Measuring the positive legacy of trauma. *Journal of traumatic stress*, *9*(3), 455-471.

Tennen, H., & Affleck, G. (1998). Personality and transformation in me face of adversity. *Posttraumatic growth: Positive changes in the aftermath of crisis*, 65-98.

Thornton, A. A., & Perez, M. A. (2006). Posttraumatic growth in prostate cancer survivors and their partners. *Psycho-Oncology*, *15*(4), 285-296. https://doi.org/10.1002/pon.953

Trail, T. E., & Karney, B. R. (2012). What's (Not) Wrong With Low-Income Marriages. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, *74*(3), 413-427. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3737.2012.00977.x

Van der Kolk, B. A., & Fisler, R. (1995). Dissociation and the fragmentary nature of traumatic memories: Overview and exploratory study. *Journal of traumatic stress*, *8*, 505-525.

van Scheppingen, M. A., Denissen, J. J. A., Chung, J. M., Tambs, K., & Bleidorn, W. (2018). Self-esteem and relationship satisfaction during the transition to motherhood. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *114*(6), 973-991. https://doi.org/10.1037/pspp0000156

Vanbergen, A., Blalock, J., Bryant, A., Bortz, P., & Bartle-Haring, S. (2020). Couples and Trauma History: A Descriptive Overview of Interpersonal Trauma and Clinical Outcomes. *Contemporary Family Therapy*, *42*(4), 335-345. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10591-020-09548-4

Vazire, S. (2010). Who knows what about a person? The self–other knowledge asymmetry (SOKA) model. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, *98*(2), 281.

Verhaeghe, S., Defloor, T., & Grypdonck, M. (2005). Stress and coping among families of patients with traumatic brain injury: a review of the literature. *Journal of Clinical Nursing*, *14*(8), 1004-1012. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2702.2005.01126.x

Vukasović, T., & Bratko, D. (2015). Heritability of personality: A meta-analysis of behavior genetic studies. *Psychological bulletin*, *141*(4), 769.

Watson, D., & Humrichouse, J. (2006). Personality development in emerging adulthood: integrating evidence from self-ratings and spouse ratings. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *91*(5), 959.

Weiss, T. (2002). Posttraumatic growth in women with breast cancer and their husbands: An intersubjective validation study. *Journal of psychosocial Oncology*, *20*(2), 65-80.

Weiss, T. (2004). Correlates of posttraumatic growth in husbands of breast cancer survivors. *Psycho-Oncology*, *13*(4), 260-268. https://doi.org/10.1002/pon.735

Wick, S., & Nelson Goff, B. S. (2014). A qualitative analysis of military couples with high and low trauma symptoms and relationship distress levels. *Journal of Couple & Relationship Therapy*, *13*(1), 63-88.

Williamson, H. C. (2020). Early effects of the COVID-19 pandemic on relationship satisfaction and attributions. *Psychological Science*, *31*(12), 1479-1487.

Williamson, H. C., Bradbury, T. N., & Karney, B. R. (2021). Experiencing a natural disaster temporarily boosts relationship satisfaction in newlywed couples. *Psychological science*, *32*(11), 1709-1719.

Wofford, N., Defever, A. M., & Chopik, W. J. (2019). The vicarious effects of discrimination: How partner experiences of discrimination affect individual health. *Social psychological and personality science*, *10*(1), 121-130.

Yoon, M.-S., Jeon, Y.-B., & Lee, S.-B. (2022). Grief, Partner Support, Posttraumatic Growth among Women with Pregnancy Loss in Korea. *Journal of Loss and Trauma*, 1-11.

Zhang, X., Deng, X., Mo, Y., Li, Y., Song, X., & Li, H. (2021). Relationship between infertility-related stress and resilience with posttraumatic growth in infertile couples: gender differences and dyadic interaction. *Human Reproduction*, *36*(7), 1862-1870.

Zwahlen, D., Hagenbuch, N., Carley, M. I., Jenewein, J., & Buchi, S. (2010). Posttraumatic growth in cancer patients and partners—effects of role, gender and the dyad on couples' posttraumatic growth experience. *Psycho-oncology*, *19*(1), 12-20.

Ávila, M., Coimbra, J. L., Park, C. L., & Matos, P. M. (2017). Attachment and posttraumatic growth after breast cancer: A dyadic approach. *Psycho-oncology*, *26*(11), 1929-1935.

APPENDIX A: TABLES FOR CHAPTER 2

Table 1. Frequency of life events; HRS sample.

Life event	Frequency (% of sample)
Moved	5126 (37.6%)
Birth of child	1035 (7.6%)
Death of child	1515 (11.1%)
New chronic illness	7885 (57.8%)
Negative change in health	13050 (95.7%)
Positive change in health	1506 (11%)
Death of parent	2992 (21.9%)
New job	3771 (27.6%)
Retirement	5011 (36.7%)
Unemployment	643 (4.7%)

Table 2. Descriptives of and correlations between traits and spousal support/strain; averaged across waves; HRS sample.

	Mean	SD	A	C	E	N	O	Spousal support
A	3.521	0.404	1					
C	3.407	0.393	.463**	1				
E	3.205	0.490	.577**	.427**	1			
N	1.952	0.493	-.152**	-.267**	-.250**	1		
O	2.936	0.477	.444**	.484**	.556**	-.234**	1	
Spousal support	3.502	0.613	.119**	.151**	.167**	-.208**	.142**	1
Spousal strain	1.947	0.669	-.086**	-.130**	-.089**	.262**	-.047**	-.535**

Note. ** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed). Traits abbreviated to their first initial.

Table 3. Biserial correlations between life events within couples; HRS sample.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1. A: Moving	1								
2. P: Moving	1.000**	1							
3. A: Birth of child	.052**	.052**	1						
4. P: Birth of child	.050**	.050**	.851**	1					
5. A: Death of child	.054**	.054**	.239**	.215**	1				
6. P:Death of child	.049**	.049**	.211**	.239**	.808**	1			
7. A: New chronic illness	.054**	.054**	.027**	.019**	.068**	.045**	1		
8. P: New chronic illness	.047**	.047**	.015**	.033**	.036**	.068**	.093**	1	
9. A: Negative health change	.018**	.018**	.030**	0.008	.042**	0.007	.155**	.076**	1
10. P: Negative health change	0.005	0.005	0.005	.041**	-0.001	.055**	.062**	.192**	.201**
11. A: Positive health change	.048**	.048**	.057**	.049**	.040**	.032**	.046**	.013*	.020**
12. P: Positive health change	.040**	.040**	.044**	.052**	.029**	.041**	.016**	.048**	.011*
13. A: Parent dies	0.000	0.000	.015**	.011*	-.025**	-.029**	.035**	.027**	.074**
14. P: Parent dies	-0.008	-0.008	0.006	.014**	-.042**	-.020**	.024**	.047**	.050**
15. A: New job	.043**	.043**	.041**	.037**	-.015**	-.014**	.017**	.013*	.059**
16. P: New job	.038**	.038**	.034**	.046**	-.019**	-0.005	0.010	.029**	.029**
17. A: Retirement	.048**	.048**	.017**	-0.001	.040**	0.011	.117**	.068**	.110**
18. P: Retirement	.038**	.038**	-0.005	.021**	0.001	.041**	.072**	.137**	.055**
19. A: Unemployment	.031**	.031**	.032**	.028**	-0.010	-.013*	.025**	.021**	.028**
20. P: Unemployment	.024**	.024**	.030**	.038**	-.016**	-0.009	.020**	.029**	.017**

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level, *Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level. A indicates actor life event, P indicates partner life event.

Table 3 (cont'd)

10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19
1									
0.009	1								
.022**	.038**	1							
.058**	-.015**	-0.002	1						
.093**	-0.006	-.015**	.129**	1					
.036**	-.012*	-0.008	.128**	.119**	1				
.081**	-0.009	-0.010	.123**	.137**	.190**	1			
.048**	.040**	0.010	.087**	.072**	.130**	.055**	1		
.135**	0.005	.046**	.085**	.106**	.063**	.134**	.190**	1	
.022**	.015**	.020**	.065**	.043**	.205**	.058**	.082**	.030**	1
.035**	.023**	.012*	.046**	.069**	.061**	.210**	.026**	.087**	.062**

Table 4. Linear growth curve model examining the effect of actor and partner life events on the slope of agreeableness; HRS sample.

	b	*SE*	*df*	*t*	*p*	*LB*	*UB*
Intercept	**3.409**	**0.059**	**8744.162**	**58.208**	**0.000**	**3.295**	**3.524**
Slope	0.019	0.013	15420.550	1.462	0.144	-0.007	0.045
Actor: Moving	-0.008	0.009	5894.176	-0.887	0.375	-0.025	0.010
Actor: Birth of a child	0.000	0.018	7517.880	-0.009	0.992	-0.035	0.035
Actor: death of a child	0.011	0.014	7267.828	0.781	0.435	-0.016	0.038
Actor: New chronic illness	**-0.022**	**0.008**	**10909.284**	**-2.699**	**0.007**	**-0.038**	**-0.006**
Partner: New chronic illness	-0.005	0.008	10968.408	-0.555	0.579	-0.021	0.011
Actor: Negative health change	-0.010	0.035	13860.510	-0.300	0.764	-0.079	0.058
Partner: Negative health change	-0.015	0.022	11949.289	-0.680	0.497	-0.057	0.028
Actor: Positive health change	-0.009	0.013	10882.875	-0.672	0.501	-0.034	0.016
Partner: Positive health change	0.005	0.013	10526.573	0.373	0.710	-0.020	0.029
Actor: Parent dies	-0.012	0.010	10091.308	-1.271	0.204	-0.032	0.007
Partner: Parent dies	-0.002	0.010	10800.031	-0.207	0.836	-0.021	0.017
Actor: New job	**0.052**	**0.009**	**10699.549**	**5.575**	**<.001**	**0.034**	**0.070**
Partner: New job	-0.003	0.009	10727.968	-0.322	0.747	-0.021	0.015
Actor: Retirement	0.003	0.008	10411.163	0.360	0.719	-0.013	0.019
Partner: Retirement	0.002	0.008	10999.478	0.221	0.825	-0.015	0.018
Actor: Unemployment	0.011	0.019	10788.423	0.550	0.583	-0.027	0.049
Partner: Unemployment	**-0.051**	**0.019**	**10339.470**	**-2.689**	**0.007**	**-0.089**	**-0.014**
Age	0.000	0.001	9003.304	-0.348	0.728	-0.001	0.001
Gender	**-0.138**	**0.004**	**6431.481**	**-36.667**	**<.001**	**-0.145**	**-0.130**
PersonOfColor	**-0.024**	**0.010**	**8025.988**	**-2.323**	**0.020**	**-0.044**	**-0.004**
Education	**0.012**	**0.001**	**10992.963**	**8.226**	**<.001**	**0.009**	**0.015**
Wealth	0.000	0.003	6696.546	0.167	0.867	-0.005	0.006

Table 4 (cont'd)

MarLength	**-0.011**	**0.005**	**7312.221**	**-2.208**	**0.027**	**-0.021**	**-0.001**
Slope* Actor: Moving	0.000	0.002	3701.840	-0.227	0.820	-0.004	0.003
Slope* Actor: Birth of a child	-0.001	0.004	4592.456	-0.150	0.880	-0.009	0.007
Slope* Actor: death of a child	-0.003	0.003	3786.218	-0.961	0.337	-0.009	0.003
Slope* Actor: New chronic illness	-0.002	0.002	7202.782	-0.814	0.416	-0.006	0.002
Slope* Partner: New chronic illness	-0.002	0.002	7263.403	-1.159	0.246	-0.006	0.002
Slope* Actor: Negative health change	**-0.027**	**0.013**	**16968.540**	**-2.154**	**0.031**	**-0.052**	**-0.002**
Slope* Partner: Negative health change	-0.004	0.006	7838.114	-0.738	0.461	-0.016	0.007
Slope* Actor: Positive health change	**-0.007**	**0.003**	**7123.923**	**-2.431**	**0.015**	**-0.013**	**-0.001**
Slope* Partner: Positive health change	-0.001	0.003	6698.529	-0.181	0.857	-0.007	0.005
Slope* Actor: Parent dies	**0.010**	**0.002**	**6233.762**	**4.652**	**<.001**	**0.006**	**0.014**
Slope* Partner: Parent dies	0.003	0.002	6634.993	1.549	0.121	-0.001	0.008
Slope* Actor: New job	0.004	0.002	6645.412	1.724	0.085	-0.001	0.008
Slope* Partner: New job	**0.005**	**0.002**	**6817.338**	**2.147**	**0.032**	**0.000**	**0.009**
Slope* Actor: Retirement	0.000	0.002	6622.909	0.165	0.869	-0.003	0.004
Slope* Partner: Retirement	0.002	0.002	6783.691	0.842	0.400	-0.002	0.006
Slope* Actor: Unemployment	-0.003	0.004	6832.372	-0.557	0.578	-0.011	0.006
Slope* Partner: Unemployment	0.000	0.005	6945.370	-0.081	0.935	-0.009	0.009

Note. Significant effects bolded, $p < .05$

Table 5. Linear growth curve model examining the effect of actor/partner life events and spousal support on the slope of agreeableness; HRS sample.

	b	*SE*	*df*	*t*	*p*	*LB*	*UB*
Intercept	**3.380**	**0.061**	**8538.755**	**55.843**	**0.000**	**3.261**	**3.499**
Slope	-0.001	0.015	12181.373	-0.044	0.965	-0.030	0.029
Actor: Moving	-0.009	0.009	5651.757	-0.973	0.331	-0.026	0.009
Actor: Birth of a child	-0.003	0.018	6973.108	-0.148	0.882	-0.038	0.033
Actor: death of a child	0.008	0.014	6714.878	0.538	0.590	-0.020	0.035
Actor: New chronic illness	-0.019	0.008	10651.022	-2.271	0.023	-0.035	-0.003
Partner: New chronic illness	-0.006	0.008	10697.590	-0.739	0.460	-0.022	0.010
Actor: Negative health change	0.020	0.037	12649.054	0.541	0.588	-0.052	0.092
Partner: Negative health change	0.008	0.028	12625.642	0.289	0.773	-0.047	0.064
Actor: Positive health change	-0.005	0.013	10835.733	-0.353	0.724	-0.030	0.021
Partner: Positive health change	0.011	0.013	10399.947	0.869	0.385	-0.014	0.036
Actor: Parent dies	-0.017	0.010	9773.641	-1.694	0.090	-0.036	0.003
Partner: Parent dies	-0.003	0.010	10260.720	-0.273	0.785	-0.022	0.017
Actor: New job	**0.049**	**0.009**	**10314.991**	**5.193**	**<.001**	**0.030**	**0.067**
Partner: New job	-0.006	0.009	10231.515	-0.631	0.528	-0.024	0.012
Actor: Retirement	0.005	0.008	10224.915	0.575	0.565	-0.012	0.021
Partner: Retirement	0.001	0.009	10533.458	0.163	0.870	-0.015	0.018
Actor: Unemployment	0.012	0.020	10440.267	0.624	0.532	-0.026	0.051
Partner: Unemployment	-0.044	0.019	10038.443	-2.267	0.023	-0.081	-0.006
Age	0.000	0.001	8877.171	0.017	0.987	-0.001	0.001
Gender	**-0.148**	**0.004**	**6454.702**	**-38.399**	**<.001**	**-0.155**	**-0.140**
PersonOfColor	-0.014	0.010	7822.858	-1.383	0.167	-0.034	0.006
Education	**0.011**	**0.001**	**10735.339**	**7.521**	**<.001**	**0.008**	**0.014**
Wealth	-0.002	0.003	6575.623	-0.552	0.581	-0.007	0.004
MarLength	-0.011	0.005	7136.633	-2.240	0.025	-0.021	-0.001
SpouseSupport	**0.278**	**0.071**	**14812.524**	**3.938**	**<.001**	**0.140**	**0.416**
Actor: Moving*Support	0.011	0.009	23471.026	1.130	0.259	-0.008	0.029
Actor: Birth of a child*Support	0.018	0.018	23951.097	1.006	0.315	-0.017	0.054
Actor: death of a child*Support	**-0.041**	**0.013**	**22456.899**	**-3.037**	**0.002**	**-0.067**	**-0.015**
Actor: New chronic illness*Support	-0.002	0.010	23651.959	-0.170	0.865	-0.021	0.017
Partner: New chronic illness*Support	0.002	0.010	23998.072	0.176	0.861	-0.017	0.021

Table 5 (cont'd)

Actor: Negative health change*Support	**-0.195**	**0.067**	**13717.548**	**-2.893**	**0.004**	**-0.327**	**-0.063**

Table 5 cont'd

Partner: Negative health change*Support	-0.006	0.028	15524.358	-0.221	0.825	-0.062	0.049
Actor: Positive health change*Support	0.028	0.014	23382.402	2.045	0.041	0.001	0.055
Partner: Positive health change*Support	-0.014	0.013	22890.776	-1.071	0.284	-0.040	0.012
Actor: Parent dies*Support	-0.012	0.011	22225.863	-1.064	0.288	-0.033	0.010
Partner: Parent dies*Support	0.008	0.011	24723.683	0.733	0.463	-0.014	0.030
Actor: New job*Support	-0.016	0.010	23958.695	-1.571	0.116	-0.037	0.004
Partner: New job*Support	0.002	0.011	22961.772	0.237	0.812	-0.018	0.023
Actor: Retirement*Support	-0.013	0.009	23275.875	-1.431	0.152	-0.032	0.005
Partner: Retirement*Support	**0.028**	**0.010**	**24705.851**	**2.877**	**0.004**	**0.009**	**0.047**
Actor: Unemployment*Support	-0.013	0.020	24787.131	-0.622	0.534	-0.052	0.027
Partner: Unemployment*Support	-0.002	0.020	23495.106	-0.096	0.924	-0.042	0.038
Slope*Support	0.040	0.024	15290.390	1.665	0.096	-0.007	0.087
Slope* Actor: Moving	-0.001	0.002	3156.669	-0.445	0.656	-0.005	0.003
Slope* Actor: Birth of a child	-0.001	0.004	3948.902	-0.157	0.875	-0.009	0.008
Slope* Actor: death of a child	-0.004	0.003	3102.449	-1.115	0.265	-0.010	0.003
Slope* Actor: New chronic illness	-0.002	0.002	6551.781	-0.743	0.458	-0.006	0.003
Slope* Partner: New chronic illness	-0.002	0.002	6645.628	-1.141	0.254	-0.007	0.002
Slope* Actor: Negative health change	-0.016	0.013	15686.786	-1.218	0.223	-0.042	0.010
Slope* Partner: Negative health change	0.007	0.010	14481.256	0.720	0.471	-0.012	0.026
Slope* Actor: Positive health change	-0.007	0.003	6642.746	-2.172	0.030	-0.014	-0.001
Slope* Partner: Positive health change	-0.001	0.003	5974.579	-0.180	0.857	-0.007	0.006

Table 5 (cont'd)

Slope* Actor: Parent dies	**0.009**	**0.002**	**5526.592**	**3.783**	**<.001**	**0.004**	**0.013**
Slope* Partner: Parent dies	0.003	0.002	5677.266	1.457	0.145	-0.001	0.008
Slope* Actor: New job	0.002	0.002	5872.448	0.928	0.353	-0.002	0.007
Slope* Partner: New job	0.004	0.002	5837.316	1.685	0.092	-0.001	0.008
Slope* Actor: Retirement	0.000	0.002	5940.506	0.176	0.860	-0.004	0.004
Slope* Partner: Retirement	0.001	0.002	6002.202	0.360	0.719	-0.003	0.005
Slope* Actor: Unemployment	-0.003	0.005	5997.018	-0.602	0.547	-0.012	0.006
Slope* Partner: Unemployment	-0.002	0.005	5684.418	-0.350	0.726	-0.011	0.008
Slope* Actor: Negative health change* Support	-0.044	0.024	15381.487	-1.852	0.064	-0.091	0.003
Slope* Actor: Positive health change* Support	0.003	0.005	12198.830	0.631	0.528	-0.007	0.013
Slope* Actor: Parent dies* Support	0.003	0.004	7908.704	0.889	0.374	-0.004	0.011
Slope* Partner: New job* Support	0.000	0.004	8774.288	0.107	0.914	-0.007	0.007

Note. Significant effects bolded, $p < .01$

Table 6. Linear growth curve model examining the effect of actor and partner life events on the slope of conscientiousness; HRS sample.

	b	*SE*	*df*	*t*	*p*	*LB*	*UB*
Intercept	**3.078**	**0.057**	**8558.268**	**53.688**	**0.000**	**2.965**	**3.190**
Slope	**0.035**	**0.013**	**15063.576**	**2.645**	**0.008**	**0.009**	**0.061**
Actor: Moving	0.007	0.009	5758.811	0.758	0.449	-0.010	0.023
Actor: Birth of a child	-0.005	0.017	7285.560	-0.315	0.753	-0.040	0.029
Actor: death of a child	0.001	0.013	7038.413	0.066	0.947	-0.026	0.027
Actor: New chronic illness	**-0.037**	**0.008**	**11102.553**	**-4.504**	**<.001**	**-0.053**	**-0.021**
Partner: New chronic illness	**-0.036**	**0.008**	**11100.426**	**-4.351**	**<.001**	**-0.052**	**-0.020**
Actor: Negative health change	-0.044	0.035	13847.964	-1.272	0.203	-0.112	0.024
Partner: Negative health change	0.007	0.022	12284.580	0.335	0.738	-0.036	0.051
Actor: Positive health change	-0.007	0.013	10916.722	-0.527	0.598	-0.031	0.018
Partner: Positive health change	0.000	0.013	10935.151	0.036	0.972	-0.024	0.025
Actor: Parent dies	0.002	0.010	10450.561	0.208	0.836	-0.017	0.021
Partner: Parent dies	0.008	0.010	10681.145	0.862	0.389	-0.011	0.028
Actor: New job	**0.057**	**0.009**	**10739.390**	**6.129**	**<.001**	**0.039**	**0.076**
Partner: New job	0.005	0.009	10844.538	0.558	0.577	-0.013	0.023
Actor: Retirement	0.000	0.008	10547.688	0.002	0.998	-0.016	0.016
Partner: Retirement	0.001	0.008	10812.567	0.105	0.916	-0.016	0.017
Actor: Unemployment	-0.017	0.019	10604.804	-0.861	0.390	-0.054	0.021
Partner: Unemployment	-0.005	0.019	10699.433	-0.242	0.809	-0.042	0.033
Age	**-0.005**	**0.001**	**8883.248**	**-8.887**	**<.001**	**-0.006**	**-0.004**
Gender	**-0.056**	**0.004**	**6377.507**	**-14.595**	**<.001**	**-0.063**	**-0.048**
PersonOfColor	0.004	0.010	7828.781	0.419	0.675	-0.016	0.024
Education	**0.021**	**0.001**	**10567.735**	**14.676**	**<.001**	**0.018**	**0.024**
Wealth	**0.031**	**0.003**	**6635.127**	**11.467**	**<.001**	**0.026**	**0.037**
MarLength	-0.008	0.005	7181.476	-1.701	0.089	-0.018	0.001
Slope* Actor: Moving	-0.001	0.002	3733.220	-0.522	0.601	-0.005	0.003
Slope* Actor: Birth of a child	0.001	0.004	4620.678	0.234	0.815	-0.007	0.009

Table 6 (cont'd)

Slope* Actor: death of a child	**-0.010**	**0.003**	**3835.154**	**-3.100**	**0.002**	**-0.016**	**-0.004**
Slope* Actor: New chronic illness	**-0.008**	**0.002**	**7160.780**	**-3.690**	**<.001**	**-0.012**	**-0.004**
Slope* Partner: New chronic illness	**-0.005**	**0.002**	**7187.390**	**-2.395**	**0.017**	**-0.009**	**-0.001**
Slope* Actor: Negative health change	**-0.045**	**0.013**	**16925.674**	**-3.585**	**<.001**	**-0.070**	**-0.020**
Slope* Partner: Negative health change	-0.003	0.006	7994.038	-0.438	0.661	-0.015	0.010
Slope* Actor: Positive health change	0.000	0.003	6984.929	0.072	0.943	-0.006	0.006
Slope* Partner: Positive health change	0.003	0.003	6678.576	1.068	0.286	-0.003	0.009
Slope* Actor: Parent dies	**0.012**	**0.002**	**6150.006**	**5.478**	**<.001**	**0.008**	**0.017**
Slope* Partner: Parent dies	**0.005**	**0.002**	**6472.871**	**2.356**	**0.019**	**0.001**	**0.010**
Slope* Actor: New job	0.004	0.002	6535.511	1.620	0.105	-0.001	0.008
Slope* Partner: New job	**0.007**	**0.002**	**6710.552**	**3.296**	**<.001**	**0.003**	**0.012**
Slope* Actor: Retirement	0.000	0.002	6538.803	0.083	0.934	-0.004	0.004
Slope* Partner: Retirement	0.004	0.002	6668.569	1.814	0.070	0.000	0.008
Slope* Actor: Unemployment	0.002	0.005	6595.397	0.329	0.742	-0.008	0.011
Slope* Partner: Unemployment	0.001	0.005	6844.617	0.302	0.762	-0.008	0.011

Note. Significant effects bolded, $p < .05$

Table 7. Linear growth curve model examining the effect of actor/partner life events and spousal support on the slope of conscientiousness; HRS sample.

	b	*SE*	*df*	*t*	*p*	*LB*	*UB*
Intercept	**3.092**	**0.059**	**8216.188**	**52.474**	**0.000**	**2.977**	**3.208**
Slope	0.035	0.015	11997.803	2.339	0.019	0.006	0.064
Actor: Moving	0.007	0.009	5456.135	0.789	0.430	-0.010	0.024
Actor: Birth of a child	-0.012	0.017	6683.794	-0.677	0.498	-0.046	0.022
Actor: death of a child	-0.001	0.014	6381.006	-0.056	0.955	-0.028	0.026
Actor: New chronic illness	**-0.032**	**0.008**	**10672.096**	**-3.828**	**<.001**	**-0.048**	**-0.015**
Partner: New chronic illness	**-0.035**	**0.008**	**10661.216**	**-4.299**	**<.001**	**-0.052**	**-0.019**
Actor: Negative health change	-0.027	0.036	12561.208	-0.734	0.463	-0.098	0.045
Partner: Negative health change	0.000	0.028	12420.757	-0.017	0.987	-0.056	0.055
Actor: Positive health change	-0.005	0.013	10647.728	-0.423	0.672	-0.031	0.020
Partner: Positive health change	0.004	0.013	10583.931	0.295	0.768	-0.021	0.029
Actor: Parent dies	0.001	0.010	9979.935	0.086	0.932	-0.018	0.020
Partner: Parent dies	0.004	0.010	10072.513	0.452	0.652	-0.015	0.024
Actor: New job	**0.057**	**0.009**	**10209.350**	**6.070**	**<.001**	**0.039**	**0.075**
Partner: New job	0.002	0.009	10220.067	0.187	0.852	-0.017	0.020
Actor: Retirement	0.000	0.008	10162.331	0.030	0.976	-0.016	0.017
Partner: Retirement	-0.002	0.008	10242.106	-0.184	0.854	-0.018	0.015
Actor: Unemployment	-0.014	0.019	10100.429	-0.748	0.454	-0.052	0.023
Partner: Unemployment	0.002	0.019	10210.020	0.094	0.925	-0.036	0.040
Age	**-0.004**	**0.001**	**8746.713**	**-8.634**	**<.001**	**-0.006**	**-0.003**
Gender	**-0.064**	**0.004**	**6386.777**	**-16.467**	**<.001**	**-0.072**	**-0.057**
PersonOfColor	0.010	0.010	7532.818	0.986	0.324	-0.010	0.030
Education	**0.020**	**0.001**	**10220.579**	**14.105**	**<.001**	**0.017**	**0.023**
Wealth	**0.029**	**0.003**	**6461.349**	**10.784**	**<.001**	**0.024**	**0.035**
MarLength	-0.008	0.005	6930.480	-1.597	0.110	-0.018	0.002
SpouseSupport	**0.186**	**0.070**	**13940.127**	**2.648**	**0.008**	**0.048**	**0.323**
Actor: Moving*Support	-0.004	0.024	14312.696	-0.177	0.859	-0.051	0.042
Actor: Birth of a child*Support	-0.003	0.009	24746.785	-0.367	0.714	-0.022	0.015
Actor: death of a child*Support	0.008	0.018	24818.449	0.448	0.654	-0.027	0.043
Actor: New chronic illness*Support	-0.016	0.014	22524.931	-1.197	0.231	-0.043	0.010

Table 7 (cont'd)

Partner: New chronic illness*Support	-0.003	0.010	24245.448	-0.334	0.739	-0.023	0.016
Actor: Negative health change*Support	-0.008	0.010	24495.039	-0.845	0.398	-0.028	0.011
Partner: Negative health change*Support	-0.107	0.067	13025.742	-1.590	0.112	-0.238	0.025
Actor: Positive health change*Support	0.014	0.029	17333.848	0.493	0.622	-0.043	0.072
Partner: Positive health change*Support	0.012	0.013	25831.262	0.925	0.355	-0.014	0.039
Actor: Parent dies*Support	-0.004	0.013	24477.735	-0.287	0.774	-0.030	0.022
Partner: Parent dies*Support	-0.022	0.011	23689.897	-2.045	0.041	-0.044	-0.001
Actor: New job*Support	0.024	0.011	25435.687	2.149	0.032	0.002	0.046
Partner: New job*Support	-0.016	0.010	25432.512	-1.498	0.134	-0.036	0.005
Actor: Retirement*Support	-0.007	0.011	24450.184	-0.651	0.515	-0.028	0.014
Partner: Retirement*Support	-0.008	0.009	24911.118	-0.847	0.397	-0.027	0.011
Actor: Unemployment*Support	0.021	0.010	26077.667	2.148	0.032	0.002	0.040
Partner: Unemployment*Support	0.006	0.020	25720.643	0.278	0.781	-0.034	0.045
Slope*Support	-0.027	0.021	24884.199	-1.329	0.184	-0.067	0.013
Slope* Actor: Moving	-0.001	0.002	3296.430	-0.348	0.728	-0.005	0.003
Slope* Actor: Birth of a child	-0.001	0.004	4097.061	-0.127	0.899	-0.009	0.008
Slope* Actor: Death of a child	**-0.009**	**0.003**	**3214.580**	**-2.689**	**0.007**	**-0.015**	**-0.002**
Slope* Actor: New chronic illness	**-0.008**	**0.002**	**6577.885**	**-3.546**	**<.001**	**-0.012**	**-0.003**
Slope* Partner: New chronic illness	-0.005	0.002	6654.675	-2.247	0.025	-0.009	-0.001
Slope* Actor: Negative health change	**-0.037**	**0.013**	**15727.256**	**-2.784**	**0.005**	**-0.063**	**-0.011**
Slope* Partner: Negative health change	-0.008	0.010	14746.645	-0.774	0.439	-0.027	0.012
Slope* Actor: Positive health change	0.001	0.003	6616.857	0.228	0.820	-0.006	0.007
Slope* Partner: Positive health change	0.002	0.003	6026.497	0.649	0.516	-0.004	0.008

Table 7 (cont'd)

Slope* Actor: Parent dies	**0.011**	**0.002**	**5499.889**	**4.917**	**<.001**	**0.007**	**0.016**
Slope* Partner: Parent dies	0.005	0.002	5655.753	1.945	0.052	0.000	0.009
Slope* Actor: New job	0.003	0.002	5845.952	1.281	0.200	-0.002	0.007
Slope* Partner: New job	0.006	0.002	5813.242	2.637	0.008	0.002	0.011
Slope* Actor: Retirement	-0.001	0.002	5924.586	-0.423	0.672	-0.005	0.003
Slope* Partner: Retirement	0.003	0.002	5977.417	1.506	0.132	-0.001	0.007
Slope* Actor: Unemployment	0.001	0.005	5904.026	0.123	0.902	-0.009	0.010
Slope* Partner: Unemployment	0.000	0.005	5671.065	-0.017	0.987	-0.009	0.009
Slope* Actor: death of a child*Support	0.006	0.005	9279.889	1.243	0.214	-0.004	0.016
Slope* Actor: New chronic illness*Support	-0.003	0.004	10224.139	-0.937	0.349	-0.010	0.004
Slope* Partner: New chronic illness*Support	-0.006	0.004	10378.289	-1.699	0.089	-0.013	0.001
Slope* Actor: Negative health change*Support	0.006	0.024	14545.328	0.269	0.788	-0.041	0.053
Slope* Actor: Parent dies*Support	0.003	0.004	7986.491	0.796	0.426	-0.004	0.010
Slope* Partner: Parent dies*Support	0.002	0.004	9101.497	0.503	0.615	-0.006	0.010
Slope* Partner: New job*Support	-0.005	0.004	8980.067	-1.234	0.217	-0.012	0.003

Note. Significant effects bolded, $p < .01$

Table 8. Linear growth curve model examining the effect of actor and partner life events on the slope of extraversion; HRS sample.

	b	*SE*	*df*	*t*	*p*	*LB*	*UB*
Intercept	**2.936**	**0.069**	**8568.141**	**42.499**	**0.000**	**2.801**	**3.072**
Slope	0.025	0.015	16085.119	1.638	0.101	-0.005	0.055
Actor: Moving	0.005	0.010	5997.236	0.441	0.659	-0.016	0.025
Actor: Birth of a child	-0.003	0.021	7552.907	-0.135	0.892	-0.045	0.039
Actor: death of a child	0.016	0.016	7388.276	0.989	0.323	-0.016	0.049
Actor: New chronic illness	**-0.032**	**0.010**	**11615.253**	**-3.181**	**0.001**	**-0.051**	**-0.012**
Partner: New chronic illness	-0.014	0.010	11604.649	-1.414	0.157	-0.034	0.005
Actor: Negative health change	-0.049	0.041	14520.893	-1.201	0.230	-0.130	0.031
Partner: Negative health change	-0.001	0.027	12871.653	-0.054	0.957	-0.054	0.051
Actor: Positive health change	0.020	0.015	11394.193	1.267	0.205	-0.011	0.050
Partner: Positive health change	0.025	0.016	11531.044	1.594	0.111	-0.006	0.055
Actor: Parent dies	-0.018	0.012	11034.542	-1.450	0.147	-0.041	0.006
Partner: Parent dies	-0.003	0.012	11150.289	-0.252	0.801	-0.027	0.021
Actor: New job	**0.105**	**0.011**	**11234.882**	**9.165**	**<.001**	**0.083**	**0.128**
Partner: New job	-0.003	0.011	11346.370	-0.255	0.799	-0.025	0.020
Actor: Retirement	**0.024**	**0.010**	**11101.738**	**2.333**	**0.020**	**0.004**	**0.044**
Partner: Retirement	**-0.027**	**0.010**	**11289.364**	**-2.571**	**0.010**	**-0.047**	**-0.006**
Actor: Unemployment	-0.013	0.024	11046.597	-0.559	0.576	-0.059	0.033
Partner: Unemployment	**-0.049**	**0.024**	**11246.088**	**-2.067**	**0.039**	**-0.095**	**-0.003**
Age	**-0.002**	**0.001**	**8790.717**	**-2.923**	**0.003**	**-0.003**	**-0.001**
Gender	**-0.054**	**0.005**	**6509.564**	**-11.525**	**<.001**	**-0.064**	**-0.045**
PersonOfColor	**0.056**	**0.012**	**7916.069**	**4.561**	**<.001**	**0.032**	**0.081**
Education	**0.011**	**0.002**	**10575.177**	**6.220**	**<.001**	**0.007**	**0.014**
Wealth	**0.024**	**0.003**	**6698.399**	**7.287**	**<.001**	**0.018**	**0.031**
MarLength	**-0.018**	**0.006**	**7277.057**	**-2.937**	**0.003**	**-0.030**	**-0.006**
Slope* Actor: Moving	0.000	0.002	3793.845	0.207	0.836	-0.004	0.005
Slope* Actor: Birth of a child	0.002	0.005	4667.986	0.355	0.723	-0.007	0.011
Slope* Actor: death of a child	-0.005	0.003	3889.053	-1.537	0.124	-0.012	0.001
Slope* Actor: New chronic illness	**-0.009**	**0.002**	**7172.378**	**-3.934**	**<.001**	**-0.013**	**-0.004**

Table 8 (cont'd)

Slope* Partner: New chronic illness	-0.003	0.002	7183.956	-1.145	0.252	-0.007	0.002
Slope* Actor: Negative health change	**-0.039**	**0.015**	**17664.693**	**-2.646**	**0.008**	**-0.068**	**-0.010**
Slope* Partner: Negative health change	-0.003	0.007	7921.845	-0.397	0.691	-0.016	0.011
Slope* Actor: Positive health change	-0.003	0.003	7003.217	-0.868	0.385	-0.010	0.004
Slope* Partner: Positive health change	0.002	0.003	6730.388	0.532	0.595	-0.005	0.008
Slope* Actor: Parent dies	**0.018**	**0.002**	**6204.940**	**7.427**	**<.001**	**0.013**	**0.023**
Slope* Partner: Parent dies	0.000	0.002	6463.997	0.102	0.919	-0.005	0.005
Slope* Actor: New job	0.003	0.002	6545.264	1.166	0.244	-0.002	0.007
Slope* Partner: New job	**0.006**	**0.002**	**6708.270**	**2.638**	**0.008**	**0.002**	**0.011**
Slope* Actor: Retirement	0.003	0.002	6577.002	1.197	0.231	-0.002	0.007
Slope* Partner: Retirement	0.004	0.002	6668.033	1.668	0.095	-0.001	0.008
Slope* Actor: Unemployment	0.002	0.005	6608.621	0.494	0.621	-0.007	0.012
Slope* Partner: Unemployment	0.001	0.005	6885.283	0.125	0.901	-0.009	0.011

Note. Significant effects bolded, $p < .05$

Table 9. Linear growth curve model examining the effect of actor/partner life events and spousal support on the slope of extraversion; HRS sample.

	b	*SE*	*df*	*t*	*p*	*LB*	*UB*
Intercept	**2.961**	**0.071**	**8439.862**	**41.975**	**0.000**	**2.822**	**3.099**
Slope	0.032	0.017	12917.881	1.832	0.067	-0.002	0.066
Actor: Moving	0.001	0.010	5834.214	0.142	0.887	-0.019	0.022
Actor: Birth of a child	-0.012	0.021	7093.695	-0.548	0.584	-0.053	0.030
Actor: death of a child	0.014	0.017	6875.933	0.826	0.409	-0.019	0.046
Actor: New chronic illness	-0.025	0.010	11279.204	-2.476	0.013	-0.045	-0.005
Partner: New chronic illness	-0.015	0.010	11258.404	-1.537	0.124	-0.035	0.004
Actor: Negative health change	-0.023	0.043	13285.698	-0.538	0.591	-0.108	0.061
Partner: Negative health change	-0.027	0.034	13290.421	-0.812	0.417	-0.093	0.039
Actor: Positive health change	0.021	0.016	11230.385	1.319	0.187	-0.010	0.051
Partner: Positive health change	0.033	0.016	11247.766	2.116	0.034	0.002	0.064
Actor: Parent dies	-0.022	0.012	10622.578	-1.855	0.064	-0.046	0.001
Partner: Parent dies	-0.006	0.012	10663.439	-0.519	0.604	-0.030	0.017
Actor: New job	**0.104**	**0.011**	**10789.045**	**9.046**	**<.001**	**0.081**	**0.126**
Partner: New job	-0.003	0.011	10813.454	-0.230	0.818	-0.025	0.020
Actor: Retirement	**0.028**	**0.010**	**10780.510**	**2.725**	**0.006**	**0.008**	**0.048**
Partner: Retirement	**-0.031**	**0.010**	**10827.359**	**-3.025**	**0.002**	**-0.051**	**-0.011**
Actor: Unemployment	-0.006	0.024	10645.348	-0.247	0.805	-0.052	0.040
Partner: Unemployment	-0.038	0.024	10829.272	-1.609	0.108	-0.084	0.008
Age	-0.001	0.001	8683.799	-2.364	0.018	-0.003	0.000
Gender	**-0.067**	**0.005**	**6568.970**	**-13.924**	**<.001**	**-0.076**	**-0.057**
PersonOfColor	**0.066**	**0.012**	**7707.260**	**5.439**	**<.001**	**0.042**	**0.090**
Education	**0.010**	**0.002**	**10282.811**	**5.716**	**<.001**	**0.007**	**0.013**
Wealth	**0.021**	**0.003**	**6579.696**	**6.477**	**<.001**	**0.015**	**0.028**
MarLength	**-0.018**	**0.006**	**7104.166**	**-3.069**	**0.002**	**-0.030**	**-0.007**
Support	**0.215**	**0.082**	**14647.661**	**2.609**	**0.009**	**0.053**	**0.376**
Slope*Support	0.019	0.028	15000.594	0.681	0.496	-0.036	0.074
Actor: Moving*Support	-0.004	0.011	24852.319	-0.386	0.700	-0.025	0.017
Actor: Birth of a child*Support	0.032	0.020	24497.214	1.593	0.111	-0.007	0.072
Actor: death of a child*Support	-0.035	0.015	23308.195	-2.310	0.021	-0.065	-0.005

Table 9 (cont'd)

Actor: New chronic illness*Support	-0.001	0.011	24620.353	-0.121	0.904	-0.023	0.021
Partner: New chronic illness*Support	-0.001	0.011	25630.203	-0.118	0.906	-0.023	0.020
Actor: Negative health change*Support	-0.139	0.079	13768.962	-1.767	0.077	-0.294	0.015
Partner: Negative health change*Support	0.037	0.034	18595.859	1.084	0.278	-0.030	0.104
Actor: Positive health change*Support	0.007	0.015	25473.152	0.461	0.645	-0.023	0.037
Partner: Positive health change*Support	0.008	0.015	24323.724	0.552	0.581	-0.021	0.038
Actor: Parent dies*Support	-0.024	0.012	23831.043	-1.975	0.048	-0.049	0.000
Partner: Parent dies*Support	0.030	0.013	25534.995	2.385	0.017	0.005	0.055
Actor: New job*Support	-0.002	0.012	25148.946	-0.168	0.867	-0.025	0.021
Partner: New job*Support	-0.010	0.012	24414.179	-0.821	0.412	-0.033	0.014
Actor: Retirement*Support	-0.006	0.011	24938.257	-0.552	0.581	-0.027	0.015
Partner: Retirement*Support	0.023	0.011	25833.132	2.069	0.039	0.001	0.044
Actor: Unemployment*Support	-0.007	0.023	25051.847	-0.302	0.763	-0.051	0.038
Partner: Unemployment*Support	-0.003	0.023	24435.019	-0.126	0.900	-0.048	0.043
Slope* Actor: Moving	0.000	0.002	3303.902	-0.026	0.979	-0.005	0.005
Slope* Actor: Birth of a child	-0.002	0.005	4107.260	-0.324	0.746	-0.011	0.008
Slope* Actor: Death of a child	-0.005	0.004	3256.025	-1.365	0.172	-0.012	0.002
Slope* Actor: New chronic illness	**-0.009**	**0.002**	**6662.845**	**-3.591**	**<.001**	**-0.013**	**-0.004**
Slope* Partner: New chronic illness	-0.003	0.002	6716.779	-1.258	0.208	-0.008	0.002
Slope* Actor: Negative health change	-0.033	0.016	16592.838	-2.093	0.036	-0.063	-0.002
Slope* Partner: Negative health change	-0.012	0.011	15241.364	-1.107	0.268	-0.035	0.010
Slope* Actor: Positive health change	-0.003	0.004	6671.999	-0.738	0.461	-0.010	0.004
Slope* Partner: Positive health change	0.003	0.004	6139.948	0.931	0.352	-0.004	0.010

Table 9 (cont'd)

Slope* Actor: Parent dies	**0.016**	**0.003**	**5612.810**	**6.302**	**<.001**	**0.011**	**0.021**
Slope* Partner: Parent dies	0.000	0.003	5724.899	-0.062	0.950	-0.005	0.005
Slope* Actor: New job	0.002	0.003	5933.491	0.733	0.464	-0.003	0.007
Slope* Partner: New job	0.005	0.003	5899.454	1.991	0.047	0.000	0.010
Slope* Actor: Retirement	0.002	0.002	6022.226	1.052	0.293	-0.002	0.007
Slope* Partner: Retirement	0.003	0.002	6056.820	1.367	0.172	-0.001	0.008
Slope* Actor: Unemployment	0.003	0.005	5979.546	0.555	0.579	-0.007	0.013
Slope* Partner: Unemployment	-0.002	0.005	5794.325	-0.307	0.759	-0.012	0.009
Slope* Actor: New chronic illness* Support	0.003	0.004	10617.796	0.694	0.488	-0.005	0.011
Slope* Actor: Negative health change* Support	-0.027	0.028	15212.030	-0.967	0.334	-0.082	0.028
Slope* Actor: Parent dies* Support	0.004	0.004	8326.872	1.001	0.317	-0.004	0.012
Slope* Partner: New job* Support	0.002	0.004	9246.719	0.417	0.676	-0.006	0.010

Note. Significant effects bolded, p <.01

Table 10. Linear growth curve model examining the effect of actor and partner life events on the slope of neuroticism; HRS sample.

	b	*SE*	*df*	*t*	*p*	*LB*	*UB*
Intercept	**2.866**	**0.073**	**8604.615**	**39.298**	**0.000**	**2.723**	**3.009**
Slope	**-0.077**	**0.017**	**15885.885**	**-4.629**	**<.001**	**-0.109**	**-0.044**
Actor: Moving	0.002	0.011	5874.358	0.170	0.865	-0.020	0.023
Actor: Birth of a child	-0.033	0.022	7591.305	-1.501	0.133	-0.077	0.010
Actor: Death of a child	**-0.038**	**0.017**	**7353.891**	**-2.209**	**0.027**	**-0.072**	**-0.004**
Actor: New chronic illness	**0.072**	**0.010**	**11481.764**	**7.005**	**<.001**	**0.052**	**0.092**
Partner: New chronic illness	**0.026**	**0.010**	**11457.719**	**2.522**	**0.012**	**0.006**	**0.046**
Actor: Negative health change	0.017	0.043	14523.523	0.388	0.698	-0.068	0.101
Partner: Negative health change	0.040	0.028	13351.368	1.440	0.150	-0.014	0.094
Actor: Positive health change	0.009	0.016	11101.199	0.553	0.580	-0.022	0.040
Partner: Positive health change	-0.020	0.016	11359.566	-1.241	0.215	-0.051	0.011
Actor: Parent dies	-0.005	0.012	10853.501	-0.441	0.659	-0.030	0.019
Partner: Parent dies	0.005	0.012	10850.220	0.420	0.675	-0.019	0.029
Actor: New job	**-0.058**	**0.012**	**11064.623**	**-4.935**	**<.001**	**-0.081**	**-0.035**
Partner: New job	0.000	0.012	11246.006	0.042	0.966	-0.022	0.023
Actor: Retirement	-0.009	0.010	11057.128	-0.830	0.407	-0.029	0.012
Partner: Retirement	**-0.023**	**0.010**	**11164.322**	**-2.222**	**0.026**	-0.044	-0.003
Actor: Unemployment	**0.078**	**0.024**	**10765.748**	**3.239**	**0.001**	**0.031**	**0.125**
Partner: Unemployment	**0.050**	**0.024**	**11141.093**	**2.059**	**0.040**	**0.002**	**0.097**
Age	**-0.006**	**0.001**	**9060.621**	**-8.334**	**<.001**	**-0.007**	**-0.004**
Gender	**-0.058**	**0.005**	**6461.282**	**-12.447**	**<.001**	**-0.068**	**-0.049**
PersonOfColor	**-0.097**	**0.013**	**7964.355**	**-7.478**	**<.001**	**-0.122**	**-0.071**
Education	**-0.021**	**0.002**	**10743.785**	**-11.498**	**<.001**	**-0.024**	**-0.017**
Wealth	**-0.026**	**0.003**	**6636.617**	**-7.536**	**<.001**	**-0.033**	**-0.019**
MarLength	0.007	0.006	7199.970	1.103	0.270	-0.005	0.020
Slope* Actor: Moving	-0.001	0.003	3770.637	-0.385	0.700	-0.006	0.004
Slope* Actor: Birth of a child	**-0.011**	**0.005**	**4703.535**	**-2.070**	**0.039**	**-0.021**	**-0.001**
Slope* Actor: death of a child	0.004	0.004	3910.723	1.108	0.268	-0.003	0.012

Table 10 (cont'd)

Slope* Actor: New chronic illness	**0.011**	**0.003**	**7481.776**	**4.366**	**<.001**	**0.006**	**0.016**
Slope* Partner: New chronic illness	-0.001	0.002	7435.979	-0.349	0.727	-0.006	0.004
Slope* Actor: Negative health change	**0.044**	**0.016**	**17559.317**	**2.791**	**0.005**	**0.013**	**0.074**
Slope* Partner: Negative health change	**0.016**	**0.008**	**8579.466**	**2.097**	**0.036**	**0.001**	**0.031**
Slope* Actor: Positive health change	**-0.010**	**0.004**	**7132.998**	**-2.654**	**0.008**	**-0.017**	**-0.003**
Slope* Partner: Positive health change	-0.007	0.004	7022.976	-1.807	0.071	-0.014	0.001
Slope* Actor: Parent dies	**-0.010**	**0.003**	**6444.600**	**-3.494**	**<.001**	**-0.015**	**-0.004**
Slope* Partner: Parent dies	-0.002	0.003	6569.055	-0.731	0.465	-0.007	0.003
Slope* Actor: New job	0.001	0.003	6770.628	0.509	0.611	-0.004	0.007
Slope* Partner: New job	0.003	0.003	6948.574	0.951	0.341	-0.003	0.008
Slope* Actor: Retirement	-0.002	0.002	6835.637	-0.887	0.375	-0.007	0.003
Slope* Partner: Retirement	-0.001	0.002	6846.941	-0.389	0.697	-0.006	0.004
Slope* Actor: Unemployment	**-0.020**	**0.006**	**6680.582**	**-3.526**	**<.001**	**-0.031**	**-0.009**
Slope* Partner: Unemployment	**-0.018**	**0.006**	**7143.862**	**-3.070**	**0.002**	**-0.029**	**-0.006**

Note. Significant effects bolded, p <.05

Table 11. Linear growth curve model examining the effect of actor/partner life events and spousal support on the slope of neuroticism; HRS sample.

Parameter	*b*	*SE*	*df*	*t*	*p*	*LB*	*UB*
Intercept	**2.914**	**0.075**	**8475.815**	**38.761**	**<.001**	**2.766**	**3.061**
Slope	-0.047	0.019	12490.921	-2.473	0.013	-0.084	-0.010
Actor: Moving	0.007	0.011	5676.483	0.622	0.534	-0.015	0.028
Actor: Birth of a child	-0.029	0.022	7064.004	-1.290	0.197	-0.072	0.015
Actor: death of a child	**-0.045**	**0.017**	**6751.175**	**-2.594**	**0.009**	**-0.079**	**-0.011**
Actor: New chronic illness	**0.064**	**0.010**	**11137.702**	**6.222**	**<.001**	**0.044**	**0.084**
Partner: New chronic illness	0.022	0.010	11108.161	2.126	0.033	0.002	0.042
Actor: Negative health change	0.007	0.045	13297.747	0.145	0.885	-0.082	0.095
Partner: Negative health change	-0.026	0.035	13866.189	-0.733	0.463	-0.095	0.043
Actor: Positive health change	0.016	0.016	10905.445	1.032	0.302	-0.015	0.048
Partner: Positive health change	-0.029	0.016	11020.219	-1.825	0.068	-0.061	0.002
Actor: Parent dies	-0.001	0.012	10408.264	-0.106	0.915	-0.025	0.023
Partner: Parent dies	0.007	0.012	10362.587	0.539	0.590	-0.017	0.030
Actor: New job	**-0.060**	**0.012**	**10619.984**	**-5.163**	**<.001**	**-0.083**	**-0.037**
Partner: New job	-0.001	0.012	10700.526	-0.101	0.919	-0.024	0.022
Actor: Retirement	-0.011	0.010	10721.179	-1.060	0.289	-0.032	0.009
Partner: Retirement	-0.023	0.010	10717.780	-2.194	0.028	-0.044	-0.002
Actor: Unemployment	**0.069**	**0.024**	**10356.406**	**2.858**	**0.004**	**0.022**	**0.116**
Partner: Unemployment	0.037	0.024	10699.541	1.521	0.128	-0.011	0.084
Age	**-0.005**	**0.001**	**8981.085**	**-8.191**	**<.001**	**-0.007**	**-0.004**
Gender	**-0.046**	**0.005**	**6507.191**	**-9.595**	**<.001**	**-0.055**	**-0.036**
PersonOfColor	**-0.104**	**0.013**	**7728.123**	**-8.103**	**<.001**	**-0.129**	**-0.079**
Education	**-0.020**	**0.002**	**10467.672**	**-10.952**	**<.001**	**-0.023**	**-0.016**
Wealth	**-0.025**	**0.003**	**6518.600**	**-7.169**	**<.001**	**-0.032**	**-0.018**
MarLength	0.008	0.006	7010.353	1.290	0.197	-0.004	0.021
Support	**-0.343**	**0.092**	**13649.008**	**-3.714**	**<.001**	**-0.524**	**-0.162**
Slope*Support	-0.055	0.034	15329.410	-1.636	0.102	-0.121	0.011
Actor: Moving*Support	-0.008	0.012	25849.534	-0.625	0.532	-0.031	0.016
Actor: Birth of a child*Support	0.057	0.023	25143.686	2.458	0.014	0.011	0.102
Actor: death of a child*Support	0.031	0.017	25102.437	1.804	0.071	-0.003	0.065
Actor: New chronic illness*Support	0.006	0.012	25057.234	0.503	0.615	-0.018	0.031
Partner: New chronic illness*Support	-0.013	0.012	26280.786	-1.020	0.308	-0.037	0.012

Table 11 (cont'd)

Actor: Negative health change*Support	0.176	0.083	13062.063	2.126	0.034	0.014	0.338
Partner: Negative health change*Support	0.028	0.050	19095.048	0.549	0.583	-0.071	0.126
Actor: Positive health change*Support	0.040	0.017	25000.710	2.313	0.021	0.006	0.074
Partner: Positive health change*Support	0.017	0.017	25495.882	0.977	0.328	-0.017	0.050
Actor: Parent dies*Support	0.003	0.014	24652.428	0.218	0.827	-0.024	0.030
Partner: Parent dies*Support	0.001	0.014	26089.978	0.068	0.946	-0.026	0.028
Actor: New job*Support	0.005	0.013	25999.228	0.383	0.702	-0.021	0.031
Partner: New job*Support	0.001	0.013	25643.033	0.072	0.942	-0.025	0.027
Actor: Retirement*Support	-0.007	0.012	25639.456	-0.567	0.571	-0.030	0.017
Partner: Retirement*Support	0.006	0.012	26460.637	0.501	0.617	-0.018	0.030
Actor: Unemployment*Support	-0.006	0.025	26133.321	-0.237	0.813	-0.056	0.044
Partner: Unemployment*Support	-0.027	0.026	25878.468	-1.047	0.295	-0.078	0.024
Slope* Actor: Moving	0.001	0.003	3291.744	0.301	0.764	-0.004	0.006
Slope* Actor: Birth of a child	-0.011	0.006	4117.866	-2.012	0.044	-0.022	0.000
Slope* Actor: Death of a child	0.005	0.004	3246.802	1.218	0.223	-0.003	0.013
Slope* Actor: New chronic illness	**0.010**	**0.003**	**6904.867**	**3.776**	**<.001**	**0.005**	**0.015**
Slope* Partner: New chronic illness	-0.003	0.003	6894.965	-1.104	0.269	-0.008	0.002
Slope* Actor: Negative health change	0.039	0.016	16279.723	2.356	0.018	0.007	0.071
Slope* Partner: Negative health change	-0.007	0.012	15682.181	-0.599	0.549	-0.031	0.016
Slope* Actor: Positive health change	-0.007	0.004	6731.088	-1.777	0.076	-0.015	0.001
Slope* Partner: Positive health change	-0.008	0.004	6348.949	-2.070	0.038	-0.016	0.000
Slope* Actor: Parent dies	**-0.009**	**0.003**	**5780.259**	**-3.104**	**0.002**	**-0.014**	**-0.003**
Slope* Partner: Parent dies	-0.003	0.003	5811.718	-1.139	0.255	-0.009	0.002
Slope* Actor: New job	0.001	0.003	6126.560	0.427	0.670	-0.004	0.007

Table 11 (cont'd)

Slope* Partner: New job	0.002	0.003	6083.226	0.821	0.412	-0.003	0.008
Slope* Actor: Retirement	-0.002	0.003	6240.762	-0.799	0.424	-0.007	0.003
Slope* Partner: Retirement	-0.001	0.003	6212.084	-0.423	0.672	-0.006	0.004
Slope* Actor: Unemployment	**-0.020**	**0.006**	**6066.747**	**-3.388**	**<.001**	**-0.031**	**-0.008**
Slope* Partner: Unemployment	**-0.016**	**0.006**	**6075.348**	**-2.755**	**0.006**	**-0.028**	**-0.005**
Slope* Actor: Birth of a child* Support	-0.008	0.009	10669.008	-0.909	0.364	-0.025	0.009
Slope* Actor: New chronic illness* Support	0.009	0.005	10788.711	2.008	0.045	0.000	0.018
Slope* Actor: Negative health change* Support	0.069	0.030	14328.377	2.332	0.020	0.011	0.128
Slope* Partner: Negative health change* Support	-0.013	0.019	20515.703	-0.664	0.506	-0.051	0.025
Slope* Actor: Positive health change* Support	-0.002	0.007	12495.063	-0.378	0.706	-0.015	0.010
Slope* Actor: Parent dies* Support	-0.011	0.005	8461.659	-2.327	0.020	-0.020	-0.002
Slope* Actor: Unemployment* Support	-0.009	0.009	11092.610	-1.017	0.309	-0.027	0.008
Slope* Partner: Unemployment* Support	-0.004	0.009	8447.526	-0.431	0.667	-0.022	0.014

Note. Significant effects bolded, p <.01

Table 12. Linear growth curve model examining the effect of actor and partner life events on the slope of openness; HRS sample.

	b	*SE*	*df*	*t*	*p*	*LB*	*UB*
Intercept	**2.412**	**0.068**	**8740.516**	**35.387**	**<.001**	**2.279**	**2.546**
Slope	0.014	0.015	16153.439	0.917	0.359	-0.016	0.043
Actor: Moving	**0.024**	**0.010**	**5906.110**	**2.282**	**0.023**	**0.003**	**0.044**
Actor: Birth of a child	-0.008	0.021	7732.337	-0.396	0.692	-0.049	0.033
Actor: death of a child	-0.008	0.016	7617.119	-0.467	0.640	-0.039	0.024
Actor: New chronic illness	-0.013	0.009	11320.580	-1.409	0.159	-0.032	0.005
Partner: New chronic illness	-0.015	0.009	11293.418	-1.558	0.119	-0.033	0.004
Actor: Negative health change	-0.071	0.039	14393.654	-1.808	0.071	-0.149	0.006
Partner: Negative health change	-0.004	0.025	13229.658	-0.177	0.859	-0.054	0.045
Actor: Positive health change	0.012	0.015	10903.833	0.793	0.428	-0.017	0.040
Partner: Positive health change	0.025	0.015	11177.766	1.675	0.094	-0.004	0.053
Actor: Parent dies	-0.005	0.011	10754.010	-0.409	0.682	-0.027	0.018
Partner: Parent dies	0.009	0.011	10720.236	0.805	0.421	-0.013	0.031
Actor: New job	**0.067**	**0.011**	**10981.275**	**6.242**	**<.001**	**0.046**	**0.088**
Partner: New job	0.011	0.011	11160.994	1.007	0.314	-0.010	0.032
Actor: Retirement	0.008	0.010	11042.514	0.886	0.376	-0.010	0.027
Partner: Retirement	0.001	0.010	11118.470	0.128	0.899	-0.018	0.020
Actor: Unemployment	**0.063**	**0.022**	**10593.805**	**2.845**	**0.004**	**0.020**	**0.107**
Partner: Unemployment	-0.023	0.022	10994.734	-1.018	0.309	-0.066	0.021
Age	**-0.004**	**0.001**	**9247.071**	**-6.937**	**<.001**	**-0.005**	**-0.003**
Gender	-0.003	0.004	6463.218	-0.761	0.447	-0.011	0.005
PersonOfColor	**0.051**	**0.012**	**8256.698**	**4.244**	**<.001**	**0.028**	**0.075**
Education	**0.041**	**0.002**	**11093.334**	**24.600**	**<.001**	**0.038**	**0.044**
Wealth	**0.031**	**0.003**	**6722.006**	**9.393**	**<.001**	**0.024**	**0.037**
MarLength	**-0.036**	**0.006**	**7373.982**	**-5.951**	**<.001**	**-0.047**	**-0.024**
Slope* Actor: Moving	-0.002	0.002	3629.001	-1.109	0.267	-0.007	0.002
Slope* Actor: Birth of a child	0.004	0.005	4493.624	0.868	0.386	-0.005	0.013

Table 12 (cont'd)

Slope* Actor: death of a child	-0.003	0.003	3750.669	-0.896	0.370	-0.009	0.004
Slope* Actor: New chronic illness	-0.003	0.002	7154.619	-1.445	0.148	-0.008	0.001
Slope* Partner: New chronic illness	**-0.005**	**0.002**	**7113.719**	**-2.227**	**0.026**	**-0.009**	**-0.001**
Slope* Actor: Negative health change	**-0.030**	**0.014**	**17559.016**	**-2.138**	**0.033**	**-0.058**	**-0.003**
Slope* Partner: Negative health change	-0.006	0.007	8138.833	-0.921	0.357	-0.020	0.007
Slope* Actor: Positive health change	-0.006	0.003	6867.801	-1.664	0.096	-0.012	0.001
Slope* Partner: Positive health change	0.002	0.003	6732.204	0.589	0.556	-0.005	0.009
Slope* Actor: Parent dies	**0.014**	**0.002**	**6191.113**	**6.068**	**<.001**	**0.010**	**0.019**
Slope* Partner: Parent dies	**0.005**	**0.002**	**6288.992**	**2.055**	**0.040**	**0.000**	**0.010**
Slope* Actor: New job	**0.005**	**0.002**	**6483.349**	**2.093**	**0.036**	**0.000**	**0.010**
Slope* Partner: New job	**0.008**	**0.002**	**6651.690**	**3.311**	**<.001**	**0.003**	**0.013**
Slope* Actor: Retirement	0.000	0.002	6569.633	0.070	0.944	-0.004	0.004
Slope* Partner: Retirement	0.003	0.002	6567.281	1.597	0.110	-0.001	0.008
Slope* Actor: Unemployment	0.006	0.005	6385.820	1.137	0.256	-0.004	0.015
Slope* Partner: Unemployment	-0.002	0.005	6844.806	-0.471	0.638	-0.012	0.008

Note. Significant effects bolded, $p < .05$

Table 13. Linear growth curve model examining the effect of actor/partner life events and spousal support on the slope of openness; HRS sample.

	b	*SE*	*df*	*t*	*p*	*LB*	*UB*
Intercept	**2.389**	**0.071**	**8560.606**	**33.764**	**<.001**	**2.250**	**2.528**
Slope	0.007	0.017	12721.026	0.394	0.694	-0.027	0.041
Actor: Moving	0.024	0.011	5733.933	2.261	0.024	0.003	0.044
Actor: Birth of a child	-0.012	0.021	7226.077	-0.559	0.576	-0.053	0.030
Actor: death of a child	-0.013	0.017	7037.950	-0.803	0.422	-0.046	0.019
Actor: New chronic illness	-0.010	0.010	11013.278	-1.028	0.304	-0.029	0.009
Partner: New chronic illness	-0.014	0.010	10979.613	-1.519	0.129	-0.033	0.004
Actor: Negative health change	-0.049	0.041	13136.410	-1.192	0.233	-0.131	0.032
Partner: Negative health change	0.009	0.032	13465.298	0.283	0.777	-0.054	0.072
Actor: Positive health change	0.019	0.015	10735.319	1.308	0.191	-0.010	0.049
Partner: Positive health change	0.030	0.015	10880.547	2.016	0.044	0.001	0.059
Actor: Parent dies	-0.008	0.011	10363.019	-0.683	0.494	-0.030	0.015
Partner: Parent dies	0.009	0.011	10276.348	0.753	0.451	-0.014	0.031
Actor: New job	0.067	0.011	10586.999	6.137	<.001	0.045	0.088
Partner: New job	0.009	0.011	10671.930	0.858	0.391	-0.012	0.030
Actor: Retirement	0.006	0.010	10761.228	0.649	0.517	-0.013	0.025
Partner: Retirement	0.000	0.010	10719.511	-0.037	0.970	-0.019	0.019
Actor: Unemployment	0.068	0.022	10208.609	3.022	0.003	0.024	0.111
Partner: Unemployment	-0.022	0.022	10585.623	-0.994	0.320	-0.066	0.022
Age	**-0.004**	**0.001**	**9207.091**	**-6.702**	**<.001**	**-0.005**	**-0.003**
Gender	**-0.012**	**0.004**	**6524.773**	**-2.696**	**0.007**	**-0.020**	**-0.003**
PersonOfColor	**0.059**	**0.012**	**8114.479**	**4.872**	**<.001**	**0.035**	**0.083**
Education	**0.041**	**0.002**	**10905.864**	**24.142**	**<.001**	**0.037**	**0.044**
Wealth	**0.029**	**0.003**	**6643.328**	**8.875**	**<.001**	**0.023**	**0.036**
MarLength	**-0.034**	**0.006**	**7245.025**	**-5.753**	**<.001**	**-0.046**	**-0.023**
Support	**0.304**	**0.080**	**14781.551**	**3.782**	**<.001**	**0.146**	**0.461**
Slope*Support	**0.075**	**0.027**	**14467.445**	**2.793**	**0.005**	**0.022**	**0.128**
Actor: Moving*Support	0.000	0.011	25607.478	-0.036	0.971	-0.021	0.021
Actor: Birth of a child*Support	0.034	0.020	25154.963	1.687	0.092	-0.006	0.074
Actor: death of a child*Support	-0.034	0.015	24171.223	-2.224	0.026	-0.064	-0.004
Actor: New chronic illness*Support	0.008	0.011	25655.127	0.710	0.478	-0.014	0.029
Partner: New chronic illness*Support	-0.003	0.011	24828.157	-0.247	0.805	-0.024	0.019

Table 13 (cont'd)

Actor: Negative health change*Support	**-0.198**	**0.076**	**13118.565**	**-2.608**	**0.009**	**-0.348**	**-0.049**
Partner: Negative health change*Support	-0.018	0.033	18082.211	-0.524	0.600	-0.083	0.048
Actor: Positive health change*Support	0.018	0.015	25878.897	1.172	0.241	-0.012	0.047
Partner: Positive health change*Support	-0.006	0.015	24706.203	-0.418	0.676	-0.036	0.023
Actor: Parent dies*Support	-0.023	0.012	23981.524	-1.895	0.058	-0.047	0.001
Partner: Parent dies*Support	-0.011	0.012	25277.364	-0.903	0.366	-0.036	0.013
Actor: New job*Support	0.009	0.012	24903.059	0.771	0.441	-0.014	0.032
Partner: New job*Support	0.018	0.012	24667.230	1.526	0.127	-0.005	0.041
Actor: Retirement*Support	-0.022	0.011	25112.085	-2.096	0.036	-0.043	-0.001
Partner: Retirement*Support	0.016	0.011	25970.970	1.437	0.151	-0.006	0.037
Actor: Unemployment*Support	-0.008	0.022	25264.533	-0.360	0.719	-0.052	0.036
Partner: Unemployment*Support	-0.051	0.023	25091.479	-2.204	0.028	-0.096	-0.006
Slope* Actor: Moving	-0.003	0.002	3157.821	-1.251	0.211	-0.008	0.002
Slope* Actor: Birth of a child	0.002	0.005	3947.361	0.509	0.611	-0.007	0.012
Slope* Actor: Death of a child	-0.004	0.004	3139.880	-1.121	0.262	-0.011	0.003
Slope* Actor: New chronic illness	-0.004	0.002	6678.863	-1.542	0.123	-0.008	0.001
Slope* Partner: New chronic illness	-0.005	0.002	6699.107	-2.061	0.039	-0.009	0.000
Slope* Actor: Negative health change	-0.029	0.015	16148.892	-1.928	0.054	-0.058	0.000
Slope* Partner: Negative health change	0.001	0.011	15477.858	0.115	0.908	-0.020	0.023
Slope* Actor: Positive health change	-0.003	0.004	6535.192	-0.816	0.414	-0.010	0.004
Slope* Partner: Positive health change	0.003	0.004	6153.151	0.885	0.376	-0.004	0.010
Slope* Actor: Parent dies	**0.013**	**0.003**	**5620.256**	**5.211**	**<.001**	**0.008**	**0.018**
Slope* Partner: Parent dies	0.005	0.003	5677.140	1.946	0.052	0.000	0.010
Slope* Actor: New job	0.006	0.002	5933.337	2.278	0.023	0.001	0.010

Table 13 (cont'd)

Slope* Partner: New job	**0.007**	**0.002**	**5902.267**	**2.738**	**0.006**	**0.002**	**0.012**
Slope* Actor: Retirement	-0.001	0.002	6074.804	-0.619	0.536	-0.006	0.003
Slope* Partner: Retirement	0.004	0.002	6052.074	1.686	0.092	-0.001	0.008
Slope* Actor: Unemployment	0.005	0.005	5849.515	0.930	0.352	-0.005	0.015
Slope* Partner: Unemployment	-0.003	0.005	5807.256	-0.648	0.517	-0.014	0.007
Slope* Partner: New chronic illness*Support	-0.004	0.004	10677.845	-1.014	0.311	-0.012	0.004
Slope* Actor: Negative health change*Support	**-0.076**	**0.027**	**14527.244**	**-2.817**	**0.005**	**-0.129**	**-0.023**
Slope* Actor: Parent dies*Support	0.005	0.004	8177.823	1.198	0.231	-0.003	0.013
Slope* Partner: Parent dies*Support	0.002	0.004	9207.096	0.551	0.582	-0.006	0.011
Slope* Actor: New job*Support	0.004	0.004	9406.067	0.944	0.345	-0.004	0.012
Slope* Partner: New job*Support	-0.003	0.004	9070.130	-0.811	0.417	-0.011	0.005

Note. Significant effects bolded, $p < .01$

Table 14. Linear growth curve model examining the effect of actor and partner life events on the slope of spousal support; HRS sample.

	b	*SE*	*df*	*t*	*p*	*LB*	*UB*
Intercept	**3.334**	**0.077**	**853.313**	**43.414**	**<.001**	**3.184**	**3.485**
Slope	**0.071**	**0.021**	**100.227**	**3.387**	**0.001**	**0.029**	**0.112**
Actor: Moving	-0.002	0.011	2605.684	-0.181	0.856	-0.024	0.020
Actor: Birth of a child	0.000	0.022	3718.688	-0.015	0.988	-0.044	0.043
Actor: death of a child	**-0.053**	**0.017**	**4203.829**	**-3.043**	**0.002**	**-0.087**	**-0.019**
Actor: New chronic illness	**-0.052**	**0.010**	**3884.525**	**-5.460**	**<.001**	**-0.071**	**-0.033**
Partner: New chronic illness	**-0.022**	**0.009**	**4119.495**	**-2.294**	**0.022**	**-0.040**	**-0.003**
Actor: Negative health change	-0.055	0.042	5579.256	-1.322	0.186	-0.137	0.027
Partner: Negative health change	0.020	0.034	1701.021	0.585	0.559	-0.047	0.087
Actor: Positive health change	-0.014	0.015	5582.163	-0.938	0.348	-0.043	0.015
Partner: Positive health change	**-0.044**	**0.015**	**6280.303**	**-2.907**	**0.004**	**-0.073**	**-0.014**
Actor: Parent dies	0.017	0.011	6817.710	1.532	0.125	-0.005	0.040
Partner: Parent dies	0.013	0.011	6719.719	1.193	0.233	-0.008	0.035
Actor: New job	-0.001	0.011	6238.048	-0.138	0.891	-0.022	0.019
Partner: New job	0.000	0.011	6613.657	0.038	0.970	-0.020	0.021
Actor: Retirement	-0.015	0.010	6818.871	-1.576	0.115	-0.034	0.004
Partner: Retirement	0.007	0.009	6063.822	0.695	0.487	-0.012	0.025
Actor: Unemployment	**-0.061**	**0.022**	**7059.351**	**-2.830**	**0.005**	**-0.104**	**-0.019**
Partner: Unemployment	**-0.069**	**0.022**	**5564.011**	**-3.127**	**0.002**	**-0.113**	**-0.026**
Age	0.000	0.001	1466.685	-0.444	0.657	-0.002	0.001
Gender	**0.097**	**0.004**	**7104.476**	**25.362**	**<.001**	**0.090**	**0.105**
PersonOfColor	**-0.054**	**0.013**	**2695.745**	**-4.220**	**<.001**	**-0.079**	**-0.029**
Education	**0.004**	**0.002**	**4109.214**	**2.286**	**0.022**	**0.001**	**0.007**
Wealth	**0.020**	**0.004**	**1611.958**	**5.480**	**<.001**	**0.013**	**0.027**
MarLength	0.000	0.006	1568.813	-0.062	0.951	-0.013	0.012
Slope* Actor: Moving	0.002	0.004	37.020	0.435	0.666	-0.007	0.010
Slope* Actor: Birth of a child	0.014	0.008	56.535	1.766	0.083	-0.002	0.031
Slope* Actor: death of a child	-0.006	0.006	33.411	-1.051	0.301	-0.019	0.006
Slope* Actor: New chronic illness	-0.004	0.003	67.706	-1.338	0.185	-0.011	0.002
Slope* Partner: New chronic illness	-0.007	0.003	87.561	-1.956	0.054	-0.013	0.000

Table 14 (cont'd)

Slope* Actor: Negative health change	-0.039	0.016	1064.481	-2.489	0.013	-0.070	-0.008
Slope* Partner: Negative health change	**-0.034**	**0.013**	**417.873**	**-2.644**	**0.009**	**-0.059**	**-0.009**
Slope* Actor: Positive health change	0.001	0.005	70.646	0.225	0.822	-0.009	0.012
Slope* Partner: Positive health change	0.002	0.005	70.669	0.325	0.746	-0.009	0.012
Slope* Actor: Parent dies	0.004	0.004	50.822	1.074	0.288	-0.003	0.011
Slope* Partner: Parent dies	0.002	0.004	76.705	0.627	0.533	-0.005	0.010
Slope* Actor: New job	**0.008**	**0.004**	**59.045**	**2.233**	**0.029**	**0.001**	**0.015**
Slope* Partner: New job	0.002	0.004	61.175	0.649	0.519	-0.005	0.009
Slope* Actor: Retirement	-0.001	0.003	67.676	-0.230	0.819	-0.007	0.006
Slope* Partner: Retirement	0.000	0.003	63.861	0.022	0.983	-0.006	0.007
Slope* Actor: Unemployment	-0.002	0.008	69.012	-0.315	0.753	-0.017	0.013
Slope* Partner: Unemployment	0.011	0.008	46.503	1.396	0.169	-0.005	0.026

Note. Significant effects bolded, $p < .05$

Table 15. Linear growth curve model examining the effect of actor and partner life events on the slope of spousal strain; HRS sample.

	b	*SE*	*df*	*t*	*p*	*LB*	*UB*
Intercept	**2.043**	**0.089**	**8378.755**	**22.990**	**<.001**	**1.869**	**2.217**
Slope	**-0.069**	**0.022**	**11624.833**	**-3.229**	**0.001**	**-0.112**	**-0.027**
Actor: Moving	0.024	0.014	5776.402	1.735	0.083	-0.003	0.050
Actor: Birth of a child	0.049	0.027	7818.978	1.845	0.065	-0.003	0.101
Actor: death of a child	0.000	0.021	7732.396	0.012	0.990	-0.040	0.041
Actor: New chronic illness	**0.056**	**0.011**	**10124.802**	**4.922**	**<.001**	**0.034**	**0.078**
Partner: New chronic illness	**0.042**	**0.011**	**10097.522**	**3.745**	**<.001**	**0.020**	**0.064**
Actor: Negative health change	-0.046	0.047	12999.722	-0.964	0.335	-0.138	0.047
Partner: Negative health change	0.037	0.038	13411.971	0.972	0.331	-0.038	0.112
Actor: Positive health change	0.027	0.018	9733.018	1.544	0.123	-0.007	0.062
Partner: Positive health change	**0.052**	**0.018**	**9897.123**	**2.907**	**0.004**	**0.017**	**0.087**
Actor: Parent dies	-0.010	0.014	9526.466	-0.736	0.462	-0.037	0.017
Partner: Parent dies	0.011	0.013	9334.594	0.826	0.409	-0.015	0.037
Actor: New job	0.014	0.013	9798.231	1.078	0.281	-0.011	0.039
Partner: New job	-0.005	0.013	9933.752	-0.386	0.700	-0.030	0.020
Actor: Retirement	0.013	0.011	10143.887	1.160	0.246	-0.009	0.036
Partner: Retirement	0.007	0.011	10036.839	0.646	0.519	-0.015	0.030
Actor: Unemployment	**0.080**	**0.026**	**9252.873**	**3.025**	**0.002**	**0.028**	**0.132**
Partner: Unemployment	**0.094**	**0.027**	**9609.660**	**3.551**	**<.001**	**0.042**	**0.146**
Age	**-0.002**	**0.001**	**10391.367**	**-2.916**	**0.004**	**-0.004**	**-0.001**
Gender	**-0.041**	**0.004**	**6237.065**	**-9.111**	**<.001**	**-0.049**	**-0.032**
PersonOfColor	**0.114**	**0.015**	**8848.846**	**7.480**	**<.001**	**0.084**	**0.144**
Education	0.002	0.002	11412.837	0.956	0.339	-0.002	0.006
Wealth	**-0.016**	**0.004**	**6692.463**	**-3.626**	**<.001**	**-0.024**	**-0.007**
MarLength	**0.028**	**0.008**	**7456.710**	**3.635**	**<.001**	**0.013**	**0.043**
Slope* Actor: Moving	-0.002	0.003	3385.180	-0.622	0.534	-0.008	0.004
Slope* Actor: Birth of a child	0.001	0.007	4308.509	0.187	0.852	-0.012	0.014

Table 15 (cont'd)

Slope* Actor: death of a child	**-0.010**	**0.005**	**3488.106**	**-2.046**	**0.041**	**-0.020**	**0.000**
Slope* Actor: New chronic illness	0.002	0.003	7204.911	0.657	0.511	-0.004	0.008
Slope* Partner: New chronic illness	0.003	0.003	7024.668	0.882	0.378	-0.003	0.009
Slope* Actor: Negative health change	0.007	0.017	16066.789	0.425	0.671	-0.027	0.041
Slope* Partner: Negative health change	**0.050**	**0.013**	**15285.410**	**3.694**	**<.001**	**0.023**	**0.076**
Slope* Actor: Positive health change	0.001	0.005	6629.248	0.142	0.887	-0.009	0.010
Slope* Partner: Positive health change	0.001	0.005	6706.670	0.308	0.758	-0.008	0.011
Slope* Actor: Parent dies	-0.004	0.003	6064.885	-1.073	0.283	-0.010	0.003
Slope* Partner: Parent dies	0.000	0.003	5846.611	0.010	0.992	-0.006	0.006
Slope* Actor: New job	-0.001	0.003	6326.614	-0.343	0.731	-0.007	0.005
Slope* Partner: New job	0.001	0.003	6314.008	0.350	0.727	-0.005	0.008
Slope* Actor: Retirement	0.000	0.003	6583.715	0.004	0.997	-0.006	0.006
Slope* Partner: Retirement	0.004	0.003	6429.965	1.328	0.184	-0.002	0.010
Slope* Actor: Unemployment	0.012	0.007	5929.736	1.749	0.080	-0.001	0.025
Slope* Partner: Unemployment	0.000	0.007	6386.858	0.012	0.991	-0.013	0.014

Note. Significant effects bolded, $p < .05$

Table 16. A summary of which life events produced a (mal)adaptive response, organized by trait; HRS sample.

Trait	Adaptive	Maladaptive
Agreeableness	Actor: Death of a parent Partner: New job	Actor: Negative health change Actor: Positive health change
Conscientiousness	Actor: Death of a parent Partner: Death of a parent Partner: New job	Actor/Partner: Death of a child Actor: New chronic illness Partner: New chronic illness Actor: Negative health change
Extraversion	Actor: Parent dying Partner: New job	Actor: New chronic illness Actor: Negative health change
Neuroticism	Actor/Partner: Birth of a child Actor: Positive health change Actor: Death of a parent Actor: Unemployment Partner: Unemployment	Actor: New chronic illness Actor: Negative health change Partner: Negative health change
Openness	Actor: Death of a parent Partner: Death of a parent Actor: New job Partner: New job	Partner: New chronic illness Actor: Negative health change

Note. Type of response (i.e., adaptive or maladaptive) based on Event*Slope interactions. "Adaptive" responses include increases in all traits with the exception of neuroticism. "Maladaptive" responses include decreases in all traits with the exception of neuroticism.

APPENDIX B: TABLES FOR CHAPTER 3

Table 17. Frequency of life events; LISS sample.

Life event	Frequency (% of sample)
Birth of child	632 (9.1%)
Death of a child	310 (4.5%)
Death of a parent	995 (14.3%)
Negative change in health	3014 (43.3%)
Positive change in health	2880 (41.4%)
New chronic illness	2334 (33.5%)
Retirement	1834 (26.3%)
Unemployment	495 (7.1%)
First job	23 (.3%)

Table 18. Descriptives of and correlations between traits and relationship satisfaction; averaged across waves; LISS sample.

	Mean	SD	Agreeableness	Conscientiousness	Extraversion	Neuroticism	Openness
Agreeableness	3.861	0.510	1				
Conscientiousness	3.767	0.507	.302**	1	.108**		
Extraversion	3.245	0.652	.327**	.108**	1		
Neuroticism	2.490	0.684	-.077**	-.243**	-.240**	1	
Openness	3.469	0.499	.264**	.253**	.337**	-.205**	1
Relationship satisfaction			.111**	.130**	.109**	-.228**	.029**

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Table 19. Biserial correlations between life events within couples; LISS sample.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1. A: Birth of a child	1								
2. P: Birth of a child	1.000**	1							
3. A: Death of a child	.024*	.024*	1						
4. P: Death of a child	.024*	.024*	1.000**	1					
5. A: Death of a parent	0.010	0.010	.035**	.035**	1				
6. P: Death of a parent	0.010	0.010	.035**	.035**	.166**	1			
7. A: Negative health change	.077**	.077**	.108**	.108**	.209**	.152**	1		
8. P: Negative health change	.077**	.077**	.108**	.108**	.152**	.209**	.337**	1	
9. A: Positive health change	.076**	.076**	.080**	.080**	.213**	.159**	.668**	.295**	1
10. P: Positive health change	.076**	.076**	.080**	.080**	.159**	.213**	.295**	.668**	.304**
11. A: New chronic illness	-0.007	-0.007	.074**	.074**	.164**	.132**	.389**	.253**	.325**
12. P: New chronic illness	-0.007	-0.007	.074**	.074**	.132**	.164**	.253**	.389**	.219**
13. A: Retirement	-.125**	-.125**	.092**	.092**	-0.003	0.009	.161**	.149**	.120**
14. P: Retirement	-.125**	-.125**	.092**	.092**	0.009	-0.003	.149**	.161**	.117**
15. A: Unemployment	.027*	.027*	0.005	0.005	.093**	.090**	.085**	.083**	.094**
16. P: Unemployment	.027*	.027*	0.005	0.005	.090**	.093**	.083**	.085**	.084**
17. A: First job	.052**	.052**	0.012	0.012	0.019	-0.002	0.020	-0.015	0.023
18. P: First job	.052**	.052**	0.012	0.012	-0.002	0.019	-0.015	0.020	-0.003

Note. **Correlation is significant at the .01 level (2-tailed), *Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed). A indicates actor life event, P indicates partner life event.

Table 19 (cont'd)

10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17
1							
.219**	1						
.325**	.317**	1					
.117**	.296**	.294**	1				
.120**	.294**	.296**	.668**	1			
.084**	.060**	.047**	-.033**	-.037**	1		
.094**	.047**	.060**	-.037**	-.033**	.124**	1	
-0.003	0.007	-0.020	-.034**	-.029*	-0.006	0.004	1
0.023	-0.020	0.007	-.029*	-.034**	0.004	-0.006	-0.003

Table 20. Linear growth curve model examining the effect of actor and partner life events on the slope of agreeableness; LISS sample.

	b	*SE*	*df*	*t*	*p*	*LB*	*UB*
Intercept	**3.524**	**0.040**	**4103.069**	**87.235**	**0.000**	**3.445**	**3.603**
Slope	**-0.008**	**0.002**	**2222.506**	**-4.121**	**<.001**	**-0.012**	**-0.004**
Actor: Birth of a child	-0.026	0.024	2448.555	-1.083	0.279	-0.072	0.021
Actor: Death of a child	-0.028	0.028	2180.222	-1.004	0.315	-0.083	0.027
Actor: Parent death	-0.001	0.016	4099.892	-0.092	0.927	-0.033	0.030
Partner: Parent death	0.026	0.016	4232.074	1.641	0.101	-0.005	0.058
Actor: Negative health change	**0.039**	**0.017**	**5209.448**	**2.223**	**0.026**	**0.005**	**0.073**
Partner: Negative health change	-0.019	0.017	5029.903	-1.125	0.261	-0.053	0.014
Actor: Positive health change	-0.004	0.017	5176.352	-0.221	0.825	-0.037	0.029
Partner: Negative health change	-0.014	0.017	4983.184	-0.846	0.397	-0.047	0.018
Actor: New chronic illness	**0.031**	**0.014**	**4563.679**	**2.240**	**0.025**	**0.004**	**0.057**
Partner: New chronic illness	0.019	0.014	4594.124	1.389	0.165	-0.008	0.046
Actor: Retired	-0.001	0.019	4520.791	-0.045	0.964	-0.037	0.035
Partner: Retired	0.008	0.018	4583.301	0.415	0.678	-0.028	0.044
Actor: Unemployed	0.024	0.022	4332.348	1.078	0.281	-0.020	0.068
Partner: Unemployed	0.006	0.022	4220.065	0.249	0.804	-0.038	0.049
Age	**0.004**	**0.001**	**3606.324**	**4.856**	**<.001**	**0.003**	**0.006**
Gender	**-0.171**	**0.006**	**3029.985**	**-30.600**	**<.001**	**-0.182**	**-0.160**
Relationship length	-0.001	0.001	3164.951	-1.850	0.064	-0.003	0.000
Education	**0.029**	**0.004**	**5041.401**	**7.143**	**<.001**	**0.021**	**0.037**
Slope*Actor: Birth of a child	**0.005**	**0.002**	**1493.901**	**2.044**	**0.041**	**0.000**	**0.010**
Slope*Actor: Death of a child	**-0.006**	**0.003**	**1342.926**	**-2.013**	**0.044**	**-0.011**	**0.000**
Slope*Actor: Parent death	0.001	0.001	2061.169	0.752	0.452	-0.002	0.004
Slope*Partner: Parent death	0.001	0.002	2074.179	0.415	0.678	-0.002	0.004
Slope*Actor: Negative health change	0.000	0.002	3100.691	-0.029	0.977	-0.004	0.004
Slope*Partner: Negative health change	-0.002	0.002	2789.774	-0.864	0.388	-0.006	0.002
Slope*Actor: Positive health change	0.002	0.002	3093.124	0.956	0.339	-0.002	0.006

Table 20 (cont'd)

Slope*Partner: Negative health change	0.003	0.002	2775.219	1.354	0.176	-0.001	0.006
Slope*Actor: New chronic illness	-0.001	0.001	2399.273	-1.022	0.307	-0.004	0.001
Slope*Partner: New chronic illness	0.000	0.001	2330.960	-0.223	0.823	-0.003	0.002
Slope*Actor: Retired	0.000	0.002	1779.130	0.160	0.873	-0.003	0.004
Slope*Partner: Retired	0.000	0.002	1781.502	-0.287	0.774	-0.004	0.003
Slope*Actor: Unemployed	0.000	0.002	2065.845	0.145	0.885	-0.004	0.005
Slope*Partner: Unemployed	0.003	0.002	2091.515	1.267	0.205	-0.002	0.007

Note. Significant effects bolded, $p < .05$

Table 21. Linear growth curve model examining the effect of actor/partner life events and relationship satisfaction on the slope of agreeableness; LISS sample.

	b	*SE*	*df*	*t*	*p*	*LB*	*UB*
Intercept	**3.555**	**0.045**	**3331.959**	**79.183**	**0.000**	**3.467**	**3.643**
Slope	-0.004	0.002	1945.073	-1.939	0.053	-0.008	0.000
Actor: Birth of a child	-0.035	0.026	2216.163	-1.385	0.166	-0.086	0.015
Actor: Death of a child	-0.019	0.029	1986.854	-0.666	0.506	-0.076	0.038
Actor: Parent death	-0.003	0.016	3522.061	-0.157	0.875	-0.035	0.030
Partner: Parent death	0.021	0.017	3614.333	1.260	0.208	-0.012	0.054
Actor: Negative health change	0.033	0.019	4496.768	1.793	0.073	-0.003	0.069
Partner: Negative health change	-0.015	0.018	4266.199	-0.841	0.400	-0.051	0.020
Actor: Positive health change	0.005	0.018	4442.356	0.273	0.785	-0.030	0.040
Partner: Negative health change	-0.018	0.018	4221.109	-1.016	0.309	-0.053	0.017
Actor: New chronic illness	0.026	0.014	3910.531	1.828	0.068	-0.002	0.055
Partner: New chronic illness	0.016	0.015	3915.244	1.130	0.259	-0.012	0.045
Actor: Retired	-0.012	0.020	3749.192	-0.583	0.560	-0.050	0.027
Partner: Retired	0.001	0.020	3859.731	0.033	0.974	-0.038	0.039
Actor: Unemployed	0.029	0.024	3665.638	1.206	0.228	-0.018	0.075
Partner: Unemployed	0.017	0.024	3653.640	0.713	0.476	-0.030	0.064
Age	**0.004**	**0.001**	**2998.134**	**3.824**	**<.001**	**0.002**	**0.006**
Gender	**-0.172**	**0.006**	**2501.673**	**-27.743**	**<.001**	**-0.185**	**-0.160**
Relationship length	-0.001	0.001	2677.778	-1.187	0.235	-0.003	0.001
Education	**0.028**	**0.004**	**4080.434**	**6.258**	**<.001**	**0.019**	**0.037**
Relationship satisfaction	**0.044**	**0.009**	**4869.800**	**4.835**	**<.001**	**0.026**	**0.062**
Slope*Relationship satisfaction	**-0.002**	**0.001**	**1903.968**	**-3.383**	**<.001**	**-0.003**	**-0.001**
Actor: Birth of a child*Satisfaction	-0.005	0.018	3531.100	-0.274	0.784	-0.040	0.030
Actor: Death of a child*Satisfaction	0.010	0.020	3320.890	0.487	0.626	-0.029	0.048
Actor: Parent death*Satisfaction	0.004	0.012	3853.463	0.372	0.710	-0.019	0.027
Partner: Parent death*Satisfaction	-0.016	0.012	3991.983	-1.335	0.182	-0.039	0.007
Actor: Negative health change*Satisfaction	-0.017	0.013	4160.949	-1.321	0.187	-0.042	0.008

Table 21 (cont'd)

Partner: Negative health change*Satisfaction	-0.016	0.013	4335.501	-1.259	0.208	-0.040	0.009
Actor: Positive health change*Satisfaction	-0.011	0.012	4204.795	-0.896	0.370	-0.035	0.013
Partner: Negative health change*Satisfaction	0.023	0.012	4230.669	1.861	0.063	-0.001	0.047
Actor: New chronic illness*Satisfaction	-0.007	0.010	4038.729	-0.669	0.503	-0.027	0.013
Partner: New chronic illness*Satisfaction	0.000	0.010	4148.049	-0.002	0.999	-0.020	0.020
Actor: Retired*Satisfaction	0.000	0.013	3738.184	0.014	0.989	-0.025	0.025
Partner: Retired*Satisfaction	-0.011	0.012	3682.443	-0.893	0.372	-0.036	0.013
Actor: Unemployed*Satisfaction	-0.018	0.016	4014.364	-1.146	0.252	-0.049	0.013
Partner: Unemployed*Satisfaction	0.011	0.016	3804.394	0.735	0.463	-0.019	0.042
Slope*Actor: Birth of a child	0.004	0.002	1432.074	1.779	0.075	0.000	0.009
Slope*Actor: Death of a child	-0.003	0.003	1366.413	-1.176	0.240	-0.009	0.002
Slope*Actor: Parent death	0.000	0.001	1930.996	0.200	0.841	-0.003	0.003
Slope*Partner: Parent death	0.000	0.002	1935.156	-0.060	0.952	-0.003	0.003
Slope*Actor: Negative health change	0.000	0.002	2764.968	0.000	1.000	-0.004	0.004
Slope*Partner: Negative health change	-0.002	0.002	2515.221	-1.224	0.221	-0.006	0.001
Slope*Actor: Positive health change	0.001	0.002	2774.476	0.592	0.554	-0.003	0.005
Slope*Partner: Negative health change	0.002	0.002	2517.403	1.186	0.236	-0.002	0.006
Slope*Actor: New chronic illness	-0.002	0.001	2204.447	-1.548	0.122	-0.005	0.001
Slope*Partner: New chronic illness	-0.001	0.001	2150.273	-0.470	0.638	-0.004	0.002
Slope*Actor: Retired	0.000	0.002	1641.080	-0.041	0.967	-0.003	0.003
Slope*Partner: Retired	-0.001	0.002	1637.489	-0.672	0.501	-0.005	0.002
Slope*Actor: Unemployed	-0.001	0.002	1915.605	-0.504	0.614	-0.005	0.003
Slope*Partner: Unemployed	0.002	0.002	1933.849	0.851	0.395	-0.002	0.006

Table 21 (cont'd)

Slope*Actor: Birth of a child*Satisfaction	0.001	0.002	2115.871	0.703	0.482	-0.002	0.004
Slope*Actor: Death of a child*Satisfaction	**-0.007**	**0.002**	**2271.314**	**-3.802**	**<.001**	**-0.011**	**-0.004**

Note. Significant effects bolded, $p < .01$

Table 22. Linear growth curve model examining the effect of actor and partner life events on the slope of conscientiousness; LISS sample.

	b	*SE*	*df*	*t*	*p*	*LB*	*UB*
Intercept	**3.443**	**0.043**	**3993.633**	**80.274**	**0.000**	**3.359**	**3.527**
Slope	0.000	0.002	2098.818	0.254	0.800	-0.003	0.004
Actor: Birth of a child	0.002	0.025	2526.254	0.073	0.942	-0.047	0.051
Actor: Death of a child	-0.045	0.030	2297.514	-1.506	0.132	-0.103	0.013
Actor: Parent death	0.031	0.017	4396.220	1.855	0.064	-0.002	0.064
Partner: Parent death	**-0.036**	**0.017**	**4518.512**	**-2.081**	**0.037**	**-0.069**	**-0.002**
Actor: Negative health change	0.000	0.018	5509.259	-0.026	0.980	-0.036	0.035
Partner: Negative health change	-0.003	0.018	5285.501	-0.161	0.872	-0.038	0.032
Actor: Positive health change	**0.070**	**0.018**	**5462.969**	**3.963**	**<.001**	**0.035**	**0.105**
Partner: Negative health change	0.020	0.017	5251.479	1.159	0.247	-0.014	0.054
Actor: New chronic illness	0.002	0.014	4832.654	0.167	0.867	-0.026	0.031
Partner: New chronic illness	-0.016	0.014	4823.938	-1.134	0.257	-0.045	0.012
Actor: Retired	**-0.050**	**0.020**	**4741.878**	**-2.540**	**0.011**	**-0.089**	**-0.011**
Partner: Retired	0.031	0.019	4592.958	1.594	0.111	-0.007	0.069
Actor: Unemployed	0.012	0.024	4570.554	0.492	0.623	-0.035	0.058
Partner: Unemployed	0.020	0.024	4578.550	0.827	0.408	-0.027	0.066
Age	**0.003**	**0.001**	**3580.735**	**3.205**	**0.001**	**0.001**	**0.005**
Gender	**-0.040**	**0.006**	**3013.487**	**-6.641**	**<.001**	**-0.052**	**-0.028**
Relationship length	**0.002**	**0.001**	**3146.717**	**2.285**	**0.022**	**0.000**	**0.003**
Education	**0.024**	**0.004**	**4971.105**	**5.558**	**<.001**	**0.016**	**0.032**
Slope*Actor: Birth of a child	0.004	0.002	1437.683	1.747	0.081	0.000	0.008
Slope*Actor: Death of a child	0.003	0.002	1316.780	1.391	0.164	-0.001	0.008
Slope*Actor: Parent death	0.002	0.001	2053.209	1.292	0.197	-0.001	0.005
Slope*Partner: Parent death	**0.003**	**0.001**	**2056.240**	**1.970**	**0.049**	**0.000**	**0.006**
Slope*Actor: Negative health change	**-0.004**	**0.002**	**3075.954**	**-2.090**	**0.037**	**-0.008**	**0.000**

Table 22 (cont'd)

Slope*Partner: Negative health change	0.000	0.002	2730.857	-0.221	0.825	-0.004	0.003
Slope*Actor: Positive health change	0.004	0.002	3061.006	1.837	0.066	0.000	0.007
Slope*Partner: Negative health change	0.001	0.002	2721.662	0.440	0.660	-0.003	0.004
Slope*Actor: New chronic illness	**-0.003**	**0.001**	**2375.446**	**-1.981**	**0.048**	**-0.005**	**0.000**
Slope*Partner: New chronic illness	-0.001	0.001	2308.167	-0.497	0.619	-0.003	0.002
Slope*Actor: Retired	-0.002	0.002	1753.604	-0.934	0.350	-0.005	0.002
Slope*Partner: Retired	**-0.006**	**0.002**	**1756.479**	**-3.522**	**<.001**	**-0.009**	**-0.003**
Slope*Actor: Unemployed	0.003	0.002	2014.054	1.716	0.086	0.000	0.007
Slope*Partner: Unemployed	0.002	0.002	2087.830	1.087	0.277	-0.002	0.006

Note. Significant effects bolded, $p < .05$

Table 23. Linear growth curve model examining the effect of actor/partner life events and relationship satisfaction on the slope of conscientiousness; LISS sample.

	b	*SE*	*df*	*t*	*p*	*LB*	*UB*
Intercept	**3.463**	**0.048**	**3221.515**	**72.530**	**0.000**	**3.370**	**3.557**
Slope	0.002	0.002	1821.390	1.254	0.210	-0.001	0.006
Actor: Birth of a child	-0.018	0.027	2229.994	-0.671	0.502	-0.071	0.035
Actor: Death of a child	-0.034	0.031	2030.962	-1.094	0.274	-0.094	0.027
Actor: Parent death	0.027	0.018	3688.785	1.534	0.125	-0.008	0.062
Partner: Parent death	-0.031	0.018	3771.478	-1.736	0.083	-0.067	0.004
Actor: Negative health change	-0.010	0.020	4618.651	-0.534	0.593	-0.049	0.028
Partner: Negative health change	-0.006	0.019	4381.789	-0.297	0.767	-0.043	0.032
Actor: Positive health change	**0.074**	**0.019**	**4564.048**	**3.905**	**<.001**	**0.037**	**0.111**
Partner: Negative health change	0.024	0.019	4361.685	1.268	0.205	-0.013	0.061
Actor: New chronic illness	0.000	0.015	4058.039	-0.015	0.988	-0.030	0.030
Partner: New chronic illness	-0.012	0.015	4014.717	-0.783	0.434	-0.042	0.018
Actor: Retired	-0.050	0.021	3878.083	-2.348	0.019	-0.092	-0.008
Partner: Retired	0.021	0.021	3775.235	1.012	0.311	-0.020	0.062
Actor: Unemployed	0.039	0.025	3792.177	1.525	0.127	-0.011	0.088
Partner: Unemployed	0.023	0.026	3836.397	0.893	0.372	-0.027	0.073
Age	0.003	0.001	2954.216	2.486	0.013	0.001	0.005
Gender	**-0.043**	**0.007**	**2459.088**	**-6.403**	**<.001**	**-0.056**	**-0.030**
Relationship length	0.002	0.001	2645.970	1.979	0.048	0.000	0.004
Education	**0.026**	**0.005**	**3973.841**	**5.405**	**<.001**	**0.016**	**0.035**
Relationship satisfaction	**0.037**	**0.011**	**5678.368**	**3.391**	**<.001**	**0.016**	**0.058**
Slope*Relationship satisfaction	-0.003	0.001	2598.173	-2.201	0.028	-0.005	0.000
Actor: Birth of a child*Satisfaction	-0.029	0.018	3867.474	-1.558	0.119	-0.065	0.007
Actor: Death of a child*Satisfaction	-0.007	0.020	3552.392	-0.325	0.745	-0.047	0.033
Actor: Parent death*Satisfaction	-0.021	0.013	3938.970	-1.637	0.102	-0.046	0.004
Partner: Parent death*Satisfaction	-0.018	0.013	3737.284	-1.381	0.167	-0.043	0.007
Actor: Negative health change*Satisfaction	-0.013	0.014	4582.375	-0.887	0.375	-0.041	0.015
Partner: Negative health change*Satisfaction	-0.001	0.014	4454.308	-0.064	0.949	-0.028	0.026

Table 23 (cont'd)

Actor: Positive health change*Satisfaction	0.003	0.014	4406.389	0.217	0.828	-0.024	0.029
Partner: Negative health change*Satisfaction	0.022	0.013	4398.322	1.667	0.096	-0.004	0.049
Actor: New chronic illness*Satisfaction	0.003	0.012	3964.451	0.221	0.825	-0.020	0.025
Partner: New chronic illness*Satisfaction	0.009	0.011	4156.589	0.783	0.434	-0.013	0.031
Actor: Retired*Satisfaction	-0.013	0.014	3731.431	-0.952	0.341	-0.040	0.014
Partner: Retired*Satisfaction	0.000	0.014	3679.014	-0.002	0.999	-0.027	0.027
Actor: Unemployed*Satisfaction	0.005	0.017	3959.494	0.294	0.769	-0.028	0.038
Partner: Unemployed*Satisfaction	-0.022	0.017	3979.678	-1.302	0.193	-0.056	0.011
Slope*Actor: Birth of a child	0.002	0.002	1362.119	1.052	0.293	-0.002	0.007
Slope*Actor: Death of a child	0.003	0.003	1270.156	1.354	0.176	-0.002	0.008
Slope*Actor: Parent death	0.001	0.001	1859.511	1.014	0.311	-0.001	0.004
Slope*Partner: Parent death	0.002	0.001	1854.577	1.539	0.124	-0.001	0.005
Slope*Actor: Negative health change	-0.005	0.002	2656.140	-2.299	0.022	-0.009	-0.001
Slope*Partner: Negative health change	0.000	0.002	2381.776	-0.207	0.836	-0.004	0.003
Slope*Actor: Positive health change	0.004	0.002	2655.336	1.876	0.061	0.000	0.008
Slope*Partner: Negative health change	0.001	0.002	2389.576	0.624	0.532	-0.003	0.005
Slope*Actor: New chronic illness	**-0.004**	**0.001**	**2115.297**	**-2.772**	**0.006**	**-0.007**	**-0.001**
Slope*Partner: New chronic illness	0.000	0.001	2061.326	-0.186	0.852	-0.003	0.002
Slope*Actor: Retired	-0.002	0.002	1604.649	-1.265	0.206	-0.005	0.001
Slope*Partner: Retired	**-0.006**	**0.002**	**1602.610**	**-3.327**	**<.001**	**-0.009**	**-0.002**
Slope*Actor: Unemployed	0.002	0.002	1803.880	0.798	0.425	-0.002	0.006
Slope*Partner: Unemployed	0.001	0.002	1878.397	0.382	0.702	-0.003	0.005
Slope*Actor: Parent death*Satisfaction	-0.002	0.001	1866.711	-1.901	0.058	-0.004	0.000
Slope*Actor: Negative health change*Satisfaction	0.001	0.001	2244.767	1.253	0.210	-0.001	0.004
Slope*Actor: New chronic illness*Satisfaction	0.001	0.001	2107.928	0.882	0.378	-0.001	0.003

Table 23 (cont'd)

Slope*Partner: Retired*Satisfaction	-0.001	0.001	1892.625	-1.058	0.290	-0.003	0.001

Note. Significant effects bolded, $p < .01$

Table 24. Linear growth curve model examining the effect of actor and partner life events on the slope of extraversion; LISS sample.

	b	*SE*	*df*	*t*	*p*	*LB*	*UB*
Intercept	**3.179**	**0.054**	**3808.969**	**58.846**	**0.000**	**3.073**	**3.285**
Slope	**-0.005**	**0.002**	**2079.933**	**-2.463**	**0.014**	**-0.009**	**-0.001**
Actor: Birth of a child	-0.020	0.031	2595.317	-0.630	0.529	-0.081	0.042
Actor: Death of a child	0.047	0.037	2383.884	1.262	0.207	-0.026	0.120
Actor: Parent death	0.002	0.023	4643.882	0.075	0.940	-0.043	0.046
Partner: Parent death	0.004	0.023	4761.499	0.180	0.857	-0.041	0.049
Actor: Negative health change	0.021	0.024	5650.881	0.876	0.381	-0.026	0.067
Partner: Negative health change	0.021	0.023	5457.487	0.900	0.368	-0.025	0.067
Actor: Positive health change	0.029	0.023	5609.752	1.244	0.213	-0.017	0.074
Partner: Negative health change	-0.023	0.023	5421.683	-1.021	0.307	-0.068	0.022
Actor: New chronic illness	**-0.054**	**0.019**	**4984.233**	**-2.797**	**0.005**	**-0.091**	**-0.016**
Partner: New chronic illness	**-0.041**	**0.019**	**5010.780**	**-2.109**	**0.035**	**-0.078**	**-0.003**
Actor: Retired	-0.022	0.027	4655.037	-0.824	0.410	-0.074	0.030
Partner: Retired	0.049	0.026	4571.165	1.880	0.060	-0.002	0.100
Actor: Unemployed	**0.091**	**0.032**	**4842.305**	**2.880**	**0.004**	**0.029**	**0.153**
Partner: Unemployed	-0.012	0.032	4806.884	-0.381	0.703	-0.074	0.050
Age	-0.001	0.001	3428.050	-0.827	0.408	-0.003	0.001
Gender	0.010	0.008	3004.145	1.234	0.217	-0.006	0.027
Relationship length	0.000	0.001	3107.120	0.131	0.896	-0.002	0.002
Education	**0.031**	**0.006**	**4679.518**	**5.585**	**<.001**	**0.020**	**0.042**
Slope*Actor: Birth of a child	-0.001	0.002	1384.819	-0.474	0.636	-0.006	0.004
Slope*Actor: Death of a child	0.000	0.003	1259.738	0.165	0.869	-0.005	0.006
Slope*Actor: Parent death	0.000	0.002	2101.219	0.157	0.875	-0.003	0.003
Slope*Partner: Parent death	-0.001	0.002	2106.374	-0.508	0.611	-0.004	0.002
Slope*Actor: Negative health change	**-0.007**	**0.002**	**3153.234**	**-3.110**	**0.002**	**-0.012**	**-0.003**

Table 24 (cont'd)

Slope*Partner: Negative health change	0.002	0.002	2808.360	0.708	0.479	-0.003	0.006
Slope*Actor: Positive health change	**0.007**	**0.002**	**3141.444**	**3.222**	**0.001**	**0.003**	**0.012**
Slope*Partner: Negative health change	-0.001	0.002	2794.861	-0.609	0.543	-0.005	0.003
Slope*Actor: New chronic illness	-0.002	0.002	2433.932	-1.334	0.182	-0.005	0.001
Slope*Partner: New chronic illness	-0.002	0.002	2364.788	-1.471	0.141	-0.005	0.001
Slope*Actor: Retired	0.001	0.002	1773.934	0.431	0.667	-0.003	0.005
Slope*Partner: Retired	0.003	0.002	1777.704	1.338	0.181	-0.001	0.006
Slope*Actor: Unemployed	0.001	0.002	2081.541	0.462	0.644	-0.003	0.006
Slope*Partner: Unemployed	-0.001	0.002	2128.998	-0.570	0.569	-0.006	0.003

Note. Significant effects bolded, $p < .05$

Table 25. Linear growth curve model examining the effect of actor/partner life events and relationship satisfaction on the slope of extraversion, LISS sample.

	b	*SE*	*df*	*t*	*p*	*LB*	*UB*
Intercept	**3.144**	**0.061**	**3096.119**	**51.397**	**0.000**	**3.024**	**3.264**
Slope	-0.004	0.002	1813.488	-1.815	0.070	-0.008	0.000
Actor: Birth of a child	-0.023	0.035	2283.667	-0.677	0.499	-0.091	0.044
Actor: Death of a child	0.051	0.039	2091.443	1.288	0.198	-0.027	0.128
Actor: Parent death	0.005	0.024	3857.075	0.229	0.819	-0.041	0.052
Partner: Parent death	0.011	0.024	3935.957	0.465	0.642	-0.036	0.059
Actor: Negative health change	0.028	0.026	4692.137	1.078	0.281	-0.023	0.078
Partner: Negative health change	0.025	0.026	4459.758	0.971	0.331	-0.025	0.075
Actor: Positive health change	0.034	0.025	4651.102	1.374	0.170	-0.015	0.084
Partner: Negative health change	-0.023	0.025	4442.496	-0.916	0.360	-0.071	0.026
Actor: New chronic illness	**-0.065**	**0.021**	**4143.733**	**-3.136**	**0.002**	**-0.105**	**-0.024**
Partner: New chronic illness	-0.048	0.021	4136.321	-2.315	0.021	-0.089	-0.007
Actor: Retired	-0.031	0.029	3817.173	-1.090	0.276	-0.088	0.025
Partner: Retired	0.042	0.028	3770.308	1.494	0.135	-0.013	0.098
Actor: Unemployed	0.084	0.034	3959.336	2.472	0.013	0.017	0.151
Partner: Unemployed	0.008	0.035	3991.667	0.243	0.808	-0.060	0.076
Age	-0.001	0.001	2852.792	-0.613	0.540	-0.004	0.002
Gender	0.008	0.009	2490.161	0.794	0.427	-0.011	0.026
Relationship length	0.001	0.001	2623.958	0.688	0.491	-0.001	0.003
Education	**0.034**	**0.006**	**3803.163**	**5.455**	**<.001**	**0.022**	**0.046**
Relationship satisfaction	**0.054**	**0.013**	**5264.143**	**3.996**	**<.001**	**0.027**	**0.080**
Slope*Relationship satisfaction	0.000	0.001	2530.882	-0.162	0.872	-0.003	0.002
Actor: Birth of a child*Satisfaction	-0.059	0.024	3787.942	-2.414	0.016	-0.107	-0.011
Actor: Death of a child*Satisfaction	0.041	0.027	3443.422	1.529	0.126	-0.012	0.093
Actor: Parent death*Satisfaction	0.009	0.017	4110.483	0.524	0.600	-0.025	0.043
Partner: Parent death*Satisfaction	-0.004	0.017	4211.064	-0.238	0.812	-0.038	0.030
Actor: Negative health change*Satisfaction	-0.009	0.020	4455.358	-0.476	0.634	-0.048	0.029

Table 25 (cont'd)

Partner: Negative health change*Satisfaction	-0.015	0.018	4430.603	-0.817	0.414	-0.051	0.021
Actor: Positive health change*Satisfaction	-0.005	0.019	4560.990	-0.246	0.805	-0.042	0.033
Partner: Negative health change*Satisfaction	0.011	0.018	4361.842	0.617	0.537	-0.024	0.046
Actor: New chronic illness*Satisfaction	0.006	0.015	4246.361	0.393	0.694	-0.024	0.035
Partner: New chronic illness*Satisfaction	-0.021	0.015	4311.244	-1.376	0.169	-0.051	0.009
Actor: Retired*Satisfaction	-0.021	0.019	3971.374	-1.138	0.255	-0.058	0.015
Partner: Retired*Satisfaction	0.002	0.018	3929.787	0.086	0.931	-0.035	0.038
Actor: Unemployed*Satisfaction	-0.016	0.023	4177.244	-0.677	0.498	-0.061	0.030
Partner: Unemployed*Satisfaction	0.039	0.023	4105.729	1.720	0.086	-0.006	0.084
Slope*Actor: Birth of a child	-0.002	0.003	1322.584	-0.943	0.346	-0.008	0.003
Slope*Actor: Death of a child	0.002	0.003	1221.549	0.689	0.491	-0.004	0.008
Slope*Actor: Parent death	0.000	0.002	1937.842	0.199	0.843	-0.003	0.004
Slope*Partner: Parent death	-0.001	0.002	1941.021	-0.781	0.435	-0.005	0.002
Slope*Actor: Negative health change	**-0.008**	**0.002**	**2763.285**	**-3.251**	**0.001**	**-0.013**	**-0.003**
Slope*Partner: Negative health change	0.002	0.002	2493.511	0.927	0.354	-0.002	0.007
Slope*Actor: Positive health change	**0.007**	**0.002**	**2763.788**	**3.183**	**0.001**	**0.003**	**0.012**
Slope*Partner: Negative health change	-0.002	0.002	2498.677	-0.909	0.363	-0.006	0.002
Slope*Actor: New chronic illness	-0.002	0.002	2201.902	-1.452	0.147	-0.006	0.001
Slope*Partner: New chronic illness	-0.002	0.002	2151.009	-1.306	0.192	-0.005	0.001
Slope*Actor: Retired	0.001	0.002	1622.432	0.608	0.543	-0.003	0.005
Slope*Partner: Retired	0.002	0.002	1622.165	1.105	0.269	-0.002	0.006
Slope*Actor: Unemployed	-0.001	0.002	1901.960	-0.590	0.555	-0.006	0.003

Table 25 (cont'd)

Slope*Partner: Unemployed	-0.002	0.002	1947.214	-0.607	0.544	-0.006	0.003
Slope*Actor: Negative health change*Satisfaction	0.000	0.002	2449.542	0.178	0.859	-0.003	0.004
Slope*Actor: Positive health change*Satisfaction	-0.002	0.002	2683.945	-1.295	0.195	-0.006	0.001

Note. Significant effects bolded, $p < .01$

Table 26. Linear growth curve model examining the effect of actor and partner life events on the slope of neuroticism; LISS sample.

	b	*SE*	*df*	*t*	*p*	*LB*	*UB*
Intercept	**2.736**	**0.057**	**4073.509**	**47.790**	**0.000**	**2.624**	**2.849**
Slope	**-0.018**	**0.003**	**2049.960**	**-7.155**	**<.001**	**-0.023**	**-0.013**
Actor: Birth of a child	0.053	0.034	2512.962	1.577	0.115	-0.013	0.119
Actor: Death of a child	-0.018	0.040	2279.923	-0.447	0.655	-0.096	0.060
Actor: Parent death	-0.047	0.022	4260.109	-2.114	0.035	-0.090	-0.003
Partner: Parent death	0.008	0.022	4375.267	0.352	0.725	-0.036	0.052
Actor: Negative health change	0.018	0.024	5371.929	0.753	0.451	-0.029	0.065
Partner: Negative health change	0.022	0.024	5143.879	0.926	0.354	-0.024	0.068
Actor: Positive health change	**-0.075**	**0.023**	**5321.090**	**-3.200**	**0.001**	**-0.121**	**-0.029**
Partner: Negative health change	-0.028	0.023	5113.276	-1.216	0.224	-0.073	0.017
Actor: New chronic illness	**0.109**	**0.019**	**4716.773**	**5.728**	**<.001**	**0.071**	**0.146**
Partner: New chronic illness	0.027	0.019	4691.511	1.401	0.161	-0.011	0.064
Actor: Retired	-0.013	0.026	4718.548	-0.497	0.619	-0.064	0.038
Partner: Retired	**-0.053**	**0.025**	**4507.330**	**-2.098**	**0.036**	**-0.102**	**-0.003**
Actor: Unemployed	0.011	0.031	4400.130	0.340	0.734	-0.050	0.072
Partner: Unemployed	0.016	0.031	4453.819	0.506	0.613	-0.045	0.077
Age	-0.001	0.001	3645.190	-0.525	0.600	-0.003	0.002
Gender	**-0.122**	**0.008**	**2978.163**	**-15.725**	**<.001**	**-0.137**	**-0.107**
Relationship length	**-0.002**	**0.001**	**3175.061**	**-2.322**	**0.020**	**-0.005**	**0.000**
Education	**-0.050**	**0.006**	**5026.188**	**-8.773**	**<.001**	**-0.061**	**-0.039**
Slope*Actor: Birth of a child	0.000	0.003	1368.962	-0.016	0.987	-0.006	0.006
Slope*Actor: Death of a child	0.001	0.004	1241.882	0.179	0.858	-0.006	0.008
Slope*Actor: Parent death	0.000	0.002	2036.831	-0.135	0.893	-0.004	0.004
Slope*Partner: Parent death	-0.003	0.002	2047.719	-1.650	0.099	-0.007	0.001
Slope*Actor: Negative health change	**0.011**	**0.003**	**3069.820**	**3.840**	**<.001**	**0.005**	**0.016**

Table 26 (cont'd)

Slope*Partner: Negative health change	0.003	0.003	2737.322	1.054	0.292	-0.002	0.008
Slope*Actor: Positive health change	**-0.006**	**0.003**	**3054.962**	**-2.201**	**0.028**	**-0.011**	**-0.001**
Slope*Partner: Negative health change	-0.001	0.003	2724.304	-0.402	0.687	-0.006	0.004
Slope*Actor: New chronic illness	**0.006**	**0.002**	**2369.718**	**3.218**	**0.001**	**0.002**	**0.010**
Slope*Partner: Change in chronic condition	0.003	0.002	2303.172	1.767	0.077	0.000	0.007
Slope*Actor: Retired	-0.001	0.002	1734.073	-0.445	0.656	-0.005	0.003
Slope*Partner: Retired	-0.001	0.002	1736.374	-0.352	0.725	-0.005	0.004
Slope*Actor: Unemployed	**-0.008**	**0.003**	**2018.885**	**-2.760**	**0.006**	**-0.013**	**-0.002**
Slope*Partner: Unemployed	0.000	0.003	2080.149	-0.145	0.885	-0.006	0.005

Note. Significant effects bolded, $p < .05$

Table 27. Linear growth curve model examining the effect of actor/partner life events and relationship satisfaction on the slope of neuroticism; LISS sample.

	b	*SE*	*df*	*t*	*p*	*LB*	*UB*
Intercept	**2.732**	**0.063**	**3285.402**	**43.394**	**0.000**	**2.608**	**2.855**
Slope	**-0.018**	**0.003**	**1780.715**	**-6.561**	**<.001**	**-0.023**	**-0.012**
Actor: Birth of a child	0.056	0.036	2228.160	1.568	0.117	-0.014	0.127
Actor: Death of a child	-0.020	0.041	2020.115	-0.487	0.626	-0.100	0.060
Actor: Parent death	-0.051	0.023	3605.232	-2.204	0.028	-0.096	-0.006
Partner: Parent death	-0.007	0.023	3686.564	-0.287	0.774	-0.053	0.039
Actor: Negative health change	0.016	0.026	4552.574	0.609	0.543	-0.035	0.066
Partner: Negative health change	0.028	0.025	4311.526	1.112	0.266	-0.021	0.077
Actor: Positive health change	**-0.080**	**0.025**	**4494.304**	**-3.238**	**0.001**	**-0.129**	**-0.032**
Partner: Negative health change	-0.034	0.025	4291.975	-1.395	0.163	-0.082	0.014
Actor: New chronic illness	**0.106**	**0.020**	**3995.850**	**5.251**	**<.001**	**0.066**	**0.145**
Partner: New chronic illness	0.021	0.020	3936.688	1.025	0.306	-0.019	0.060
Actor: Retired	0.000	0.028	3866.397	-0.008	0.994	-0.055	0.054
Partner: Retired	-0.057	0.027	3706.492	-2.100	0.036	-0.109	-0.004
Actor: Unemployed	-0.002	0.033	3687.168	-0.072	0.943	-0.067	0.062
Partner: Unemployed	-0.018	0.034	3763.736	-0.545	0.586	-0.084	0.047
Age	0.001	0.001	2997.901	0.449	0.653	-0.002	0.003
Gender	**-0.114**	**0.009**	**2424.321**	**-13.163**	**<.001**	**-0.131**	**-0.097**
Relationship length	**-0.004**	**0.001**	**2669.939**	**-2.974**	**0.003**	**-0.006**	**-0.001**
Education	**-0.057**	**0.006**	**4000.060**	**-9.090**	**<.001**	**-0.069**	**-0.044**
Relationship satisfaction	**-0.082**	**0.014**	**5825.202**	**-5.689**	**<.001**	**-0.111**	**-0.054**
Slope*Relationship satisfaction	**0.004**	**0.002**	**2608.468**	**2.633**	**0.009**	**0.001**	**0.007**
Actor: Birth of a child*Satisfaction	**0.076**	**0.024**	**3884.317**	**3.144**	**0.002**	**0.029**	**0.123**
Actor: Death of a child*Satisfaction	-0.015	0.027	3596.730	-0.549	0.583	-0.067	0.038
Actor: Parent death*Satisfaction	-0.005	0.017	3800.856	-0.313	0.754	-0.038	0.027
Partner: Parent death*Satisfaction	-0.005	0.017	3908.126	-0.288	0.773	-0.037	0.028
Actor: Negative health change*Satisfaction	0.013	0.019	4237.041	0.682	0.495	-0.025	0.051

Table 27 (cont'd)

Partner: Negative health change*Satisfaction	0.010	0.018	4417.026	0.585	0.558	-0.025	0.045
Actor: Positive health change*Satisfaction	0.008	0.019	4359.758	0.414	0.679	-0.029	0.045
Partner: Negative health change*Satisfaction	-0.022	0.017	4367.819	-1.250	0.211	-0.056	0.012
Actor: New chronic illness*Satisfaction	-0.014	0.015	3896.637	-0.917	0.359	-0.043	0.016
Partner: New chronic illness*Satisfaction	-0.006	0.015	4054.097	-0.422	0.673	-0.035	0.022
Actor: Retired*Satisfaction	0.020	0.018	3597.470	1.136	0.256	-0.015	0.055
Partner: Retired*Satisfaction	0.002	0.018	3613.326	0.107	0.915	-0.033	0.036
Actor: Unemployed*Satisfaction	0.013	0.022	3512.444	0.582	0.561	-0.031	0.057
Partner: Unemployed*Satisfaction	0.013	0.022	3923.322	0.569	0.570	-0.031	0.056
Slope*Actor: Birth of a child	-0.001	0.003	1307.434	-0.362	0.718	-0.008	0.005
Slope*Actor: Death of a child	-0.001	0.004	1207.919	-0.359	0.720	-0.008	0.006
Slope*Actor: Parent death	-0.002	0.002	1887.347	-0.794	0.427	-0.006	0.002
Slope*Partner: Parent death	-0.003	0.002	1892.530	-1.351	0.177	-0.007	0.001
Slope*Actor: Negative health change	**0.009**	**0.003**	**2703.980**	**3.056**	**0.002**	**0.003**	**0.015**
Slope*Partner: Negative health change	0.004	0.003	2439.664	1.586	0.113	-0.001	0.010
Slope*Actor: Positive health change	-0.005	0.003	2701.509	-1.658	0.097	-0.010	0.001
Slope*Partner: Negative health change	-0.002	0.003	2443.270	-0.802	0.422	-0.007	0.003
Slope*Actor: New chronic illness	**0.007**	**0.002**	**2159.781**	**3.487**	**<.001**	**0.003**	**0.011**
Slope*Partner: New chronic illness	0.003	0.002	2104.947	1.568	0.117	-0.001	0.007
Slope*Actor: Retired	-0.002	0.002	1636.655	-0.696	0.487	-0.006	0.003
Slope*Partner: Retired	-0.001	0.002	1636.205	-0.347	0.729	-0.005	0.004
Slope*Actor: Unemployed	-0.007	0.003	1850.405	-2.274	0.023	-0.012	-0.001
Slope*Partner: Unemployed	0.000	0.003	1910.473	-0.064	0.949	-0.006	0.006

Table 27 (cont'd)

Slope*Actor: Negative health change*Satisfaction	-0.002	0.002	2381.684	-0.769	0.442	-0.006	0.003
Slope*Actor: Positive health change*Satisfaction	0.001	0.002	2645.092	0.557	0.578	-0.003	0.005
Slope*Actor: New chronic illness*Satisfaction	-0.002	0.001	2187.186	-1.111	0.267	-0.004	0.001
Slope*Actor: Unemployed*Satisfaction	-0.002	0.002	1896.226	-0.779	0.436	-0.006	0.002

Note. Significant effects bolded, $p < .01$

Table 28. Linear growth curve model examining the effect of actor and partner life events on the slope of openness; LISS sample.

	b	*SE*	*df*	*t*	*p*	*LB*	*UB*
Intercept	**3.113**	**0.040**	**4005.758**	**77.487**	**0.000**	**3.035**	**3.192**
Slope	**-0.005**	**0.002**	**1886.688**	**-3.175**	**0.002**	**-0.009**	**-0.002**
Actor: Birth of a child	-0.014	0.023	2543.819	-0.604	0.546	-0.060	0.032
Actor: Death of a child	-0.028	0.028	2323.851	-1.000	0.317	-0.082	0.027
Actor: Parent death	0.028	0.016	4415.444	1.778	0.075	-0.003	0.059
Partner: Parent death	-0.023	0.016	4541.299	-1.473	0.141	-0.054	0.008
Actor: Negative health change	-0.023	0.017	5520.066	-1.362	0.173	-0.056	0.010
Partner: Negative health change	0.008	0.017	5303.164	0.480	0.631	-0.024	0.040
Actor: Positive health change	**0.049**	**0.016**	**5472.820**	**2.984**	**0.003**	**0.017**	**0.081**
Partner: Negative health change	**-0.034**	**0.016**	**5265.728**	**-2.104**	**0.035**	**-0.066**	**-0.002**
Actor: New chronic illness	0.000	0.013	4844.699	-0.012	0.991	-0.026	0.026
Partner: New chronic illness	0.012	0.013	4850.982	0.887	0.375	-0.014	0.038
Actor: Retired	-0.028	0.018	4736.763	-1.526	0.127	-0.064	0.008
Partner: Retired	**0.045**	**0.018**	**4619.259**	**2.503**	**0.012**	**0.010**	**0.080**
Actor: Unemployed	**0.081**	**0.022**	**4602.224**	**3.678**	**<.001**	**0.038**	**0.124**
Partner: Unemployed	0.021	0.022	4586.476	0.931	0.352	-0.023	0.064
Age	0.001	0.001	3608.985	0.714	0.475	-0.001	0.002
Gender	**0.034**	**0.006**	**2989.965**	**6.173**	**<.001**	**0.023**	**0.045**
Relationship length	**-0.004**	**0.001**	**3161.364**	**-5.055**	**<.001**	**-0.005**	**-0.002**
Education	**0.103**	**0.004**	**5014.269**	**25.364**	**<.001**	**0.095**	**0.110**
Slope*Actor: Birth of a child	**0.006**	**0.002**	**1308.376**	**2.947**	**0.003**	**0.002**	**0.010**
Slope*Actor: Death of a child	-0.001	0.002	1199.670	-0.253	0.800	-0.005	0.004
Slope*Actor: Parent death	0.002	0.001	1869.190	1.446	0.148	-0.001	0.004
Slope*Partner: Parent death	0.002	0.001	1863.408	1.277	0.202	-0.001	0.004
Slope*Actor: Negative health change	**-0.005**	**0.002**	**2815.633**	**-2.520**	**0.012**	**-0.008**	**-0.001**

Table 28 (cont'd)

Slope*Partner: Negative health change	-0.001	0.002	2462.433	-0.869	0.385	-0.005	0.002
Slope*Actor: Positive health change	**0.007**	**0.002**	**2786.719**	**3.856**	**<.001**	**0.003**	**0.010**
Slope*Partner: Negative health change	0.000	0.002	2463.752	0.162	0.871	-0.003	0.003
Slope*Actor: New chronic illness	-0.002	0.001	2164.462	-1.811	0.070	-0.005	0.000
Slope*Partner: Change in chronic condition	-0.001	0.001	2094.888	-0.427	0.669	-0.003	0.002
Slope*Actor: Retired	-0.001	0.001	1617.399	-0.844	0.399	-0.004	0.002
Slope*Partner: Retired	0.000	0.001	1619.160	-0.116	0.908	-0.003	0.003
Slope*Actor: Unemployed	0.002	0.002	1792.421	0.990	0.322	-0.002	0.005
Slope*Partner: Unemployed	-0.001	0.002	1911.602	-0.278	0.781	-0.004	0.003

Note. Significant effects bolded, $p < .05$

Table 29. Linear growth curve model examining the effect of actor/partner life events and relationship satisfaction on the slope of openness; LISS sample.

	b	*SE*	*df*	*t*	*p*	*LB*	*UB*
Intercept	**3.099**	**0.045**	**3256.502**	**68.538**	**0.000**	**3.010**	**3.188**
Slope	-0.004	0.002	1679.448	-2.152	0.032	-0.007	0.000
Actor: Birth of a child	-0.021	0.026	2252.004	-0.821	0.412	-0.071	0.029
Actor: Death of a child	-0.027	0.029	2059.032	-0.920	0.357	-0.084	0.030
Actor: Parent death	0.021	0.016	3728.448	1.258	0.208	-0.012	0.053
Partner: Parent death	-0.018	0.017	3811.911	-1.044	0.297	-0.050	0.015
Actor: Negative health change	-0.020	0.018	4658.831	-1.103	0.270	-0.056	0.016
Partner: Negative health change	0.012	0.018	4415.604	0.672	0.502	-0.023	0.047
Actor: Positive health change	**0.058**	**0.018**	**4600.412**	**3.281**	**0.001**	**0.023**	**0.092**
Partner: Negative health change	-0.029	0.017	4389.352	-1.637	0.102	-0.063	0.006
Actor: New chronic illness	-0.008	0.014	4095.126	-0.549	0.583	-0.036	0.020
Partner: New chronic illness	0.019	0.014	4061.917	1.331	0.183	-0.009	0.047
Actor: Retired	**-0.033**	**0.020**	**3923.643**	**-1.651**	**0.099**	**-0.072**	**0.006**
Partner: Retired	0.038	0.019	3844.218	1.950	0.051	0.000	0.076
Actor: Unemployed	**0.093**	**0.024**	**3833.666**	**3.938**	**<.001**	**0.047**	**0.139**
Partner: Unemployed	0.025	0.024	3873.411	1.057	0.291	-0.022	0.072
Age	0.000	0.001	3007.915	0.470	0.638	-0.002	0.003
Gender	**0.030**	**0.006**	**2458.331**	**4.813**	**<.001**	**0.018**	**0.042**
Relationship length	**-0.003**	**0.001**	**2677.443**	**-4.076**	**<.001**	**-0.005**	**-0.002**
Education	**0.104**	**0.004**	**4051.515**	**23.148**	**<.001**	**0.095**	**0.113**
Relationship satisfaction	0.011	0.010	5612.861	1.134	0.257	-0.008	0.031
Slope*Relationship satisfaction	-0.002	0.001	2163.155	-1.709	0.088	-0.003	0.000
Actor: Birth of a child*Satisfaction	-0.035	0.018	3724.229	-1.992	0.046	-0.070	-0.001
Actor: Death of a child*Satisfaction	-0.004	0.019	3611.940	-0.205	0.838	-0.042	0.034
Actor: Parent death*Satisfaction	0.020	0.012	3882.162	1.645	0.100	-0.004	0.043
Partner: Parent death*Satisfaction	-0.009	0.012	3997.747	-0.781	0.435	-0.033	0.014
Actor: Negative health change*Satisfaction	0.002	0.014	4327.769	0.116	0.908	-0.025	0.028

Table 29 (cont'd)

Partner: Negative health change*Satisfaction	-0.006	0.013	4416.971	-0.441	0.659	-0.031	0.019
Actor: Positive health change*Satisfaction	-0.009	0.013	4444.084	-0.635	0.526	-0.035	0.018
Partner: Negative health change*Satisfaction	0.024	0.013	4352.756	1.946	0.052	0.000	0.049
Actor: New chronic illness*Satisfaction	0.007	0.010	4127.356	0.649	0.516	-0.014	0.027
Partner: New chronic illness*Satisfaction	-0.008	0.011	4124.210	-0.787	0.431	-0.029	0.012
Actor: Retired*Satisfaction	0.000	0.013	3676.096	-0.014	0.989	-0.025	0.025
Partner: Retired*Satisfaction	-0.014	0.013	3668.848	-1.114	0.265	-0.039	0.011
Actor: Unemployed*Satisfaction	-0.025	0.016	3930.707	-1.548	0.122	-0.056	0.007
Partner: Unemployed*Satisfaction	-0.001	0.016	3914.626	-0.045	0.964	-0.032	0.030
Slope*Actor: Birth of a child	0.005	0.002	1275.814	2.400	0.017	0.001	0.009
Slope*Actor: Death of a child	0.000	0.002	1182.235	0.132	0.895	-0.004	0.005
Slope*Actor: Parent death	0.001	0.001	1727.049	1.059	0.290	-0.001	0.004
Slope*Partner: Parent death	0.002	0.001	1718.241	1.627	0.104	0.000	0.005
Slope*Actor: Negative health change	**-0.005**	**0.002**	**2453.847**	**-2.669**	**0.008**	**-0.009**	**-0.001**
Slope*Partner: Negative health change	-0.001	0.002	2186.021	-0.767	0.443	-0.005	0.002
Slope*Actor: Positive health change	**0.007**	**0.002**	**2446.428**	**3.699**	**<.001**	**0.003**	**0.010**
Slope*Partner: Negative health change	0.000	0.002	2200.286	-0.051	0.959	-0.003	0.003
Slope*Actor: New chronic illness	-0.003	0.001	1961.702	-2.394	0.017	-0.005	-0.001
Slope*Partner: New chronic illness	0.000	0.001	1904.658	-0.336	0.737	-0.003	0.002
Slope*Actor: Retired	-0.001	0.001	1501.616	-0.868	0.386	-0.004	0.002
Slope*Partner: Retired	0.000	0.001	1497.593	-0.296	0.767	-0.003	0.002
Slope*Actor: Unemployed	0.000	0.002	1649.174	0.192	0.848	-0.003	0.004
Slope*Partner: Unemployed	-0.002	0.002	1754.192	-0.966	0.334	-0.006	0.002

Table 29 (cont'd)

Slope*Actor: Birth of a child* Satisfaction	0.001	0.001	1887.467	0.682	0.495	-0.002	0.004
Slope*Actor: Negative health change* Satisfaction	0.001	0.001	2334.616	0.944	0.345	-0.001	0.004
Slope*Actor: Positive health change* Satisfaction	0.000	0.001	2488.003	-0.284	0.776	-0.003	0.002

Note. Significant effects bolded, $p < .01$

Table 30. Linear growth curve model examining the effect of actor and partner life events on the slope of relationship satisfaction; LISS sample.

	b	*SE*	*df*	*t*	*p*	*LB*	*UB*
Intercept	**8.027**	**0.119**	**4796.371**	**67.730**	**0.000**	**7.794**	**8.259**
Slope	**-0.051**	**0.007**	**1964.540**	**-7.620**	**<.001**	**-0.064**	**-0.038**
Actor: Birth of a child	0.017	0.075	2276.167	0.227	0.820	-0.130	0.164
Actor: Death of a child	-0.087	0.089	2059.665	-0.976	0.329	-0.261	0.088
Actor: Parent death	-0.062	0.042	3132.272	-1.487	0.137	-0.145	0.020
Partner: Parent death	-0.041	0.043	3234.499	-0.969	0.333	-0.125	0.042
Actor: Negative health change	0.027	0.046	4060.381	0.578	0.563	-0.064	0.117
Partner: Negative health change	-0.058	0.046	3926.137	-1.265	0.206	-0.148	0.032
Actor: Positive health change	0.075	0.045	4024.930	1.669	0.095	-0.013	0.163
Partner: Negative health change	0.041	0.045	3900.816	0.922	0.357	-0.046	0.129
Actor: New chronic illness	**-0.112**	**0.036**	**3611.684**	**-3.113**	**0.002**	**-0.183**	**-0.042**
Partner: New chronic illness	-0.012	0.036	3605.015	-0.338	0.736	-0.083	0.059
Actor: Retired	**0.200**	**0.047**	**4575.961**	**4.286**	**<.001**	**0.108**	**0.291**
Partner: Retired	0.076	0.045	4385.006	1.683	0.092	-0.012	0.164
Actor: Unemployed	-0.101	0.060	3254.435	-1.686	0.092	-0.218	0.016
Partner: Unemployed	**-0.152**	**0.060**	**3297.874**	**-2.538**	**0.011**	**-0.269**	**-0.035**
Age	**0.007**	**0.003**	**4489.410**	**2.853**	**0.004**	**0.002**	**0.013**
Gender	**0.046**	**0.011**	**2904.083**	**4.114**	**<.001**	**0.024**	**0.068**
Relationship length	0.000	0.002	3383.404	0.181	0.857	-0.004	0.005
Education	**-0.037**	**0.010**	**5048.260**	**-3.523**	**<.001**	**-0.057**	**-0.016**
Slope*Actor: Birth of a child	**-0.023**	**0.008**	**1316.489**	**-2.747**	**0.006**	**-0.040**	**-0.007**
Slope*Actor: Death of a child	-0.014	0.010	1213.857	-1.401	0.161	-0.034	0.006
Slope*Actor: Parent death	**0.013**	**0.005**	**1894.268**	**2.694**	**0.007**	**0.004**	**0.023**
Slope*Partner: Parent death	**0.015**	**0.005**	**1941.521**	**3.012**	**0.003**	**0.005**	**0.025**
Slope*Actor: Negative health change	-0.001	0.007	2912.684	-0.195	0.845	-0.014	0.012

Table 30 (cont'd)

Slope*Partner: Negative health change	-0.009	0.006	2622.982	-1.456	0.145	-0.022	0.003
Slope*Actor: Positive health change	0.012	0.006	2866.760	1.824	0.068	-0.001	0.024
Slope*Partner: Negative health change	0.008	0.006	2598.446	1.340	0.180	-0.004	0.020
Slope*Actor: New chronic illness	0.000	0.005	2273.729	-0.101	0.920	-0.009	0.009
Slope*Partner: New chronic illness	0.007	0.005	2212.020	1.495	0.135	-0.002	0.016
Slope*Actor: Retired	0.007	0.005	1931.753	1.480	0.139	-0.002	0.017
Slope*Partner: Retired	**0.012**	**0.005**	**1930.765**	**2.400**	**0.016**	**0.002**	**0.022**
Slope*Actor: Unemployed	0.013	0.007	1925.162	1.897	0.058	0.000	0.027
Slope*Partner: Unemployed	0.001	0.007	1985.900	0.082	0.935	-0.013	0.015

Note. Significant effects bolded, $p < .05$

Table 31. A summary of which life events produced a (mal)adaptive response, organized by trait; LISS sample.

Trait	Adaptive	Maladaptive
Agreeableness	Actor/Partner: Birth of a child	Actor/Partner: Death of a child
Conscientiousness	Partner: Parent dying	Actor: New chronic illness Actor: Negative health change Partner: Retirement
Extraversion	Actor: Positive health change	Actor: Negative health change
Neuroticism	Actor: Positive health change Actor: Unemployment	Actor: New chronic illness Actor: Negative health change
Openness	Actor/Partner: Birth of a child Actor: Positive health change	Actor: Negative health change

Note. Type of response (i.e., adaptive or maladaptive) based on Event*Slope interactions. "Adaptive" responses include steeper increases in all traits with the exception of neuroticism. "Maladaptive" responses include steeper decreases in all traits with the exception of neuroticism.

APPENDIX C: TABLES FOR CHAPTER 4

Table 32. Frequency of life events; CouPers sample.

Life event	Frequency (% of sample)
Birth of child	33 (3.4%)
Birth of a grandchild	0 (0%)
Graduation	146 (15.1%)
Retirement	2 (.2%)
Unemployment	8 (.8%)
Change in job	165 (17.1%)
Moving	161 (16.7%)
Becoming an empty nester	5 (.5%)
Negative health event	143 (14.8%)
Death of a close other	234 (24.3%)
Miscarriage	25 (2.6%)
Abortion	5 (.5%)
Other	51 (5.3%)

Note. This table reflects only the prevalence of life events that participants found either negative or distressing.

Table 33. Biserial correlations between life events within couples; CouPers sample.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. A: Birth of a child	1						
2. P: Birth of a child	.379**	1					
3. A: Graduation	-0.036	-0.051	1				
4. P: Graduation	-0.051	-0.036	.237**	1			
5. A: Change in job	-0.017	-0.003	.107**	0.008	1		
6. P: Change in job	-0.003	-0.017	0.008	.107**	0.027	1	
7. A: Moving	.070*	0.028	.182**	.084**	.166**	.073*	1
8. P: Moving	0.028	.070*	.084**	.184**	.073*	.167**	.324**
9. A: Negative health event	0.039	0.054	-0.055	-.063*	.065*	0.022	0.047
10. P: Negative health event	0.054	0.039	-.063*	-0.055	0.022	.064*	0.048
11. A: Death of a close other	-0.042	-0.055	0.022	0.040	0.024	0.035	-0.014
12. P: Death of a close other	-0.055	-0.042	0.040	0.021	0.035	0.023	-0.013
13. A: Miscarriage	.106**	.072*	-0.052	-0.052	0.039	0.039	-0.025
14. P: Miscarriage	.072*	.106**	-0.052	-0.052	0.039	0.039	0.008
15. A: Other	-0.023	-0.046	0.059	0.012	.097**	-0.014	0.055
16. P: Other	-0.046	-0.023	0.012	0.059	-0.014	.097**	0.033

Note. **Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed), *Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed). A indicates actor life event, P indicates partner life event.

Table 33 (cont'd)

8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
1							
0.048	1						
0.048	0.027	1					
-0.013	.098**	.085**	1				
-0.013	.085**	.097**	.333**	1			
0.008	.086**	.069*	.070*	.070*	1		
-0.025	.069*	.086**	.070*	.070*	.684**	1	
0.033	-0.011	0.047	-0.018	-0.018	0.041	0.014	1
0.056	0.047	-0.011	-0.018	-0.018	0.014	0.041	.123**

Table 34. Descriptives of and correlations between self-reported traits and relationship variables; averaged across waves; CouPers sample.

	Mean	SD	A	C	E	N	O	Support	Responsiveness
A	3.129	0.331	1						
C	3.438	0.319	.227**	1					
E	3.479	0.774	.109**	-.034*	1				
N	2.797	0.790	.199**	.138**	-.227**	1			
O	3.564	0.451	.130**	.136**	.258**	-0.009	1		
Support	0.360	0.408	0.013	-0.024	.117**	.052**	.132**	1	
Responsiveness	3.953	0.650	-.047**	.068**	.138**	-.173**	.142**	.225**	1
Closeness	6.300	3.171	.075**	.065**	0.002	0.006	-0.001	.107**	.171**

Note. * Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed);** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed). Traits abbreviated with their first letter.

Table 35. Descriptives of and correlations between partner-reported traits and relationship variables; averaged across waves; CouPers sample.

	Mean	SD	A	C	E	N	O	Support	Responsiveness
A	3.056	0.521	1						
C	3.884	0.839	-.053**	1					
E	3.679	1.065	-.106**	.200**	1				
N	2.781	1.009	-0.023	-.053**	-.173**	1			
O	3.840	0.850	-.046*	.245**	.325**	.071**	1		
Support	0.360	0.408	0.019	.072**	-0.004	-.129**	.047**	1	
Responsiveness	3.953	0.650	-.041*	.210**	.182**	-.207**	.223**	.225**	1
Closeness	6.300	3.171	-0.014	-0.007	0.024	.040*	0.006	.107**	.171**

Note. * Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed);** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed). Traits abbreviated with their first letter.

Table 36. Correlations between partner-reported and self-reported personality, averaged across waves; CouPers sample.

	A	C	E	N	O	PR A	PR C	PR E	PR N
A	1								
C	.227**	1							
E	.109**	-.034*	1						
N	.199**	.138**	-.227**	1					
O	.130**	.136**	.258**	-0.009	1				
PR A	.146**	.047**	0.032	.093**	.038*	1			
PR C	-.072**	0.001	.109**	-.251**	0.009	-.053**	1		
PR E	-.087**	-.081**	-.079**	-.132**	0.002	-.106**	.200**	1	
PR N	.083**	.096**	-.119**	-.192**	-0.032	-0.023	-.053**	-.173**	1
PR O	-.040*	-0.027	0.013	-.213**	.121**	-.046*	.245**	.325**	.071**

Note. ** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level. * Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level. Traits indicated by their first initial. PR indicates a partner-reported trait.

Table 37. Linear growth curve model examining the effect of actor and partner life events on the slope of agreeableness; CouPers sample.

	b	*SE*	*df*	*t*	*p*	*LB*	*UB*
Intercept	**3.225**	**0.081**	**191.808**	**39.704**	**<.001**	**3.065**	**3.385**
Slope	**-0.010**	**0.004**	**134.195**	**-2.412**	**0.017**	**-0.019**	**-0.002**
Actor: Birth of a child	-0.215	0.135	175.190	-1.587	0.114	-0.481	0.052
Partner: Birth of a child	0.130	0.135	176.743	0.956	0.340	-0.138	0.397
Actor: Graduation	-0.042	0.051	251.050	-0.818	0.414	-0.142	0.059
Partner: Graduation	-0.064	0.051	248.736	-1.265	0.207	-0.165	0.036
Actor: Change in job	0.032	0.044	244.272	0.732	0.465	-0.054	0.118
Partner: Change in job	-0.019	0.043	240.959	-0.454	0.650	-0.104	0.065
Actor: Moving	**0.142**	**0.055**	**226.767**	**2.565**	**0.011**	**0.033**	**0.251**
Partner: Moving	-0.043	0.056	221.726	-0.779	0.437	-0.153	0.066
Actor: Negative health event	-0.039	0.049	232.125	-0.804	0.422	-0.135	0.057
Partner: Negative health event	0.064	0.048	227.715	1.318	0.189	-0.031	0.159
Actor: Death of a close other	-0.007	0.042	242.274	-0.160	0.873	-0.089	0.076
Partner: Death of a close other	-0.038	0.042	238.637	-0.900	0.369	-0.120	0.045
Actor: Miscarriage	-0.034	0.141	221.200	-0.245	0.807	-0.311	0.243
Partner: Miscarriage	-0.192	0.138	211.564	-1.394	0.165	-0.463	0.079
Actor: Other	-0.040	0.066	248.272	-0.603	0.547	-0.169	0.090
Partner: Other	-0.006	0.069	249.188	-0.087	0.931	-0.141	0.129
Gender	-0.026	0.015	141.962	-1.752	0.082	-0.056	0.003
Age	0.000	0.002	150.164	-0.163	0.871	-0.004	0.003
Education	-0.005	0.007	250.958	-0.648	0.517	-0.019	0.010
Income	-0.005	0.008	222.351	-0.630	0.530	-0.020	0.011
Relationship length	**-0.005**	**0.002**	**140.979**	**-2.519**	**0.013**	**-0.009**	**-0.001**
Slope*Actor: Birth of a child	0.006	0.026	171.622	0.232	0.817	-0.045	0.057
Slope*Partner: Birth of a child	0.003	0.026	171.991	0.117	0.907	-0.048	0.054

Table 37 (cont'd)

Slope*Actor: Graduation	0.002	0.009	257.803	0.204	0.839	-0.015	0.019
Slope*Partner: Graduation	0.004	0.009	257.656	0.488	0.626	-0.013	0.022
Slope*Actor: Change in job	-0.010	0.008	259.376	-1.310	0.191	-0.025	0.005
Slope*Partner: Change in job	-0.005	0.007	259.177	-0.665	0.507	-0.020	0.010
Slope*Actor: Moving	0.005	0.010	216.832	0.488	0.626	-0.015	0.025
Slope*Partner: Moving	0.000	0.010	219.041	-0.031	0.975	-0.021	0.020
Slope*Actor: Negative health event	0.006	0.009	240.244	0.760	0.448	-0.010	0.023
Slope*Partner: Negative health event	0.010	0.009	244.815	1.210	0.227	-0.007	0.027
Slope*Actor: Death of a close other	0.003	0.008	236.994	0.363	0.717	-0.012	0.018
Slope*Partner: Death of a close other	**-0.015**	**0.008**	**235.123**	**-1.970**	**0.050**	**-0.030**	**0.000**
Slope*Actor: Miscarriage	0.020	0.025	225.859	0.784	0.434	-0.030	0.069
Slope*Partner: Miscarriage	0.036	0.025	223.796	1.469	0.143	-0.012	0.085
Slope*Actor: Other	-0.022	0.012	252.221	-1.861	0.064	-0.045	0.001
Slope*Partner: Other	-0.005	0.012	255.353	-0.405	0.686	-0.029	0.019

Note. Significant effects bolded, $p < .05$

Table 38. Linear growth curve model examining the effect of actor/partner life events and support on the slope of agreeableness; CouPers sample.

	b	*SE*	*df*	*t*	*p*	*LB*	*UB*
Intercept	**3.238**	**0.083**	**198.682**	**39.069**	**<.001**	**3.074**	**3.401**
Slope	-0.010	0.005	169.412	-2.067	0.040	-0.019	0.000
Actor: Birth of a child	-0.160	0.146	206.624	-1.100	0.273	-0.447	0.127
Partner: Birth of a child	0.102	0.143	190.780	0.714	0.476	-0.180	0.385
Actor: Graduation	-0.044	0.053	279.171	-0.833	0.405	-0.149	0.060
Partner: Graduation	-0.074	0.055	307.252	-1.347	0.179	-0.182	0.034
Actor: Change in job	0.025	0.045	262.022	0.557	0.578	-0.063	0.113
Partner: Change in job	-0.010	0.044	260.530	-0.219	0.827	-0.097	0.077
Actor: Moving	0.107	0.059	252.323	1.814	0.071	-0.009	0.223
Partner: Moving	-0.008	0.060	269.635	-0.128	0.898	-0.127	0.111
Actor: Negative health event	-0.061	0.050	246.226	-1.219	0.224	-0.160	0.038
Partner: Negative health event	0.046	0.050	241.407	0.925	0.356	-0.052	0.144
Actor: Death of a close other	-0.005	0.043	253.346	-0.111	0.912	-0.090	0.081
Partner: Death of a close other	-0.025	0.043	249.056	-0.580	0.562	-0.110	0.060
Actor: Miscarriage	-0.140	0.161	331.033	-0.871	0.384	-0.457	0.176
Partner: Miscarriage	-0.239	0.206	595.132	-1.162	0.246	-0.644	0.165
Actor: Other	-0.062	0.067	250.876	-0.924	0.356	-0.193	0.070
Partner: Other	0.016	0.070	251.777	0.228	0.820	-0.123	0.155
Gender	-0.025	0.016	147.883	-1.608	0.110	-0.056	0.006
Age	0.000	0.002	150.203	-0.132	0.895	-0.004	0.003
Education	-0.005	0.008	252.604	-0.625	0.532	-0.020	0.010
Income	-0.007	0.008	227.665	-0.828	0.408	-0.022	0.009
Relationship length	**-0.005**	**0.002**	**136.439**	**-2.648**	**0.009**	**-0.009**	**-0.001**
Support	0.004	0.034	862.873	0.124	0.901	-0.062	0.071
Slope*Actor: Birth of a child	0.019	0.028	214.797	0.697	0.487	-0.036	0.075
Slope*Partner: Birth of a child	-0.004	0.027	189.489	-0.141	0.888	-0.057	0.050
Slope*Actor: Graduation	0.004	0.009	268.592	0.382	0.702	-0.015	0.022
Slope*Partner: Graduation	0.001	0.009	270.991	0.065	0.948	-0.018	0.019

Table 38 (cont'd)

Slope*Actor: Change in job	-0.010	0.008	265.310	-1.211	0.227	-0.025	0.006
Slope*Partner: Change in job	-0.005	0.008	279.506	-0.627	0.531	-0.021	0.011
Slope*Actor: Moving	0.003	0.010	213.641	0.307	0.759	-0.017	0.024
Slope*Partner: Moving	0.005	0.011	229.799	0.451	0.652	-0.016	0.026
Slope*Actor: Negative health event	0.006	0.009	250.017	0.714	0.476	-0.011	0.024
Slope*Partner: Negative health event	0.008	0.009	247.146	0.937	0.350	-0.009	0.026
Slope*Actor: Death of a close other	0.003	0.008	259.624	0.384	0.701	-0.013	0.019
Slope*Partner: Death of a close other	-0.014	0.008	242.311	-1.741	0.083	-0.030	0.002
Slope*Actor: Miscarriage	0.005	0.027	305.989	0.169	0.866	-0.049	0.059
Slope*Partner: Miscarriage	0.033	0.028	355.263	1.169	0.243	-0.023	0.089
Slope*Actor: Other	-0.022	0.012	247.982	-1.799	0.073	-0.046	0.002
Slope*Partner: Other	-0.003	0.013	261.832	-0.260	0.795	-0.029	0.022
Actor: Birth of a child*Support	0.443	0.380	455.658	1.166	0.244	-0.303	1.188
Partner: Birth of a child*Support	-0.237	0.368	445.845	-0.644	0.520	-0.960	0.486
Actor: Graduation*Support	0.032	0.083	865.493	0.388	0.698	-0.131	0.195
Partner: Graduation*Support	-0.062	0.099	871.535	-0.627	0.531	-0.256	0.132
Actor: Change in job*Support	0.017	0.061	926.932	0.274	0.784	-0.103	0.136
Partner: Change in job*Support	0.084	0.065	893.203	1.295	0.196	-0.043	0.212
Actor: Moving*Support	-0.172	0.103	729.128	-1.674	0.095	-0.373	0.030
Partner: Moving*Support	0.173	0.109	803.185	1.586	0.113	-0.041	0.388
Actor: Negative health event*Support	-0.009	0.071	777.556	-0.124	0.902	-0.147	0.130

Table 38 (cont'd)

Partner: Negative health event*Support	-0.077	0.072	825.080	-1.081	0.280	-0.218	0.063
Actor: Death of a close other*Support	-0.016	0.071	910.738	-0.225	0.822	-0.155	0.123
Partner: Death of a close other*Support	0.070	0.066	934.785	1.048	0.295	-0.061	0.200
Actor: Miscarriage*Support	-0.481	0.340	710.520	-1.413	0.158	-1.149	0.187
Partner: Miscarriage*Support	-0.105	0.516	624.055	-0.203	0.839	-1.118	0.908
Actor: Other*Support	-0.058	0.094	870.218	-0.612	0.541	-0.242	0.127
Partner: Other*Support	-0.051	0.089	703.436	-0.577	0.564	-0.226	0.123
Slope*Partner: Death of a close other*Support	-0.007	0.016	396.438	-0.420	0.675	-0.038	0.024

Note. Significant effects bolded, $p < .01$

Table 39. Linear growth curve model examining the effect of actor/partner life events and responsiveness on the slope of agreeableness; CouPers sample.

	b	*SE*	*df*	*t*	*p*	*LB*	*UB*
Intercept	**3.218**	**0.081**	**186.513**	**39.623**	**<.001**	**3.057**	**3.378**
Slope	-0.011	0.004	135.498	-2.485	0.014	-0.019	-0.002
Actor: Birth of a child	-0.271	0.155	189.421	-1.743	0.083	-0.577	0.036
Partner: Birth of a child	0.205	0.150	193.199	1.361	0.175	-0.092	0.501
Actor: Graduation	-0.020	0.052	259.005	-0.386	0.700	-0.122	0.082
Partner: Graduation	-0.046	0.052	252.552	-0.885	0.377	-0.147	0.056
Actor: Change in job	0.031	0.044	242.464	0.710	0.478	-0.055	0.117
Partner: Change in job	-0.022	0.043	245.329	-0.518	0.605	-0.108	0.063
Actor: Moving	0.135	0.057	230.157	2.378	0.018	0.023	0.247
Partner: Moving	-0.059	0.057	222.076	-1.045	0.297	-0.171	0.053
Actor: Negative health event	-0.022	0.050	239.664	-0.451	0.652	-0.120	0.075
Partner: Negative health event	0.062	0.050	250.073	1.242	0.215	-0.037	0.161
Actor: Death of a close other	-0.021	0.043	238.488	-0.490	0.625	-0.105	0.063
Partner: Death of a close other	-0.042	0.043	235.085	-0.995	0.321	-0.126	0.041
Actor: Miscarriage	-0.025	0.151	236.833	-0.163	0.871	-0.323	0.273
Partner: Miscarriage	-0.257	0.151	212.458	-1.708	0.089	-0.554	0.040
Actor: Other	-0.039	0.066	243.807	-0.587	0.558	-0.169	0.092
Partner: Other	0.006	0.070	250.288	0.087	0.931	-0.131	0.143
Gender	-0.029	0.016	147.446	-1.837	0.068	-0.060	0.002
Age	0.000	0.002	149.096	-0.292	0.771	-0.004	0.003
Education	-0.004	0.007	246.511	-0.481	0.631	-0.018	0.011
Income	-0.003	0.008	218.350	-0.439	0.661	-0.019	0.012
Relationship length	-0.005	0.002	139.697	-2.462	0.015	-0.008	-0.001
Responsiveness	-0.022	0.024	753.018	-0.918	0.359	-0.070	0.025
Slope*Actor: Birth of a child	-0.004	0.027	204.239	-0.141	0.888	-0.057	0.050
Slope*Partner: Birth of a child	0.013	0.027	198.976	0.481	0.631	-0.040	0.066
Slope*Actor: Graduation	0.006	0.009	257.676	0.652	0.515	-0.012	0.023
Slope*Partner: Graduation	0.001	0.009	270.134	0.128	0.899	-0.017	0.019
Slope*Actor: Change in job	-0.012	0.008	257.728	-1.573	0.117	-0.027	0.003
Slope*Partner: Change in job	-0.008	0.008	263.102	-1.062	0.289	-0.023	0.007
Slope*Actor: Moving	0.006	0.010	213.904	0.592	0.555	-0.014	0.026
Slope*Partner: Moving	0.001	0.010	212.324	0.074	0.941	-0.019	0.021
Slope*Actor: Negative health event	0.006	0.009	248.754	0.728	0.467	-0.011	0.023
Slope*Partner: Negative health event	0.010	0.009	247.978	1.134	0.258	-0.007	0.027
Slope*Actor: Death of a close other	0.003	0.008	232.880	0.340	0.734	-0.013	0.018

Table 39 (cont'd)

Slope*Partner: Death of a close other	-0.014	0.008	230.825	-1.779	0.077	-0.028	0.001
Slope*Actor: Miscarriage	0.031	0.027	261.300	1.165	0.245	-0.021	0.083
Slope*Partner: Miscarriage	0.041	0.025	222.722	1.653	0.100	-0.008	0.090
Slope*Actor: Other	-0.021	0.012	248.194	-1.761	0.079	-0.044	0.002
Slope*Partner: Other	-0.003	0.012	249.658	-0.280	0.780	-0.028	0.021
Actor: Birth of a child*Responsiveness	0.227	0.182	541.744	1.252	0.211	-0.129	0.584
Partner: Birth of a child*Responsiveness	-0.017	0.173	558.809	-0.100	0.921	-0.358	0.323
Actor: Graduation*Responsiveness	0.137	0.057	893.773	2.418	0.016	0.026	0.248
Partner: Graduation*Responsiveness	0.024	0.066	931.510	0.359	0.719	-0.106	0.154
Actor: Change in job*Responsiveness	-0.042	0.048	929.511	-0.870	0.384	-0.137	0.053
Partner: Change in job*Responsiveness	-0.030	0.044	939.311	-0.686	0.493	-0.116	0.056
Actor: Moving*Responsiveness	-0.097	0.069	832.799	-1.403	0.161	-0.232	0.039
Partner: Moving*Responsiveness	0.038	0.070	812.079	0.546	0.585	-0.100	0.176
Actor: Negative health event*Responsiveness	0.112	0.053	803.070	2.104	0.036	0.008	0.217
Partner: Negative health event*Responsiveness	-0.017	0.048	915.526	-0.367	0.714	-0.111	0.076
Actor: Death of a close other*Responsiveness	-0.102	0.044	880.106	-2.346	0.019	-0.188	-0.017
Partner: Death of a close other*Responsiveness	0.044	0.045	892.731	0.962	0.336	-0.045	0.132
Actor: Miscarriage*Responsiveness	-0.287	0.211	670.510	-1.360	0.174	-0.702	0.128
Partner: Miscarriage*Responsiveness	0.001	0.146	708.688	0.004	0.997	-0.287	0.288
Actor: Other*Responsiveness	0.094	0.074	926.281	1.266	0.206	-0.052	0.239
Partner: Other*Responsiveness	-0.149	0.076	675.457	-1.948	0.052	-0.299	0.001
Slope*Partner: Death of a close other*Responsiveness	-0.001	0.010	276.153	-0.092	0.927	-0.020	0.019

Note. Significant effects bolded, $p < .01$

Table 40. Linear growth curve model examining the effect of actor/partner life events and closeness on the slope of agreeableness; CouPers sample.

	b	*SE*	*df*	*t*	*p*	*LB*	*UB*
Intercept	**3.228**	**0.083**	**208.624**	**38.725**	**<.001**	**3.063**	**3.392**
Slope	-0.009	0.005	157.116	-1.966	0.051	-0.018	0.000
Actor: Birth of a child	-0.225	0.181	413.264	-1.239	0.216	-0.581	0.132
Partner: Birth of a child	0.032	0.185	433.802	0.174	0.862	-0.331	0.395
Actor: Graduation	0.005	0.070	639.318	0.074	0.941	-0.131	0.142
Partner: Graduation	-0.091	0.073	689.488	-1.246	0.213	-0.235	0.052
Actor: Change in job	0.049	0.060	604.680	0.809	0.419	-0.069	0.167
Partner: Change in job	0.055	0.059	620.844	0.939	0.348	-0.060	0.171
Actor: Moving	0.082	0.083	682.239	0.985	0.325	-0.082	0.246
Partner: Moving	-0.140	0.082	626.422	-1.705	0.089	-0.302	0.021
Actor: Negative health event	-0.075	0.078	713.232	-0.959	0.338	-0.229	0.079
Partner: Negative health event	0.025	0.077	717.279	0.331	0.741	-0.125	0.176
Actor: Death of a close other	-0.009	0.066	675.126	-0.135	0.892	-0.138	0.120
Partner: Death of a close other	-0.100	0.087	765.094	-1.156	0.248	-0.270	0.070
Actor: Miscarriage	-0.103	0.186	568.504	-0.552	0.581	-0.468	0.262
Partner: Miscarriage	-0.116	0.180	506.878	-0.642	0.521	-0.470	0.238
Actor: Other	-0.065	0.099	683.225	-0.658	0.511	-0.261	0.130
Partner: Other	0.049	0.114	808.571	0.433	0.665	-0.174	0.273
Gender	-0.026	0.015	143.020	-1.749	0.082	-0.056	0.003
Age	0.000	0.002	149.745	-0.127	0.899	-0.004	0.003
Education	-0.004	0.007	250.256	-0.582	0.561	-0.019	0.010
Income	-0.004	0.008	221.068	-0.481	0.631	-0.019	0.012
Relationship length	-0.005	0.002	139.827	-2.545	0.012	-0.009	-0.001
Closeness	0.002	0.005	530.550	0.452	0.651	-0.008	0.012
Slope*Actor: Birth of a child	0.010	0.037	442.430	0.273	0.785	-0.063	0.083
Slope*Partner: Birth of a child	-0.020	0.036	420.623	-0.565	0.573	-0.092	0.051
Slope*Actor: Graduation	0.003	0.010	320.735	0.343	0.731	-0.016	0.023
Slope*Partner: Graduation	0.001	0.010	328.626	0.112	0.911	-0.019	0.021
Slope*Actor: Change in job	-0.010	0.009	363.157	-1.093	0.275	-0.028	0.008

Table 40 (cont'd)

Slope*Partner: Change in job	0.005	0.009	349.139	0.524	0.601	-0.013	0.022
Slope*Actor: Moving	-0.001	0.011	267.980	-0.104	0.918	-0.024	0.021
Slope*Partner: Moving	-0.009	0.012	280.112	-0.807	0.420	-0.032	0.013
Slope*Actor: Negative health event	0.009	0.009	288.553	0.916	0.360	-0.010	0.027
Slope*Partner: Negative health event	0.007	0.009	286.271	0.778	0.437	-0.011	0.026
Slope*Actor: Death of a close other	0.002	0.009	275.333	0.204	0.838	-0.015	0.019
Slope*Partner: Death of a close other	-0.039	0.024	545.002	-1.631	0.103	-0.086	0.008
Slope*Actor: Miscarriage	-0.005	0.034	357.138	-0.151	0.880	-0.073	0.062
Slope*Partner: Miscarriage	0.053	0.029	279.472	1.842	0.067	-0.004	0.111
Slope*Actor: Other	-0.024	0.013	276.712	-1.813	0.071	-0.050	0.002
Slope*Partner: Other	-0.003	0.013	276.874	-0.260	0.795	-0.030	0.023
Actor: Birth of a child*Closeness	0.002	0.026	442.112	0.087	0.931	-0.050	0.054
Partner: Birth of a child*Closeness	-0.027	0.027	446.347	-1.016	0.310	-0.080	0.026
Actor: Graduation*Closeness	0.009	0.010	801.295	0.905	0.366	-0.010	0.027
Partner: Graduation*Closeness	-0.004	0.010	751.053	-0.425	0.671	-0.025	0.016
Actor: Change in job*Closeness	0.002	0.008	768.497	0.297	0.766	-0.013	0.018
Partner: Change in job*Closeness	0.015	0.008	814.518	1.835	0.067	-0.001	0.031
Actor: Moving*Closeness	-0.012	0.012	671.390	-1.012	0.312	-0.036	0.012
Partner: Moving*Closeness	-0.019	0.012	654.710	-1.609	0.108	-0.043	0.004
Actor: Negative health event*Closeness	-0.004	0.011	730.625	-0.382	0.702	-0.026	0.017
Partner: Negative health event*Closeness	-0.007	0.010	788.835	-0.687	0.493	-0.028	0.013
Actor: Death of a close other*Closeness	0.000	0.010	604.816	-0.048	0.962	-0.019	0.018
Partner: Death of a close other*Closeness	-0.011	0.013	670.294	-0.810	0.418	-0.037	0.015

Table 40 (cont'd)

Actor: Miscarriage*Closeness	-0.023	0.027	731.549	-0.838	0.402	-0.076	0.030
Partner: Miscarriage*Closeness	0.022	0.025	583.428	0.893	0.372	-0.027	0.071
Actor: Other*Closeness	-0.006	0.015	683.950	-0.390	0.696	-0.035	0.023
Partner: Other*Closeness	0.011	0.017	732.492	0.661	0.509	-0.022	0.044
Slope*Partner: Death of a close other*Closeness	-0.004	0.004	564.731	-1.115	0.265	-0.012	0.003

Note. Significant effects bolded, $p < .01$

Table 41. Linear growth curve model examining the effect of actor and partner life events on the slope of conscientiousness; CouPers sample.

	b	*SE*	*df*	*t*	*p*	*LB*	*UB*
Intercept	**3.483**	**0.073**	**168.327**	**47.930**	**<.001**	**3.339**	**3.626**
Slope	**-0.008**	**0.004**	**129.532**	**-2.144**	**0.034**	**-0.016**	**-0.001**
Actor: Birth of a child	0.096	0.153	151.099	0.624	0.534	-0.207	0.399
Partner: Birth of a child	-0.249	0.152	147.989	-1.637	0.104	-0.550	0.052
Actor: Graduation	0.037	0.051	238.502	0.735	0.463	-0.063	0.137
Partner: Graduation	-0.009	0.051	243.986	-0.173	0.862	-0.110	0.092
Actor: Change in job	0.004	0.043	240.813	0.093	0.926	-0.080	0.088
Partner: Change in job	0.027	0.042	249.383	0.636	0.525	-0.056	0.110
Actor: Moving	-0.012	0.059	178.450	-0.210	0.834	-0.128	0.104
Partner: Moving	0.019	0.060	194.011	0.322	0.748	-0.099	0.138
Actor: Negative health event	-0.058	0.047	208.489	-1.248	0.214	-0.150	0.034
Partner: Negative health event	0.044	0.049	250.150	0.898	0.370	-0.052	0.140
Actor: Death of a close other	-0.053	0.044	198.496	-1.210	0.228	-0.140	0.033
Partner: Death of a close other	-0.031	0.045	208.238	-0.695	0.488	-0.119	0.057
Actor: Miscarriage	-0.179	0.134	202.293	-1.333	0.184	-0.443	0.086
Partner: Miscarriage	0.070	0.142	231.599	0.495	0.621	-0.210	0.351
Actor: Other	0.092	0.065	210.651	1.412	0.159	-0.037	0.221
Partner: Other	0.025	0.070	239.833	0.361	0.718	-0.113	0.164
Gender	0.016	0.018	136.589	0.906	0.366	-0.019	0.051
Age	**-0.003**	**0.001**	**139.755**	**-2.312**	**0.022**	**-0.006**	**0.000**
Education	0.011	0.007	208.908	1.536	0.126	-0.003	0.025
Income	-0.006	0.007	180.924	-0.896	0.371	-0.021	0.008

Table 41 (cont'd)

Relationship length	-0.002	0.002	132.200	-1.525	0.130	-0.006	0.001
Slope*Actor: Birth of a child	-0.014	0.027	161.141	-0.516	0.607	-0.068	0.040
Slope*Partner: Birth of a child	0.003	0.027	151.688	0.118	0.906	-0.050	0.056
Slope*Actor: Graduation	0.011	0.009	232.216	1.203	0.230	-0.007	0.028
Slope*Partner: Graduation	-0.004	0.009	239.744	-0.399	0.691	-0.021	0.014
Slope*Actor: Change in job	0.003	0.007	242.443	0.345	0.731	-0.012	0.017
Slope*Partner: Change in job	-0.013	0.007	243.850	-1.712	0.088	-0.027	0.002
Slope*Actor: Moving	0.006	0.010	183.274	0.570	0.569	-0.015	0.026
Slope*Partner: Moving	0.011	0.011	195.868	1.072	0.285	-0.010	0.032
Slope*Actor: Negative health event	0.004	0.008	214.471	0.507	0.613	-0.012	0.020
Slope*Partner: Negative health event	-0.003	0.009	251.980	-0.303	0.762	-0.020	0.014
Slope*Actor: Death of a close other	-0.004	0.008	203.038	-0.534	0.594	-0.020	0.011
Slope*Partner: Death of a close other	-0.008	0.008	207.351	-0.961	0.338	-0.023	0.008
Slope*Actor: Miscarriage	0.020	0.024	207.116	0.833	0.406	-0.027	0.068
Slope*Partner: Miscarriage	0.023	0.025	223.374	0.905	0.366	-0.027	0.073
Slope*Actor: Other	0.003	0.012	217.880	0.285	0.776	-0.020	0.026
Slope*Partner: Other	0.000	0.013	236.785	-0.020	0.984	-0.025	0.024

Note. Significant effects bolded, $p < .05$

Table 42. Linear growth curve model examining the effect of actor and partner life events on the slope of extraversion; CouPers sample.

	b	*SE*	*df*	*t*	*p*	*LB*	*UB*
Intercept	**3.255**	**0.207**	**154.328**	**15.723**	**<.001**	**2.846**	**3.664**
Slope	0.001	0.006	139.157	0.103	0.918	-0.010	0.012
Actor: Birth of a child	-0.808	0.427	90.508	-1.892	0.062	-1.656	0.040
Partner: Birth of a child	0.598	0.428	158.099	1.397	0.164	-0.247	1.443
Actor: Graduation	0.093	0.145	222.204	0.646	0.519	-0.192	0.378
Partner: Graduation	0.005	0.144	244.464	0.033	0.974	-0.280	0.289
Actor: Change in job	0.047	0.122	205.188	0.390	0.697	-0.193	0.288
Partner: Change in job	-0.104	0.119	221.973	-0.875	0.383	-0.340	0.131
Actor: Moving	0.132	0.168	196.835	0.788	0.432	-0.199	0.463
Partner: Moving	-0.006	0.168	192.406	-0.034	0.973	-0.336	0.325
Actor: Negative health event	-0.092	0.137	220.614	-0.671	0.503	-0.361	0.178
Partner: Negative health event	0.067	0.135	159.976	0.499	0.619	-0.199	0.333
Actor: Death of a close other	0.140	0.125	200.775	1.121	0.264	-0.106	0.386
Partner: Death of a close other	0.079	0.124	202.024	0.636	0.525	-0.166	0.325
Actor: Miscarriage	0.228	0.398	189.394	0.573	0.567	-0.557	1.013
Partner: Miscarriage	0.059	0.386	182.436	0.151	0.880	-0.704	0.821
Actor: Other	0.012	0.190	224.819	0.062	0.950	-0.362	0.386
Partner: Other	-0.064	0.197	196.777	-0.323	0.747	-0.452	0.325
Gender	**-0.135**	**0.049**	**138.679**	**-2.758**	**0.007**	**-0.232**	**-0.038**
Age	0.006	0.004	141.048	1.406	0.162	-0.002	0.014
Education	-0.010	0.020	200.325	-0.493	0.623	-0.049	0.030
Income	**0.046**	**0.020**	**184.260**	**2.243**	**0.026**	**0.006**	**0.086**
Relationship length	-0.007	0.005	132.565	-1.573	0.118	-0.016	0.002
Slope*Actor: Birth of a child	0.049	0.033	208.534	1.488	0.138	-0.016	0.114
Slope*Partner: Birth of a child	-0.053	0.032	210.738	-1.644	0.102	-0.117	0.011
Slope*Actor: Graduation	-0.018	0.011	302.205	-1.590	0.113	-0.040	0.004
Slope*Partner: Graduation	-0.003	0.011	291.065	-0.303	0.762	-0.026	0.019

Table 42 (cont'd)

Slope*Actor: Change in job	-0.008	0.010	277.917	-0.795	0.427	-0.027	0.011
Slope*Partner: Change in job	-0.003	0.010	282.936	-0.274	0.784	-0.022	0.016
Slope*Actor: Moving	0.010	0.013	262.805	0.755	0.451	-0.015	0.035
Slope*Partner: Moving	0.004	0.013	274.846	0.330	0.742	-0.022	0.031
Slope*Actor: Negative health event	0.014	0.011	269.762	1.374	0.170	-0.006	0.035
Slope*Partner: Negative health event	0.001	0.011	279.733	0.057	0.954	-0.022	0.023
Slope*Actor: Death of a close other	-0.009	0.010	269.224	-0.921	0.358	-0.028	0.010
Slope*Partner: Death of a close other	0.012	0.010	275.806	1.249	0.213	-0.007	0.032
Slope*Actor: Miscarriage	-0.016	0.031	283.031	-0.535	0.593	-0.076	0.044
Slope*Partner: Miscarriage	-0.007	0.034	227.160	-0.208	0.836	-0.074	0.060
Slope*Actor: Other	-0.010	0.015	280.497	-0.703	0.483	-0.040	0.019
Slope*Partner: Other	0.020	0.016	299.210	1.251	0.212	-0.012	0.052

Note. Significant effects bolded, $p < .05$

Table 43. Linear growth curve model examining the effect of actor and partner life events on the slope of neuroticism; CouPers sample.

	b	*SE*	*df*	*t*	*p*	*LB*	*UB*
Intercept	**3.006**	**0.114**	**766.141**	**26.410**	**<.001**	**2.783**	**3.229**
Slope	-0.018	0.015	527.871	-1.220	0.223	-0.048	0.011
Actor: Birth of a child	-0.202	0.206	687.235	-0.982	0.326	-0.607	0.202
Partner: Birth of a child	0.228	0.207	705.453	1.101	0.271	-0.179	0.635
Actor: Graduation	-0.064	0.074	1048.261	-0.871	0.384	-0.209	0.081
Partner: Graduation	-0.128	0.074	1022.853	-1.745	0.081	-0.273	0.016
Actor: Change in job	0.057	0.063	1049.531	0.909	0.364	-0.066	0.181
Partner: Change in job	0.092	0.062	1026.829	1.497	0.135	-0.029	0.213
Actor: Moving	-0.026	0.083	892.642	-0.307	0.759	-0.189	0.138
Partner: Moving	-0.026	0.082	842.794	-0.320	0.749	-0.188	0.135
Actor: Negative health event	0.087	0.071	1013.862	1.226	0.220	-0.052	0.226
Partner: Negative health event	0.067	0.069	911.596	0.959	0.338	-0.070	0.203
Actor: Death of a close other	-0.002	0.062	963.196	-0.039	0.969	-0.124	0.120
Partner: Death of a close other	**-0.122**	**0.062**	**922.329**	**-1.973**	**0.049**	**-0.243**	**-0.001**
Actor: Miscarriage	-0.130	0.205	954.239	-0.636	0.525	-0.533	0.272
Partner: Miscarriage	-0.220	0.195	853.915	-1.129	0.259	-0.602	0.162
Actor: Other	0.111	0.097	1038.972	1.154	0.249	-0.078	0.301
Partner: Other	0.148	0.100	1006.338	1.490	0.136	-0.047	0.344
Gender	**-0.219**	**0.023**	**588.193**	**-9.365**	**<.001**	**-0.265**	**-0.173**
Age	**-0.005**	**0.002**	**609.870**	**-2.186**	**0.029**	**-0.010**	**-0.001**
Education	-0.002	0.011	1004.305	-0.196	0.844	-0.023	0.019
Income	**-0.030**	**0.011**	**848.184**	**-2.670**	**0.008**	**-0.052**	**-0.008**
Relationship length	0.001	0.003	574.302	0.484	0.629	-0.004	0.006
Slope*Actor: Birth of a child	-0.024	0.092	675.469	-0.261	0.795	-0.204	0.156
Slope*Partner: Birth of a child	0.026	0.092	695.820	0.278	0.781	-0.156	0.207
Slope*Actor: Graduation	0.036	0.031	1032.412	1.142	0.254	-0.026	0.097
Slope*Partner: Graduation	-0.004	0.031	1017.054	-0.138	0.890	-0.066	0.057
Slope*Actor: Change in job	0.015	0.027	1050.402	0.542	0.588	-0.038	0.068

Table 43 (cont'd)

Slope*Partner: Change in job	-0.009	0.027	1029.039	-0.325	0.745	-0.061	0.043
Slope*Actor: Moving	0.001	0.037	890.267	0.030	0.976	-0.071	0.073
Slope*Partner: Moving	-0.013	0.036	845.886	-0.362	0.718	-0.085	0.058
Slope*Actor: Negative health event	0.003	0.031	1019.312	0.086	0.931	-0.058	0.063
Slope*Partner: Negative health event	0.004	0.030	912.795	0.148	0.882	-0.054	0.063
Slope*Actor: Death of a close other	0.024	0.028	958.857	0.878	0.380	-0.030	0.079
Slope*Partner: Death of a close other	-0.014	0.027	919.384	-0.513	0.608	-0.067	0.039
Slope*Actor: Miscarriage	0.020	0.090	950.122	0.224	0.823	-0.157	0.198
Slope*Partner: Miscarriage	0.080	0.086	841.255	0.930	0.353	-0.089	0.248
Slope*Actor: Other	-0.015	0.042	1044.447	-0.363	0.717	-0.099	0.068
Slope*Partner: Other	0.010	0.044	1002.343	0.227	0.821	-0.076	0.096

Note. Significant effects bolded, $p < .05$

Table 44. Linear growth curve model examining the effect of actor and partner life events on the slope of openness; CouPers sample.

	b	*SE*	*df*	*t*	*p*	*LB*	*UB*
Intercept	**3.346**	**0.117**	**181.754**	**28.503**	**<.001**	**3.114**	**3.577**
Slope	-0.004	0.005	129.436	-0.833	0.406	-0.014	0.006
Actor: Birth of a child	-0.106	0.227	162.810	-0.468	0.641	-0.554	0.342
Partner: Birth of a child	-0.014	0.227	162.777	-0.060	0.952	-0.461	0.434
Actor: Graduation	0.053	0.079	254.113	0.676	0.500	-0.102	0.208
Partner: Graduation	0.111	0.079	253.456	1.413	0.159	-0.044	0.266
Actor: Change in job	0.067	0.066	254.870	1.013	0.312	-0.064	0.198
Partner: Change in job	-0.091	0.065	255.490	-1.390	0.166	-0.219	0.038
Actor: Moving	0.000	0.089	203.211	-0.001	0.999	-0.176	0.176
Partner: Moving	0.015	0.090	204.661	0.162	0.872	-0.163	0.192
Actor: Negative health event	-0.004	0.074	233.621	-0.049	0.961	-0.149	0.141
Partner: Negative health event	-0.031	0.074	240.484	-0.424	0.672	-0.177	0.114
Actor: Death of a close other	0.097	0.067	222.323	1.445	0.150	-0.035	0.229
Partner: Death of a close other	-0.067	0.067	222.548	-1.001	0.318	-0.200	0.065
Actor: Miscarriage	-0.226	0.213	221.826	-1.062	0.289	-0.647	0.194
Partner: Miscarriage	0.172	0.212	220.267	0.809	0.419	-0.247	0.590
Actor: Other	0.005	0.102	238.088	0.053	0.958	-0.195	0.206
Partner: Other	0.040	0.107	248.114	0.374	0.709	-0.171	0.251
Gender	-0.019	0.025	143.387	-0.746	0.457	-0.069	0.031
Age	0.004	0.002	147.958	1.592	0.114	-0.001	0.009
Education	**0.023**	**0.011**	**232.246**	**2.089**	**0.038**	**0.001**	**0.045**
Income	-0.022	0.012	199.568	-1.882	0.061	-0.045	0.001
Relationship length	-0.005	0.003	139.807	-1.914	0.058	-0.010	0.000
Slope*Actor: Birth of a child	-0.043	0.031	166.919	-1.412	0.160	-0.104	0.017
Slope*Partner: Birth of a child	0.046	0.031	163.645	1.491	0.138	-0.015	0.106
Slope*Actor: Graduation	-0.009	0.010	253.385	-0.881	0.379	-0.029	0.011
Slope*Partner: Graduation	-0.007	0.010	255.635	-0.667	0.505	-0.027	0.014

Table 44 (cont'd)

Slope*Actor: Change in job	-0.017	0.009	255.595	-1.940	0.053	-0.035	0.000
Slope*Partner: Change in job	-0.005	0.009	259.582	-0.517	0.605	-0.022	0.013
Slope*Actor: Moving	0.005	0.012	203.560	0.429	0.668	-0.018	0.029
Slope*Partner: Moving	0.013	0.012	216.387	1.101	0.272	-0.011	0.037
Slope*Actor: Negative health event	0.006	0.010	228.680	0.662	0.508	-0.013	0.026
Slope*Partner: Negative health event	-0.005	0.010	254.792	-0.523	0.601	-0.025	0.015
Slope*Actor: Death of a close other	-0.011	0.009	226.634	-1.193	0.234	-0.029	0.007
Slope*Partner: Death of a close other	0.000	0.009	230.485	-0.046	0.963	-0.018	0.017
Slope*Actor: Miscarriage	**0.075**	**0.029**	**215.070**	**2.627**	**0.009**	**0.019**	**0.131**
Slope*Partner: Miscarriage	-0.010	0.029	231.645	-0.340	0.734	-0.068	0.048
Slope*Actor: Other	0.015	0.014	240.608	1.081	0.281	-0.012	0.042
Slope*Partner: Other	-0.028	0.015	255.685	-1.888	0.060	-0.056	0.001

Note. Significant effects bolded, $p < .05$

Table 45. Linear growth curve model examining the effect of actor/partner life events and support on the slope of openness; CouPers sample.

	b	*SE*	*df*	*t*	*p*	*LB*	*UB*
Intercept	**3.395**	**0.119**	**186.588**	**28.487**	**<.001**	**3.160**	**3.630**
Slope	-0.003	0.005	159.214	-0.563	0.574	-0.014	0.008
Actor: Birth of a child	-0.135	0.233	179.591	-0.579	0.563	-0.595	0.325
Partner: Birth of a child	0.008	0.231	172.505	0.033	0.974	-0.449	0.464
Actor: Graduation	0.069	0.080	270.300	0.862	0.389	-0.089	0.227
Partner: Graduation	0.110	0.082	288.607	1.343	0.180	-0.051	0.271
Actor: Change in job	0.074	0.067	263.527	1.104	0.271	-0.058	0.207
Partner: Change in job	-0.081	0.066	265.674	-1.217	0.225	-0.211	0.050
Actor: Moving	-0.017	0.092	220.766	-0.189	0.850	-0.199	0.164
Partner: Moving	0.026	0.094	232.110	0.280	0.780	-0.158	0.211
Actor: Negative health event	-0.009	0.075	243.631	-0.115	0.909	-0.157	0.140
Partner: Negative health event	-0.025	0.075	246.206	-0.327	0.744	-0.172	0.123
Actor: Death of a close other	0.086	0.068	230.307	1.271	0.205	-0.048	0.220
Partner: Death of a close other	-0.063	0.068	228.168	-0.929	0.354	-0.197	0.071
Actor: Miscarriage	-0.428	0.234	303.091	-1.827	0.069	-0.890	0.033
Partner: Miscarriage	0.115	0.278	516.526	0.412	0.680	-0.432	0.662
Actor: Other	-0.023	0.103	240.470	-0.223	0.824	-0.225	0.179
Partner: Other	0.038	0.108	248.963	0.354	0.723	-0.175	0.251
Gender	-0.016	0.026	147.055	-0.630	0.529	-0.067	0.034
Age	0.004	0.002	149.055	1.474	0.142	-0.001	0.008
Education	0.019	0.011	230.614	1.656	0.099	-0.004	0.041
Income	-0.022	0.012	204.091	-1.920	0.056	-0.045	0.001
Relationship length	-0.005	0.003	136.725	-1.804	0.073	-0.010	0.000
Support	0.011	0.040	817.600	0.265	0.791	-0.069	0.090
Slope*Actor: Birth of a child	-0.053	0.034	202.660	-1.586	0.114	-0.119	0.013
Slope*Partner: Birth of a child	0.055	0.032	172.386	1.701	0.091	-0.009	0.118
Slope*Actor: Graduation	-0.008	0.011	252.168	-0.783	0.434	-0.030	0.013
Slope*Partner: Graduation	-0.006	0.011	269.482	-0.512	0.609	-0.028	0.016
Slope*Actor: Change in job	-0.012	0.009	265.103	-1.237	0.217	-0.030	0.007
Slope*Partner: Change in job	-0.005	0.009	271.413	-0.551	0.582	-0.024	0.013

Table 45 (cont'd)

Slope*Actor: Moving	0.000	0.012	196.054	0.020	0.984	-0.024	0.025
Slope*Partner: Moving	0.018	0.013	237.368	1.378	0.170	-0.008	0.044
Slope*Actor: Negative health event	0.001	0.010	231.698	0.096	0.924	-0.019	0.021
Slope*Partner: Negative health event	-0.003	0.011	256.619	-0.289	0.773	-0.024	0.018
Slope*Actor: Death of a close other	-0.010	0.010	249.710	-1.064	0.288	-0.030	0.009
Slope*Partner: Death of a close other	-0.002	0.009	231.766	-0.176	0.861	-0.020	0.017
Slope*Actor: Miscarriage	0.013	0.041	317.655	0.324	0.746	-0.067	0.094
Slope*Partner: Miscarriage	-0.023	0.035	369.169	-0.654	0.514	-0.091	0.045
Slope*Actor: Other	0.014	0.014	226.943	0.991	0.322	-0.014	0.042
Slope*Partner: Other	-0.020	0.015	260.123	-1.307	0.192	-0.050	0.010
Actor: Birth of a child*Support	-0.302	0.431	406.574	-0.701	0.484	-1.149	0.545
Partner: Birth of a child*Support	0.389	0.417	392.206	0.934	0.351	-0.430	1.208
Actor: Graduation*Support	0.070	0.098	805.508	0.710	0.478	-0.123	0.262
Partner: Graduation*Support	-0.045	0.120	869.874	-0.376	0.707	-0.280	0.190
Actor: Change in job*Support	0.081	0.071	818.728	1.136	0.256	-0.059	0.221
Partner: Change in job*Support	-0.004	0.079	875.825	-0.054	0.957	-0.159	0.150
Actor: Moving*Support	-0.186	0.121	643.826	-1.537	0.125	-0.424	0.052
Partner: Moving*Support	0.150	0.132	761.634	1.134	0.257	-0.110	0.410
Actor: Negative health event*Support	-0.125	0.082	718.704	-1.523	0.128	-0.287	0.036
Partner: Negative health event*Support	0.134	0.088	896.010	1.519	0.129	-0.039	0.308
Actor: Death of a close other*Support	-0.049	0.084	855.839	-0.580	0.562	-0.214	0.116
Partner: Death of a close other*Support	-0.033	0.080	852.142	-0.413	0.680	-0.189	0.123
Actor: Miscarriage*Support	-0.824	0.394	672.784	-2.092	0.037	-1.597	-0.050
Partner: Miscarriage*Support	-0.387	0.615	589.432	-0.629	0.530	-1.596	0.822
Actor: Other*Support	0.107	0.114	835.662	0.941	0.347	-0.116	0.331

Table 45 (cont'd)

Partner: Other*Support	0.143	0.112	813.736	1.277	0.202	-0.077	0.362
Slope*Actor: Miscarriage*Support	-0.208	0.171	421.131	-1.218	0.224	-0.544	0.128

Note. Significant effects bolded, $p < .01$

Table 46. Linear growth curve model examining the effect of actor/partner life events and responsiveness on the slope of openness; CouPers sample.

	b	*SE*	*df*	*t*	*p*	*LB*	*UB*
Intercept	**3.351**	**0.117**	**175.653**	**28.643**	**<.001**	**3.120**	**3.582**
Slope	-0.002	0.005	126.756	-0.403	0.688	-0.012	0.008
Actor: Birth of a child	-0.100	0.249	182.805	-0.401	0.689	-0.591	0.392
Partner: Birth of a child	0.001	0.242	182.532	0.005	0.996	-0.476	0.478
Actor: Graduation	0.070	0.079	256.879	0.884	0.378	-0.086	0.226
Partner: Graduation	0.128	0.079	251.753	1.619	0.107	-0.028	0.283
Actor: Change in job	0.062	0.067	250.578	0.927	0.355	-0.069	0.193
Partner: Change in job	-0.093	0.065	254.151	-1.423	0.156	-0.222	0.036
Actor: Moving	-0.024	0.090	207.005	-0.263	0.793	-0.202	0.154
Partner: Moving	0.005	0.091	204.104	0.058	0.954	-0.173	0.184
Actor: Negative health event	0.000	0.075	239.568	-0.002	0.998	-0.147	0.147
Partner: Negative health event	-0.002	0.076	252.472	-0.028	0.978	-0.151	0.147
Actor: Death of a close other	0.083	0.067	220.682	1.236	0.218	-0.049	0.215
Partner: Death of a close other	-0.068	0.067	220.158	-1.004	0.316	-0.200	0.065
Actor: Miscarriage	-0.330	0.228	239.012	-1.443	0.150	-0.780	0.120
Partner: Miscarriage	0.147	0.226	218.505	0.652	0.515	-0.298	0.593
Actor: Other	0.014	0.102	235.135	0.135	0.893	-0.187	0.215
Partner: Other	0.028	0.108	246.694	0.261	0.795	-0.184	0.241
Gender	-0.015	0.026	145.992	-0.572	0.568	-0.065	0.036
Age	0.004	0.002	144.574	1.471	0.144	-0.001	0.008
Education	0.024	0.011	223.545	2.152	0.032	0.002	0.046
Income	-0.021	0.012	193.931	-1.809	0.072	-0.044	0.002
Relationship length	-0.005	0.003	136.856	-1.821	0.071	-0.010	0.000
Responsiveness	0.035	0.030	821.742	1.183	0.237	-0.023	0.094
Slope*Actor: Birth of a child	-0.009	0.037	223.253	-0.241	0.810	-0.083	0.065
Slope*Partner: Birth of a child	0.020	0.035	202.465	0.581	0.562	-0.049	0.090
Slope*Actor: Graduation	-0.007	0.010	250.946	-0.630	0.529	-0.027	0.014
Slope*Partner: Graduation	-0.003	0.011	267.370	-0.299	0.765	-0.024	0.018
Slope*Actor: Change in job	-0.021	0.009	254.365	-2.335	0.020	-0.039	-0.003
Slope*Partner: Change in job	-0.003	0.009	263.717	-0.304	0.761	-0.020	0.015
Slope*Actor: Moving	0.006	0.012	198.662	0.503	0.616	-0.018	0.030
Slope*Partner: Moving	0.010	0.012	206.853	0.821	0.413	-0.014	0.034
Slope*Actor: Negative health event	0.005	0.010	240.090	0.452	0.652	-0.015	0.024

Table 46 (cont'd)

Slope*Partner: Negative health event	-0.003	0.010	256.961	-0.310	0.757	-0.024	0.017
Slope*Actor: Death of a close other	-0.012	0.009	222.650	-1.320	0.188	-0.030	0.006
Slope*Partner: Death of a close other	-0.001	0.009	223.428	-0.086	0.932	-0.019	0.017
Slope*Actor: Miscarriage	0.067	0.032	241.776	2.088	0.038	0.004	0.131
Slope*Partner: Miscarriage	-0.005	0.030	229.769	-0.168	0.867	-0.064	0.054
Slope*Actor: Other	0.013	0.014	235.771	0.904	0.367	-0.015	0.040
Slope*Partner: Other	-0.024	0.015	251.671	-1.608	0.109	-0.053	0.005
Actor: Birth of a child*Responsiveness	-0.448	0.231	597.064	-1.939	0.053	-0.901	0.006
Partner: Birth of a child*Responsiveness	0.469	0.220	569.602	2.133	0.033	0.037	0.901
Actor: Graduation*Responsiveness	0.085	0.070	929.014	1.219	0.223	-0.052	0.223
Partner: Graduation*Responsiveness	0.059	0.082	949.172	0.718	0.473	-0.102	0.220
Actor: Change in job*Responsiveness	-0.035	0.060	951.786	-0.583	0.560	-0.152	0.082
Partner: Change in job*Responsiveness	0.121	0.054	942.180	2.247	0.025	0.015	0.226
Actor: Moving*Responsiveness	0.005	0.083	784.506	0.055	0.956	-0.159	0.168
Partner: Moving*Responsiveness	-0.048	0.087	818.805	-0.558	0.577	-0.219	0.122
Actor: Negative health event*Responsiveness	-0.027	0.064	755.839	-0.416	0.678	-0.153	0.100
Partner: Negative health event*Responsiveness	0.046	0.058	911.124	0.785	0.433	-0.069	0.160
Actor: Death of a close other*Responsiveness	-0.072	0.053	835.026	-1.368	0.172	-0.176	0.031
Partner: Death of a close other*Responsiveness	-0.026	0.055	850.410	-0.474	0.636	-0.134	0.082
Actor: Miscarriage*Responsiveness	0.260	0.263	702.765	0.991	0.322	-0.255	0.776
Partner: Miscarriage*Responsiveness	-0.310	0.184	733.476	-1.690	0.091	-0.671	0.050
Actor: Other*Responsiveness	0.015	0.090	896.317	0.165	0.869	-0.162	0.192
Partner: Other*Responsiveness	-0.006	0.093	673.456	-0.066	0.947	-0.188	0.176
Slope*Actor: Miscarriage*Responsiveness	0.032	0.036	179.123	0.882	0.379	-0.039	0.103

Table 46 (cont'd)
Note. Significant effects bolded, $p < .01$

Table 47. Linear growth curve model examining the effect of actor/partner life events and closeness on the slope of openness; CouPers sample.

	b	*SE*	*df*	*t*	*p*	*LB*	*UB*
Intercept	**3.321**	**0.120**	**192.565**	**27.683**	**<.001**	**3.084**	**3.558**
Slope	-0.007	0.005	153.912	-1.409	0.161	-0.018	0.003
Actor: Birth of a child	0.058	0.268	284.995	0.217	0.829	-0.469	0.585
Partner: Birth of a child	-0.224	0.269	289.152	-0.833	0.406	-0.753	0.305
Actor: Graduation	0.115	0.096	503.200	1.201	0.230	-0.073	0.304
Partner: Graduation	0.153	0.100	556.361	1.526	0.128	-0.044	0.350
Actor: Change in job	0.130	0.083	514.489	1.572	0.116	-0.032	0.292
Partner: Change in job	-0.026	0.081	520.796	-0.323	0.747	-0.185	0.133
Actor: Moving	0.002	0.115	468.367	0.016	0.987	-0.225	0.228
Partner: Moving	0.083	0.115	450.707	0.722	0.471	-0.143	0.309
Actor: Negative health event	-0.050	0.103	608.297	-0.488	0.626	-0.252	0.152
Partner: Negative health event	-0.128	0.103	631.434	-1.247	0.213	-0.330	0.074
Actor: Death of a close other	0.122	0.090	539.798	1.364	0.173	-0.054	0.299
Partner: Death of a close other	-0.098	0.088	515.509	-1.108	0.268	-0.271	0.075
Actor: Miscarriage	0.387	0.471	718.274	0.822	0.411	-0.537	1.311
Partner: Miscarriage	0.171	0.254	409.016	0.674	0.501	-0.329	0.672
Actor: Other	-0.064	0.135	567.513	-0.476	0.634	-0.330	0.201
Partner: Other	0.062	0.151	667.233	0.415	0.678	-0.233	0.358
Gender	-0.018	0.026	143.327	-0.696	0.488	-0.068	0.033
Age	0.003	0.002	148.242	1.318	0.190	-0.002	0.008
Education	0.023	0.011	231.687	2.033	0.043	0.001	0.045
Income	-0.022	0.012	199.393	-1.851	0.066	-0.044	0.001
Relationship length	-0.005	0.003	139.285	-1.790	0.076	-0.010	0.001
Closeness	-0.010	0.006	503.942	-1.725	0.085	-0.022	0.001
Slope*Actor: Birth of a child	-0.013	0.042	429.716	-0.308	0.758	-0.097	0.070
Slope*Partner: Birth of a child	0.008	0.042	407.519	0.185	0.853	-0.074	0.089
Slope*Actor: Graduation	-0.004	0.011	302.762	-0.371	0.711	-0.026	0.018
Slope*Partner: Graduation	-0.002	0.012	320.937	-0.131	0.896	-0.025	0.022
Slope*Actor: Change in job	-0.013	0.010	332.946	-1.299	0.195	-0.034	0.007

Table 47 (cont'd)

Slope*Partner: Change in job	-0.001	0.010	350.942	-0.118	0.906	-0.021	0.019
Slope*Actor: Moving	0.003	0.013	237.661	0.237	0.813	-0.022	0.028
Slope*Partner: Moving	0.021	0.013	266.931	1.585	0.114	-0.005	0.047
Slope*Actor: Negative health event	0.006	0.011	262.841	0.568	0.571	-0.015	0.027
Slope*Partner: Negative health event	-0.010	0.011	296.768	-0.948	0.344	-0.032	0.011
Slope*Actor: Death of a close other	-0.007	0.010	247.314	-0.683	0.495	-0.026	0.013
Slope*Partner: Death of a close other	-0.002	0.010	256.466	-0.210	0.834	-0.021	0.017
Slope*Actor: Miscarriage	0.253	0.144	623.112	1.758	0.079	-0.030	0.535
Slope*Partner: Miscarriage	-0.013	0.034	296.577	-0.373	0.710	-0.080	0.054
Slope*Actor: Other	0.006	0.015	242.309	0.383	0.702	-0.024	0.035
Slope*Partner: Other	-0.026	0.016	281.750	-1.657	0.099	-0.057	0.005
Actor: Birth of a child*Closeness	0.019	0.030	433.502	0.634	0.527	-0.040	0.078
Partner: Birth of a child*Closeness	-0.032	0.031	421.224	-1.052	0.294	-0.092	0.028
Actor: Graduation*Closeness	0.015	0.011	777.436	1.323	0.186	-0.007	0.036
Partner: Graduation*Closeness	0.009	0.012	751.880	0.714	0.475	-0.015	0.033
Actor: Change in job*Closeness	0.014	0.009	756.362	1.463	0.144	-0.005	0.032
Partner: Change in job*Closeness	0.014	0.010	812.388	1.448	0.148	-0.005	0.033
Actor: Moving*Closeness	0.000	0.014	630.459	-0.032	0.975	-0.028	0.027
Partner: Moving*Closeness	0.014	0.014	644.523	1.019	0.309	-0.013	0.042
Actor: Negative health event*Closeness	-0.007	0.013	634.685	-0.586	0.558	-0.032	0.017
Partner: Negative health event*Closeness	-0.017	0.012	776.696	-1.357	0.175	-0.041	0.007
Actor: Death of a close other*Closeness	0.004	0.011	603.585	0.394	0.694	-0.018	0.027
Partner: Death of a close other*Closeness	-0.005	0.011	583.809	-0.512	0.609	-0.026	0.016
Actor: Miscarriage*Closeness	0.111	0.071	558.737	1.567	0.118	-0.028	0.250

Table 47 (cont'd)

Partner: Miscarriage*Closeness	-0.004	0.030	591.854	-0.128	0.899	-0.062	0.054
Actor: Other*Closeness	-0.015	0.017	685.957	-0.845	0.398	-0.049	0.019
Partner: Other*Closeness	0.005	0.019	706.422	0.239	0.811	-0.033	0.043
Slope*Actor: Miscarriage*Closeness	0.022	0.023	645.440	0.981	0.327	-0.022	0.067

Note. Significant effects bolded, $p < .01$

Table 48. Linear growth curve model examining the effect of actor and partner life events on the slope of support; CouPers sample.

	b	*SE*	*df*	*t*	*p*	*LB*	*UB*
Intercept	-0.110	0.105	207.602	-1.046	0.297	-0.316	0.097
Slope	**-0.051**	**0.006**	**128.504**	**-7.959**	**<.001**	**-0.064**	**-0.038**
Actor: Birth of a child	-0.010	0.140	221.737	-0.072	0.943	-0.287	0.267
Partner: Birth of a child	0.083	0.141	227.725	0.585	0.559	-0.196	0.361
Actor: Graduation	-0.022	0.064	209.571	-0.353	0.724	-0.148	0.103
Partner: Graduation	-0.029	0.063	207.398	-0.460	0.646	-0.154	0.096
Actor: Change in job	0.039	0.056	195.840	0.700	0.485	-0.071	0.149
Partner: Change in job	-0.011	0.055	189.582	-0.208	0.836	-0.120	0.097
Actor: Moving	-0.016	0.063	247.019	-0.249	0.803	-0.140	0.109
Partner: Moving	0.050	0.063	236.439	0.805	0.422	-0.073	0.174
Actor: Negative health event	-0.052	0.063	192.539	-0.837	0.404	-0.176	0.071
Partner: Negative health event	0.012	0.061	182.470	0.194	0.846	-0.109	0.133
Actor: Death of a close other	0.016	0.049	242.258	0.329	0.742	-0.080	0.113
Partner: Death of a close other	0.037	0.049	236.159	0.763	0.446	-0.059	0.134
Actor: Miscarriage	-0.240	0.181	185.973	-1.325	0.187	-0.597	0.117
Partner: Miscarriage	-0.198	0.174	175.479	-1.136	0.258	-0.541	0.146
Actor: Other	0.079	0.081	211.586	0.966	0.335	-0.082	0.239
Partner: Other	0.148	0.084	216.388	1.769	0.078	-0.017	0.313
Gender	**-0.106**	**0.014**	**142.776**	**-7.419**	**<.001**	**-0.134**	**-0.078**
Age	**0.007**	**0.002**	**165.928**	**3.204**	**0.002**	**0.003**	**0.012**
Education	**0.031**	**0.008**	**224.257**	**3.721**	**<.001**	**0.015**	**0.048**
Income	-0.011	0.009	237.840	-1.187	0.236	-0.029	0.007
Relationship length	-0.001	0.003	157.850	-0.277	0.782	-0.006	0.004
Slope*Actor: Birth of a child	-0.018	0.032	167.258	-0.558	0.578	-0.081	0.045
Slope*Partner: Birth of a child	0.015	0.032	178.603	0.472	0.638	-0.049	0.079
Slope*Actor: Graduation	0.003	0.012	229.522	0.225	0.823	-0.021	0.026
Slope*Partner: Graduation	0.010	0.012	237.522	0.789	0.431	-0.014	0.033

Table 48 (cont'd)

Slope*Actor: Change in job	0.013	0.010	225.562	1.244	0.215	-0.008	0.033
Slope*Partner: Change in job	0.003	0.010	222.237	0.291	0.771	-0.017	0.023
Slope*Actor: Moving	0.013	0.013	232.906	0.972	0.332	-0.013	0.039
Slope*Partner: Moving	-0.014	0.013	204.584	-1.040	0.300	-0.039	0.012
Slope*Actor: Negative health event	0.018	0.012	236.476	1.475	0.141	-0.006	0.042
Slope*Partner: Negative health event	**0.026**	**0.012**	**198.999**	**2.284**	**0.023**	**0.004**	**0.049**
Slope*Actor: Death of a close other	-0.017	0.010	237.240	-1.673	0.096	-0.037	0.003
Slope*Partner: Death of a close other	**0.022**	**0.010**	**225.475**	**2.177**	**0.031**	**0.002**	**0.042**
Slope*Actor: Miscarriage	-0.004	0.036	228.542	-0.120	0.904	-0.075	0.066
Slope*Partner: Miscarriage	-0.015	0.032	180.860	-0.474	0.636	-0.079	0.049
Slope*Actor: Other	0.015	0.016	244.598	0.928	0.354	-0.017	0.047
Slope*Partner: Other	0.005	0.017	220.428	0.277	0.782	-0.028	0.037

Note. Significant effects bolded, $p < .05$

Table 49. Linear growth curve model examining the effect of actor and partner life events on the slope of responsiveness; CouPers sample.

	b	*SE*	*df*	*t*	*p*	*LB*	*UB*
Intercept	**4.148**	**0.170**	**210.366**	**24.355**	**<.001**	**3.813**	**4.484**
Slope	-0.014	0.009	133.786	-1.541	0.126	-0.031	0.004
Actor: Birth of a child	-0.331	0.232	238.693	-1.425	0.155	-0.789	0.127
Partner: Birth of a child	0.075	0.233	242.957	0.320	0.749	-0.384	0.534
Actor: Graduation	-0.046	0.109	204.840	-0.423	0.673	-0.260	0.168
Partner: Graduation	0.040	0.108	202.927	0.368	0.713	-0.174	0.254
Actor: Change in job	0.034	0.096	189.163	0.351	0.726	-0.155	0.222
Partner: Change in job	-0.018	0.095	183.634	-0.186	0.853	-0.204	0.169
Actor: Moving	0.045	0.106	242.704	0.425	0.672	-0.164	0.254
Partner: Moving	0.010	0.106	235.540	0.094	0.926	-0.199	0.219
Actor: Negative health event	-0.124	0.107	181.531	-1.161	0.247	-0.336	0.087
Partner: Negative health event	**-0.217**	**0.106**	**177.006**	**-2.044**	**0.042**	**-0.427**	**-0.007**
Actor: Death of a close other	0.076	0.083	232.997	0.916	0.360	-0.088	0.240
Partner: Death of a close other	0.059	0.083	230.147	0.710	0.478	-0.105	0.223
Actor: Miscarriage	-0.114	0.310	178.596	-0.369	0.712	-0.726	0.497
Partner: Miscarriage	-0.217	0.305	171.374	-0.711	0.478	-0.818	0.385
Actor: Other	-0.025	0.139	199.987	-0.182	0.856	-0.300	0.249
Partner: Other	-0.071	0.144	209.104	-0.495	0.621	-0.355	0.212
Gender	-0.014	0.021	144.118	-0.641	0.522	-0.056	0.029
Age	0.004	0.004	164.900	1.011	0.314	-0.004	0.011
Education	-0.025	0.013	208.284	-1.915	0.057	-0.050	0.001
Income	-0.015	0.015	226.910	-1.062	0.289	-0.044	0.013
Relationship length	-0.004	0.004	158.111	-1.030	0.305	-0.013	0.004
Slope*Actor: Birth of a child	-0.014	0.039	199.863	-0.350	0.727	-0.091	0.063
Slope*Partner: Birth of a child	0.019	0.039	193.737	0.491	0.624	-0.057	0.095
Slope*Actor: Graduation	0.000	0.015	234.420	-0.015	0.988	-0.030	0.030
Slope*Partner: Graduation	-0.010	0.016	242.186	-0.612	0.541	-0.040	0.021
Slope*Actor: Change in job	-0.015	0.014	216.666	-1.085	0.279	-0.041	0.012

Table 49 (cont'd)

Slope*Partner: Change in job	-0.011	0.014	220.340	-0.782	0.435	-0.037	0.016
Slope*Actor: Moving	-0.001	0.016	231.866	-0.056	0.955	-0.033	0.031
Slope*Partner: Moving	0.003	0.017	246.543	0.191	0.849	-0.030	0.036
Slope*Actor: Negative health event	**0.054**	**0.015**	**194.159**	**3.568**	**<.001**	**0.024**	**0.083**
Slope*Partner: Negative health event	-0.026	0.016	224.251	-1.618	0.107	-0.057	0.006
Slope*Actor: Death of a close other	0.014	0.013	242.728	1.132	0.259	-0.011	0.040
Slope*Partner: Death of a close other	-0.002	0.013	249.734	-0.133	0.894	-0.027	0.023
Slope*Actor: Miscarriage	0.020	0.043	188.537	0.459	0.647	-0.066	0.106
Slope*Partner: Miscarriage	0.013	0.046	205.821	0.291	0.772	-0.077	0.103
Slope*Actor: Other	0.005	0.020	220.590	0.225	0.822	-0.036	0.045
Slope*Partner: Other	0.001	0.022	241.833	0.047	0.963	-0.042	0.044

Note. Significant effects bolded, $p < .05$

Table 50. Linear growth curve model examining the effect of actor and partner life events on the slope of closeness; CouPers sample.

	b	*SE*	*df*	*t*	*p*	*LB*	*UB*
Intercept	**5.997**	**0.348**	**10.381**	**17.254**	**<.001**	**5.227**	**6.768**
Slope	**-0.338**	**0.063**	**5.570**	**-5.336**	**0.002**	**-0.496**	**-0.180**
Actor: Birth of a child	0.257	0.461	6.570	0.558	0.596	-0.847	1.361
Partner: Birth of a child	0.532	0.467	5.904	1.139	0.299	-0.616	1.680
Actor: Graduation	0.250	0.228	10.106	1.096	0.299	-0.257	0.756
Partner: Graduation	0.139	0.227	4.509	0.613	0.570	-0.463	0.741
Actor: Change in job	-0.122	0.204	4.895	-0.600	0.575	-0.650	0.405
Partner: Change in job	0.383	0.202	8.434	1.901	0.092	-0.078	0.844
Actor: Moving	0.140	0.220	20.452	0.636	0.532	-0.319	0.599
Partner: Moving	0.094	0.216	13.047	0.437	0.669	-0.371	0.560
Actor: Negative health event	-0.341	0.232	11.183	-1.468	0.170	-0.851	0.169
Partner: Negative health event	-0.487	0.224	3.362	-2.176	0.108	-1.159	0.184
Actor: Death of a close other	0.170	0.173	13.409	0.984	0.343	-0.202	0.542
Partner: Death of a close other	0.009	0.171	5.762	0.054	0.959	-0.414	0.433
Actor: Miscarriage	0.977	0.673	1.119	1.452	0.365	-5.691	7.645
Partner: Miscarriage	0.576	0.636	1.191	0.906	0.511	-5.009	6.162
Actor: Other	0.431	0.297	11.727	1.450	0.173	-0.218	1.080
Partner: Other	0.040	0.300	1.366	0.132	0.912	-2.034	2.113
Gender	**0.168**	**0.043**	**268.403**	**3.947**	**<.001**	**0.084**	**0.252**
Age	**-0.016**	**0.008**	**42.596**	**-2.128**	**0.039**	**-0.032**	**-0.001**
Education	**-0.051**	**0.026**	**266.427**	**-1.989**	**0.048**	**-0.102**	**-0.001**
Income	-0.003	0.029	155.323	-0.093	0.926	-0.059	0.054
Relationship length	0.016	0.009	46.214	1.823	0.075	-0.002	0.033
Slope*Actor: Birth of a child	-0.299	0.188	26.705	-1.588	0.124	-0.686	0.087
Slope*Partner: Birth of a child	-0.104	0.187	1.059	-0.555	0.673	-2.190	1.982
Slope*Actor: Graduation	-0.077	0.094	3.421	-0.823	0.464	-0.355	0.201

Table 50 (cont'd)

Slope*Partner: Graduation	-0.117	0.094	1.967	-1.250	0.340	-0.528	0.293
Slope*Actor: Change in job	-0.233	0.086	3.419	-2.729	0.062	-0.488	0.021
Slope*Partner: Change in job	-0.165	0.085	3.014	-1.937	0.148	-0.436	0.106
Slope*Actor: Moving	0.095	0.091	1.265	1.042	0.456	-0.620	0.810
Slope*Partner: Moving	0.054	0.092	3.597	0.585	0.593	-0.214	0.322
Slope*Actor: Negative health event	0.121	0.097	3.319	1.247	0.293	-0.172	0.415
Slope*Partner: Negative health event	0.054	0.099	2.904	0.546	0.624	-0.266	0.374
Slope*Actor: Death of a close other	-0.010	0.073	55.534	-0.137	0.891	-0.156	0.136
Slope*Partner: Death of a close other	0.035	0.073	11.911	0.481	0.639	-0.124	0.194
Slope*Actor: Miscarriage	-0.470	0.280	0.259	-1.679	0.624	-9862.438	9861.497
Slope*Partner: Miscarriage	-0.263	0.285	16.988	-0.922	0.370	-0.864	0.338
Slope*Actor: Other	0.020	0.126	3.384	0.162	0.880	-0.356	0.397
Slope*Partner: Other	0.094	0.129	1.614	0.731	0.556	-0.610	0.799

Note. Significant effects bolded, $p < .05$

Table 51. Linear growth curve model examining the effect of actor and partner life events on the slope of partner-reported agreeableness; CouPers sample.

	b	*SE*	*df*	*t*	*p*	*LB*	*UB*
Intercept	**3.148**	**0.084**	**653.668**	**37.490**	**<.001**	**2.983**	**3.313**
Slope	-0.011	0.011	490.658	-1.035	0.301	-0.033	0.010
Actor: Birth of a child	-0.244	0.170	673.450	-1.437	0.151	-0.577	0.089
Partner: Birth of a child	0.189	0.168	649.361	1.127	0.260	-0.140	0.518
Actor: Graduation	-0.008	0.055	872.754	-0.138	0.890	-0.115	0.100
Partner: Graduation	**-0.140**	**0.056**	**876.112**	**-2.516**	**0.012**	**-0.249**	**-0.031**
Actor: Change in job	0.100	0.047	881.732	2.124	0.034	0.008	0.193
Partner: Change in job	-0.040	0.047	877.534	-0.849	0.396	-0.131	0.052
Actor: Moving	-0.022	0.062	733.003	-0.351	0.726	-0.144	0.100
Partner: Moving	0.046	0.062	716.384	0.751	0.453	-0.075	0.168
Actor: Negative health event	0.048	0.052	832.172	0.931	0.352	-0.053	0.149
Partner: Negative health event	-0.070	0.053	761.032	-1.327	0.185	-0.174	0.034
Actor: Death of a close other	-0.026	0.046	791.283	-0.571	0.568	-0.116	0.064
Partner: Death of a close other	**-0.121**	**0.046**	**785.435**	**-2.616**	**0.009**	**-0.211**	**-0.030**
Actor: Miscarriage	**-0.368**	**0.152**	**769.875**	**-2.422**	**0.016**	**-0.666**	**-0.070**
Partner: Miscarriage	**0.351**	**0.162**	**693.692**	**2.162**	**0.031**	**0.032**	**0.669**
Actor: Other	-0.042	0.071	834.720	-0.593	0.553	-0.182	0.098
Partner: Other	**0.205**	**0.074**	**847.064**	**2.775**	**0.006**	**0.060**	**0.351**
Gender	0.024	0.018	539.952	1.335	0.183	-0.011	0.060
Age	0.000	0.002	597.164	0.114	0.909	-0.003	0.004
Education	-0.010	0.008	825.563	-1.250	0.212	-0.026	0.006
Income	0.007	0.008	788.836	0.795	0.427	-0.010	0.023
Relationship length	-0.003	0.002	553.408	-1.741	0.082	-0.007	0.000
Slope*Actor: Birth of a child	-0.040	0.069	580.982	-0.573	0.567	-0.176	0.097
Slope*Partner: Birth of a child	0.100	0.071	592.282	1.409	0.159	-0.040	0.240
Slope*Actor: Graduation	0.016	0.023	857.953	0.694	0.488	-0.029	0.061
Slope*Partner: Graduation	-0.012	0.024	865.155	-0.510	0.610	-0.059	0.034
Slope*Actor: Change in job	0.018	0.021	882.021	0.859	0.390	-0.023	0.058
Slope*Partner: Change in job	-0.014	0.020	882.235	-0.721	0.471	-0.054	0.025
Slope*Actor: Moving	0.018	0.028	740.282	0.634	0.526	-0.037	0.073

Table 51 (cont'd)

Slope*Partner: Moving	-0.025	0.028	733.300	-0.908	0.364	-0.080	0.029
Slope*Actor: Negative health event	-0.023	0.023	849.621	-1.008	0.314	-0.067	0.022
Slope*Partner: Negative health event	0.016	0.023	788.216	0.729	0.466	-0.028	0.061
Slope*Actor: Death of a close other	0.008	0.020	788.875	0.408	0.684	-0.032	0.048
Slope*Partner: Death of a close other	-0.002	0.020	781.789	-0.103	0.918	-0.042	0.038
Slope*Actor: Miscarriage	**0.165**	**0.067**	**695.301**	**2.475**	**0.014**	**0.034**	**0.296**
Slope*Partner: Miscarriage	-0.047	0.077	658.337	-0.613	0.540	-0.199	0.104
Slope*Actor: Other	0.039	0.032	840.089	1.213	0.226	-0.024	0.102
Slope*Partner: Other	0.015	0.033	840.297	0.445	0.656	-0.051	0.080

Note. Significant effects bolded, $p < .05$

Table 52. Linear growth curve model examining the effect of actor and partner life events on the slope of partner-reported conscientiousness; CouPers sample.

	b	*SE*	*df*	*t*	*p*	*LB*	*UB*
Intercept	**3.649**	**0.207**	**174.703**	**17.668**	**<.001**	**3.241**	**4.056**
Slope	0.012	0.008	131.408	1.474	0.143	-0.004	0.028
Actor: Birth of a child	0.070	0.400	141.761	0.175	0.861	-0.721	0.861
Partner: Birth of a child	-0.185	0.405	148.172	-0.457	0.648	-0.985	0.615
Actor: Graduation	-0.149	0.140	237.723	-1.064	0.289	-0.424	0.127
Partner: Graduation	-0.238	0.139	235.724	-1.714	0.088	-0.513	0.036
Actor: Change in job	-0.046	0.118	243.522	-0.393	0.695	-0.279	0.186
Partner: Change in job	0.029	0.115	238.406	0.252	0.802	-0.198	0.256
Actor: Moving	0.106	0.162	195.691	0.657	0.512	-0.213	0.426
Partner: Moving	0.019	0.159	178.757	0.122	0.903	-0.294	0.333
Actor: Negative health event	-0.162	0.136	253.288	-1.190	0.235	-0.429	0.106
Partner: Negative health event	-0.062	0.126	204.213	-0.494	0.622	-0.311	0.187
Actor: Death of a close other	0.149	0.120	209.053	1.249	0.213	-0.086	0.385
Partner: Death of a close other	0.033	0.118	195.438	0.281	0.779	-0.200	0.266
Actor: Miscarriage	-0.119	0.398	237.310	-0.298	0.766	-0.902	0.665
Partner: Miscarriage	0.527	0.361	185.834	1.457	0.147	-0.186	1.240
Actor: Other	-0.206	0.186	240.401	-1.109	0.269	-0.571	0.160
Partner: Other	-0.157	0.190	231.793	-0.828	0.409	-0.532	0.217
Gender	**0.150**	**0.048**	**138.176**	**3.131**	**0.002**	**0.055**	**0.244**
Age	0.005	0.004	142.979	1.106	0.271	-0.004	0.013
Education	0.023	0.020	221.352	1.166	0.245	-0.016	0.063
Income	0.006	0.020	183.680	0.303	0.762	-0.034	0.046
Relationship length	0.001	0.005	133.192	0.220	0.826	-0.008	0.010
Slope*Actor: Birth of a child	0.002	0.047	122.825	0.037	0.970	-0.092	0.095
Slope*Partner: Birth of a child	0.000	0.047	123.895	-0.008	0.994	-0.094	0.093
Slope*Actor: Graduation	0.005	0.017	219.084	0.283	0.777	-0.029	0.038
Slope*Partner: Graduation	-0.011	0.018	223.976	-0.612	0.541	-0.046	0.024
Slope*Actor: Change in job	0.015	0.015	223.116	1.005	0.316	-0.014	0.044

Table 52 (cont'd)

Slope*Partner: Change in job	0.017	0.014	221.849	1.242	0.215	-0.010	0.045
Slope*Actor: Moving	-0.035	0.020	183.765	-1.776	0.077	-0.075	0.004
Slope*Partner: Moving	0.026	0.020	185.198	1.324	0.187	-0.013	0.066
Slope*Actor: Negative health event	-0.009	0.016	207.138	-0.535	0.594	-0.041	0.024
Slope*Partner: Negative health event	-0.010	0.016	217.395	-0.612	0.541	-0.042	0.022
Slope*Actor: Death of a close other	-0.010	0.015	198.398	-0.693	0.489	-0.040	0.019
Slope*Partner: Death of a close other	0.003	0.015	200.014	0.205	0.838	-0.026	0.033
Slope*Actor: Miscarriage	**0.100**	**0.048**	**235.000**	**2.068**	**0.040**	**0.005**	**0.194**
Slope*Partner: Miscarriage	-0.046	0.051	117.917	-0.897	0.372	-0.147	0.055
Slope*Actor: Other	-0.033	0.023	217.392	-1.439	0.152	-0.078	0.012
Slope*Partner: Other	-0.022	0.025	217.405	-0.868	0.386	-0.071	0.027

Note. Significant effects bolded, $p < .05$

Table 53. Linear growth curve model examining the effect of actor and partner life events on the slope of partner-reported extraversion; CouPers sample.

	b	*SE*	*df*	*t*	*p*	*LB*	*UB*
Intercept	**3.820**	**0.275**	**172.502**	**13.888**	**<.001**	**3.277**	**4.363**
Slope	0.006	0.012	104.093	0.546	0.586	-0.017	0.030
Actor: Birth of a child	0.407	0.570	158.268	0.713	0.477	-0.720	1.533
Partner: Birth of a child	-0.955	0.568	158.830	-1.681	0.095	-2.077	0.167
Actor: Graduation	-0.096	0.190	235.438	-0.502	0.616	-0.471	0.280
Partner: Graduation	-0.002	0.192	226.272	-0.010	0.992	-0.380	0.376
Actor: Change in job	0.031	0.159	245.106	0.196	0.845	-0.282	0.344
Partner: Change in job	0.068	0.156	238.172	0.433	0.665	-0.240	0.375
Actor: Moving	-0.094	0.221	190.686	-0.427	0.670	-0.530	0.341
Partner: Moving	0.393	0.218	175.940	1.805	0.073	-0.037	0.822
Actor: Negative health event	-0.013	0.183	243.332	-0.072	0.942	-0.375	0.348
Partner: Negative health event	-0.239	0.175	210.731	-1.364	0.174	-0.584	0.106
Actor: Death of a close other	-0.054	0.163	208.707	-0.332	0.740	-0.376	0.268
Partner: Death of a close other	0.376	0.163	201.738	2.301	0.022	0.054	0.699
Actor: Miscarriage	-0.004	0.635	141.352	-0.006	0.995	-1.259	1.251
Partner: Miscarriage	0.035	0.490	194.091	0.072	0.943	-0.932	1.003
Actor: Other	-0.127	0.254	235.783	-0.498	0.619	-0.628	0.375
Partner: Other	-0.187	0.256	221.802	-0.731	0.466	-0.690	0.317
Gender	**0.161**	**0.065**	**143.644**	**2.487**	**0.014**	**0.033**	**0.290**
Age	0.001	0.006	142.487	0.207	0.836	-0.010	0.012
Education	-0.014	0.027	220.394	-0.531	0.596	-0.067	0.039
Income	0.011	0.028	181.516	0.413	0.680	-0.043	0.066
Relationship length	-0.008	0.006	132.229	-1.327	0.187	-0.021	0.004
Slope*Actor: Birth of a child	0.078	0.083	135.509	0.943	0.347	-0.085	0.241
Slope*Partner: Birth of a child	-0.109	0.085	128.062	-1.287	0.200	-0.277	0.059
Slope*Actor: Graduation	0.026	0.024	174.670	1.056	0.292	-0.022	0.074
Slope*Partner: Graduation	-0.006	0.025	165.819	-0.226	0.822	-0.055	0.044
Slope*Actor: Change in job	0.008	0.021	186.408	0.382	0.703	-0.033	0.049
Slope*Partner: Change in job	0.012	0.020	177.943	0.592	0.554	-0.028	0.052
Slope*Actor: Moving	-0.047	0.027	131.107	-1.764	0.080	-0.101	0.006

Table 53 (cont'd)

Slope*Partner: Moving	0.005	0.027	133.981	0.178	0.859	-0.049	0.059
Slope*Actor: Negative health event	0.017	0.024	179.275	0.727	0.468	-0.030	0.064
Slope*Partner: Negative health event	-0.004	0.023	172.234	-0.169	0.866	-0.050	0.042
Slope*Actor: Death of a close other	-0.001	0.022	158.404	-0.025	0.980	-0.043	0.042
Slope*Partner: Death of a close other	-0.007	0.022	153.834	-0.326	0.745	-0.051	0.037
Slope*Actor: Miscarriage	-0.012	0.077	133.812	-0.161	0.872	-0.164	0.139
Slope*Partner: Miscarriage	0.043	0.065	171.114	0.664	0.508	-0.085	0.171
Slope*Actor: Other	-0.002	0.035	201.318	-0.058	0.954	-0.072	0.068
Slope*Partner: Other	0.005	0.034	156.560	0.159	0.874	-0.061	0.072

Note. Significant effects bolded, $p < .05$

Table 54. Linear growth curve model examining the effect of actor and partner life events on the slope of partner-reported neuroticism; CouPers sample.

	b	*SE*	*df*	*t*	*p*	*LB*	*UB*
Intercept	**3.145**	**0.237**	**171.910**	**13.295**	**<.001**	**2.678**	**3.612**
Slope	-0.008	0.011	113.616	-0.682	0.497	-0.030	0.015
Actor: Birth of a child	-0.062	0.476	151.191	-0.131	0.896	-1.002	0.878
Partner: Birth of a child	-0.070	0.474	146.302	-0.147	0.884	-1.006	0.867
Actor: Graduation	0.214	0.159	233.311	1.344	0.180	-0.099	0.526
Partner: Graduation	0.166	0.162	246.736	1.029	0.305	-0.152	0.485
Actor: Change in job	0.084	0.134	238.274	0.624	0.533	-0.180	0.348
Partner: Change in job	-0.063	0.133	253.267	-0.473	0.637	-0.326	0.200
Actor: Moving	-0.123	0.183	177.982	-0.669	0.504	-0.484	0.239
Partner: Moving	0.120	0.188	192.323	0.640	0.523	-0.250	0.490
Actor: Negative health event	0.008	0.147	206.417	0.051	0.959	-0.282	0.297
Partner: Negative health event	0.183	0.153	248.371	1.193	0.234	-0.119	0.484
Actor: Death of a close other	-0.203	0.137	200.958	-1.474	0.142	-0.474	0.068
Partner: Death of a close other	-0.027	0.140	213.299	-0.190	0.850	-0.302	0.249
Actor: Miscarriage	0.456	0.422	200.279	1.080	0.281	-0.376	1.288
Partner: Miscarriage	0.043	0.449	239.504	0.096	0.924	-0.841	0.927
Actor: Other	0.217	0.207	215.702	1.047	0.296	-0.191	0.625
Partner: Other	-0.041	0.224	251.174	-0.184	0.854	-0.482	0.400
Gender	**0.368**	**0.055**	**142.637**	**6.730**	**<.001**	**0.260**	**0.476**
Age	-0.005	0.005	143.108	-1.007	0.316	-0.015	0.005
Education	**-0.046**	**0.023**	**212.110**	**-2.048**	**0.042**	**-0.091**	**-0.002**
Income	-0.006	0.023	192.372	-0.252	0.802	-0.052	0.040
Relationship length	**0.011**	**0.005**	**133.382**	**2.020**	**0.045**	**0.000**	**0.021**
Slope*Actor: Birth of a child	0.098	0.087	157.831	1.128	0.261	-0.073	0.268
Slope*Partner: Birth of a child	-0.100	0.089	133.044	-1.131	0.260	-0.275	0.075
Slope*Actor: Graduation	-0.017	0.024	184.849	-0.692	0.490	-0.064	0.031

Table 54 (cont'd)

Slope*Partner: Graduation	0.045	0.026	200.589	1.740	0.083	-0.006	0.096
Slope*Actor: Change in job	0.003	0.021	211.079	0.129	0.897	-0.039	0.045
Slope*Partner: Change in job	-0.047	0.021	197.474	-2.208	0.028	-0.089	-0.005
Slope*Actor: Moving	0.045	0.029	148.187	1.554	0.122	-0.012	0.103
Slope*Partner: Moving	-0.027	0.031	161.708	-0.860	0.391	-0.088	0.035
Slope*Actor: Negative health event	-0.029	0.024	193.617	-1.187	0.237	-0.076	0.019
Slope*Partner: Negative health event	0.028	0.024	185.451	1.176	0.241	-0.019	0.075
Slope*Actor: Death of a close other	-0.028	0.023	180.504	-1.256	0.211	-0.073	0.016
Slope*Partner: Death of a close other	0.015	0.023	178.688	0.679	0.498	-0.029	0.060
Slope*Actor: Miscarriage	-0.031	0.069	212.981	-0.451	0.652	-0.168	0.105
Slope*Partner: Miscarriage	0.002	0.072	153.773	0.030	0.976	-0.140	0.144
Slope*Actor: Other	0.028	0.034	180.829	0.835	0.405	-0.039	0.095
Slope*Partner: Other	-0.009	0.036	191.574	-0.257	0.797	-0.081	0.063

Note. Significant effects bolded, $p < .05$

Table 55. Linear growth curve model examining the effect of actor and partner life events on the slope of partner-reported openness; CouPers sample.

	b	*SE*	*df*	*t*	*p*	*LB*	*UB*
Intercept	**3.471**	**0.204**	**162.325**	**16.983**	**<.001**	**3.067**	**3.875**
Slope	-0.003	0.008	116.685	-0.422	0.674	-0.020	0.013
Actor: Birth of a child	-0.126	0.367	143.175	-0.343	0.732	-0.852	0.600
Partner: Birth of a child	-0.335	0.373	149.661	-0.898	0.371	-1.071	0.402
Actor: Graduation	0.113	0.134	217.154	0.849	0.397	-0.150	0.377
Partner: Graduation	0.076	0.133	204.620	0.568	0.570	-0.187	0.339
Actor: Change in job	-0.038	0.114	220.475	-0.329	0.743	-0.262	0.187
Partner: Change in job	0.061	0.112	209.044	0.545	0.586	-0.159	0.281
Actor: Moving	-0.126	0.154	198.596	-0.821	0.413	-0.430	0.177
Partner: Moving	0.092	0.148	170.219	0.626	0.532	-0.199	0.384
Actor: Negative health event	-0.053	0.136	240.929	-0.389	0.698	-0.320	0.215
Partner: Negative health event	-0.075	0.122	185.579	-0.614	0.540	-0.317	0.166
Actor: Death of a close other	0.008	0.113	203.621	0.070	0.944	-0.214	0.230
Partner: Death of a close other	0.182	0.110	186.541	1.651	0.100	-0.035	0.399
Actor: Miscarriage	0.433	0.391	237.804	1.107	0.269	-0.338	1.204
Partner: Miscarriage	-0.177	0.337	172.923	-0.526	0.599	-0.842	0.488
Actor: Other	-0.284	0.181	226.579	-1.575	0.117	-0.640	0.071
Partner: Other	-0.123	0.180	191.623	-0.687	0.493	-0.478	0.231
Gender	**0.217**	**0.044**	**132.086**	**4.876**	**<.001**	**0.129**	**0.305**
Age	0.008	0.004	134.076	1.901	0.059	0.000	0.017
Education	0.021	0.020	211.339	1.059	0.291	-0.018	0.059
Income	0.000	0.020	175.598	-0.016	0.988	-0.040	0.039
Relationship length	-0.004	0.005	126.260	-0.796	0.427	-0.013	0.006
Slope*Actor: Birth of a child	-0.016	0.047	121.279	-0.339	0.735	-0.108	0.076
Slope*Partner: Birth of a child	-0.040	0.047	124.868	-0.845	0.399	-0.133	0.053
Slope*Actor: Graduation	-0.014	0.017	207.981	-0.829	0.408	-0.048	0.020
Slope*Partner: Graduation	-0.020	0.018	214.573	-1.101	0.272	-0.055	0.016
Slope*Actor: Change in job	-0.015	0.015	213.741	-1.010	0.313	-0.044	0.014

Table 55 (cont'd)

Slope*Partner: Change in job	0.014	0.015	204.945	0.924	0.357	-0.016	0.043
Slope*Actor: Moving	0.000	0.021	194.572	-0.019	0.985	-0.041	0.041
Slope*Partner: Moving	0.036	0.020	173.275	1.801	0.073	-0.003	0.075
Slope*Actor: Negative health event	0.026	0.017	217.497	1.460	0.146	-0.009	0.060
Slope*Partner: Negative health event	-0.024	0.016	179.040	-1.524	0.129	-0.055	0.007
Slope*Actor: Death of a close other	-0.002	0.015	189.501	-0.141	0.888	-0.032	0.028
Slope*Partner: Death of a close other	0.016	0.014	175.893	1.102	0.272	-0.013	0.045
Slope*Actor: Miscarriage	-0.012	0.047	191.715	-0.251	0.802	-0.105	0.081
Slope*Partner: Miscarriage	-0.047	0.043	154.707	-1.109	0.269	-0.132	0.037
Slope*Actor: Other	0.010	0.023	202.973	0.452	0.651	-0.035	0.055
Slope*Partner: Other	0.024	0.023	187.365	1.048	0.296	-0.022	0.070

Note. Significant effects bolded, $p < .05$

Table 56. A summary of which life events produced a (mal)adaptive response, organized by trait; CouPers sample.

Trait	Adaptive	Maladaptive
Agreeableness	Actor: miscarriage	Partner: death of a close other
Conscientiousness	Actor: miscarriage	
Extraversion		
Neuroticism		
Openness	Actor: miscarriage	

Note. Type of response (i.e., adaptive or maladaptive) based on Event*Slope interactions. "Adaptive" responses include steeper increases/stability in in all traits with the exception of neuroticism. "Maldaptive" responses include steeper decreases in all traits with the exception of neuroticism. Self-reported changes in black, partner-reported changes in red.

APPENDIX D: SUPPLEMENTARY GROWTH MIXTURE RESULTS AND TABLES

Results: Growth Mixture Models

To characterize changes in personality, I employed a variant of growth mixture modeling (GMM; Infurna & Luthar, 2016; Ram & Grimm, 2009). Growth mixture modeling combines latent growth models with mixture modeling to determine latent classes. This approach enabled me to model multiple latent classes characterizing trajectories of personality change within one sample. In other words, it allows for the possibility that one group of people might start relatively low on a trait (e.g., neuroticism) and then increase after an event. Likewise, another group might start relatively high on neuroticism and decrease after an event. Further, another group might start low and have relatively stable levels of neuroticism after an event happens. Permitting multiple growth trajectories is an advantage over other models that have been traditionally used to model longitudinal data (e.g., more general growth curve modeling) that assume the population under study changes in one homogenous way over time. I adopted this particular approach because it gives feedback about whether a certain percentage of the sample "grows" over time (i.e., experiences ostensibly positive personality change). All couples were included in the analyses. In order to ensure that various subgroups were allowed to vary in terms of their starting points and how they change over time (as well as avoid the over-estimation of resilience and growth sometimes implicated in fixed-effects approaches; Infurna & Jayawickreme, 2019; Infurna & Luthar, 2016), I allowed intercepts and slopes to vary randomly.

I used maximum likelihood estimation with robust standard errors in Mplus to account for missing data. I tested 1-4 class solutions for each personality trait; the fit indices for each of these models are reported in Supplemental Table 1. As mentioned in my proposal, I considered AIC, BIC, consistency/interpretability of classes, and entropy for model selection (Frankfurt et

al., 2016; Jung & Wickrama, 2008; Ram & Grimm, 2009; Smith & Ehlers, 2020). Entropy levels approaching 1 indicate appropriate model selection (Jung & Wickrama, 2007).

After identifying these latent classes, I used a multi-level logistic regression to predict membership in the "growth" class (if applicable). The multi-level component will account for the non-independence of couple members' change outcomes (Loeys et al., 2014). Each logistic regression included actor life events, partner life events, spousal support, spousal strain, a set of interaction variables (spousal support X actor life event, spousal support X partner life event, spousal strain X actor life event, spousal strain X partner life event) and a set of control variables (i.e., actor's age, gender, race/ethnicity, education, income, and relationship length). Life events were tested simultaneously in one model (rather than having a separate model for each life event). Modeling the main effects of support and strain (irrespective of life event occurrence) allowed me to estimate how much personality change is attributable to having a supportive (or strenuous) spouse. Importantly, interactions between support/strain and life events allow for a critical test of whether experiencing a life event in the presence of a supportive relationship engenders positive personality change/growth over time. Below, I report the results of each analysis, organized by personality trait. Additionally, as discussed in the dissertation proposal, I report results for a similar set of analyses where spousal support and spousal strain are positioned as outcome variables.

Agreeableness

Growth mixture model

The fit indices for each class solution for agreeableness are displayed in Table 57. I followed the same process of model selection for each trait. First, I examined the number of participants grouped into each latent class. Occasionally, the GMM would identify a class that

consisted of a very small subsection of the sample (e.g., Class 3 in the 4-class solution for agreeableness contained only 3.8% of the sample). In order to ensure that subgroups were large enough to be meaningful, I set a cut-off limit of 5% (i.e., class solutions which produced subgroups of <5% would be modified). After identifying these potentially problematic subgroups, I compared AIC/BIC, entropy, and interpretability of classes across subgroups. Ultimately, I pursued the 2-class solution for agreeableness, as the 3 and 4 class solutions each produced subclasses with < 5% of the sample, did not vary dramatically in fit from the 2-class solution, and produced similar subclasses (i.e., one set of participants which started relatively high in agreeableness and remained stable/increased very slightly over time and another set which started slightly lower in agreeableness and decreased slightly over time).

These classes were then recoded so that Class 1 represented a "resilient" or "growth" class (Class = 1), which saw slight gains in agreeableness over time (i=3.70, s=.007, p = .003), and a "non-resilient" class (Class =2), which saw slight decreases in agreeableness over time (i= 2.83, s=. -007, p < .001).

Multilevel logistic regression

This class membership was then used as the outcome variable in two multilevel logistic regressions, the first of which only included actor/ partner life events and control variables, and the second of which incorporated spousal support and strain.

Model 1: Actor/partner life events. As highlighted in Table 3, some life events (i.e., moving, having a child, or experiencing the loss of a child) were highly (or perfectly) correlated, indicating that partners always experienced these life events together. For these life events, only the actor effects were modeled. In addition to these effects, actor and partner effects for all other life events (i.e., new chronic illness, negative health changes, positive health changes, death of a

parent, new job, retirement, and unemployment), as well as a series of control variables (i.e., age, gender, race, education, wealth, and relationship length) were included as predictors of class membership.

Results of this analysis are reported in Table 58. As the "resilient" or "growth" class was coded as Class 1, this group served as the reference group. Therefore, significant negative bs indicate that experiencing a given life event is predictive of a participant being assigned to the "resilient" class. Significant positive bs indicate that experiencing a given life event is predictive of a participant being assigned to the "non-resilient" class. These bs were then exponentiated and converted to odds ratios (where negative odds ratios indicate a higher chance of being assigned to the "resilient" class).

Of the effects examined, two were predicative of being classified as "resilient" in agreeableness: the actor effect of a parent's death (b= -.18, p = .003) and the partner effect of unemployment (b= -.30, p = .007). One effect was predictive of being classified as "non-resilient" in agreeableness: the actor effect of getting a new job (b= .21, p < .001). A handful of control variables were also significant; women and those who had been married for longer were more likely to be classified as "resilient" (b= -.58, p < .001; b= -.07, p = .024, respectively). Those with more education were more likely to be classified as "non-resilient" (b= .05, p < .001).

Model 2: Actor/partner life events and spousal support/strain. Spousal support and spousal strain were then entered as predictors in the model described above. In addition, support and strain were included as interaction variables with life events that had predicted class membership (i.e., Actor: Parent died*Support, Actor: New job*Support. Partner: Unemployment*Support, Actor: Parent died*Strain, Actor: New job*Strain, Partner:

Unemployment*Strain). The results of this model are reported in Table 59. Of these, only the main effect of spousal support was significant; those who reported higher spousal support were more likely to be classified as "non-resilient" (b= .56, p < .001).

Conscientiousness

Growth mixture model

The fit indices for each class solution for conscientiousness are displayed in Table 57. As was the case when examining agreeableness, the 3 and 4 class solutions each included subclasses that included < 5% of the sample. Interpretability of the classes suggested a 3-class solution (i.e., a group that starts low in conscientiousness and increases, another that starts higher and decreases, and a third that starts highest in conscientiousness and remains stable). However, the group that declined in conscientiousness only consisted of 4.5% of the sample. Again, the fit indices did not vary dramatically between the classes (especially between the 2 and 3 class solutions). Ultimately, I chose to pursue a 2-class solution.

These classes were then recoded so that Class 1 represented a "resilient" or "growth" class (Class = 1), which remained stable in conscientiousness over time (i=3.49, s=.001, p = .101), and a "non-resilient" class (Class =2), which saw slight decreases in conscientiousness over time (i= 2.92, s=.-028, p < .001).

Multilevel logistic regression

Model 1: Actor/partner life events. I repeated the regression procedure outlined in above section (i.e., agreeableness). The results of this model are presented in Table 60. Of the effects examined, one predicative of being classified as "resilient" in conscientiousness: the actor effect of a new job (b= -.30, p < .001). Three effects were predictive of being classified as "non-resilient" in conscientiousness: the actor effect of a new chronic illness (b= .21, p < .001), the

partner effect of a new chronic illness (b= .20, p < .001), and the actor effect of retirement (b= .12, p < .04). Some control variables were also significant; those with more education and wealth were more likely to be classified as "resilient" in conscientiousness (both b= -.13, p < .001). Men and older participants were more likely to be classified as "non-resilient" (both b= .02, p < .001).

Model 2: Actor/partner life events and spousal support/strain. As described above, spousal support, spousal strain, and interactions between any significant life events and support/strain were entered as predictors into the model. The results of this model are reported in Table 61. Of these, one main effect was significant; those with more spousal support were more likely to be classified as "resilient" (b= .52, p < .001). Additionally, there was an interaction of support and an actor's chronic illness such that those who experienced the onset of a new illness and had higher support were more likely to be classified as "non-resilient" (although this effect was marginal, b= .24, p = .04).

Extraversion

Growth mixture model

The fit indices for each class solution for extraversion are displayed in Table 57. Here, the 3 and 4 class solutions each produced subclasses that contained less than 1% of the sample. The AIC and BIC were not dramatically different between the 2 class and the 3 and 4 class solutions, and entropy was highest for the 2-class solution. Due to the small subclass sizes of the larger models and the fit indices, I ultimately pursued the 2-class solution. This resulted in one subclass (coded as Class 1, the "resilient" class) which started relatively high in extraversion and remained stable (i= 3.62, s=-.002, p = .125) and another subclass (coded as Class 2, the "non-resilient" class) which started at approximately the same level of extraversion, but declined relatively steeply (i= 3.20, s=-.109, p = .002).

Multilevel logistic regression

Model 1: Actor/partner life events. I repeated the regression procedure outlined in above sections. The results of this model are reported in Table 62. Of the effects examined, none were predicative of being classified as "resilient" in extraversion. Three effects were predictive of being classified as "non-resilient" in extraversion: the actor effect of a new chronic illness (b= .41, p = .019), the partner effect of a new chronic illness (b= .48, p = .007), and the actor effect of a positive health change (b= .44, p = .032). Two control variables were also significant; those with more education were more likely to be classified as "resilient" in extraversion (b= -.10, p < .001). Those who had been in longer relationships were more likely to be classified as "non-resilient" (although this effect was marginal, b= .21, p = .049).

Model 2: Actor/partner life events and spousal support/strain. I repeated the support and strain analyses as described in the previous sections. The results of this model are reported in Table 63. Of these, one main was effect significant; those with more spousal support were more likely to be classified as "resilient" (b= -.92, p < .001). Additionally, there was an interaction of support and an actor's chronic illness such that those who experienced the onset of a new illness and had higher support were more likely to be classified as "non-resilient" (although this effect was marginal, b= .67, p = .04).

Neuroticism

Growth mixture model

The fit indices for each class solution for neuroticism are displayed in Table 57. As with other traits, the 3 and 4 class solutions contained produced subclasses that contained < 5% of the sample. When examining interpretability of classes, the 3-class solution identified a subclass that had a higher intercept than the other 2 classes (i.e., 3.03 vs 1.93 and 2.47). The AIC, BIC, and

entropy also suggested that the 3-class solution was a better fit. However, this class contained <4% of the sample. In order to maintain the more accurate estimates afforded by the 3-class solution, I maintained this solution and modified to class membership so that the participants in this rare class would be reassigned to one of the other two groups (based on their next highest probability of membership). This resulted in two subgroups. The first (coded as Class 1, the "resilient" class) started slightly lower in neuroticism and remained stable (*i*= 1.92, *s*=-.007, *p* = .267) and another subclass (coded as Class 2, the "non-resilient" class) which started slightly higher in neuroticism and increased slightly over time (*i*= 2.47, *s*= .033 *p* = .007).

Multilevel logistic regression

Model 1: Actor/partner life events. I repeated the regression procedure outlined in above sections. The results of this model are reported in Table 64. Of the effects examined, two were predicative of being classified as "resilient" in neuroticism: the actor effect of a new job (*b*= -.18, *p* = .035) and the partner effect of retirement (*b*= -.21, *p* = .005). One effect was predictive of being classified as "non-resilient" in neuroticism: the actor effect of a new chronic illness (*b*= .45, *p* < .001). Five control variables were also significant; older people (*b*= -.03), women (*b*= -.19), people of color (*b*= -.47), those with more education (*b*= -.07), and those with more wealth (*b*= -.11) were all more likely to be classified as "resilient" in neuroticism (all *p*s < .001).

Model 2: Actor/partner life events and spousal support/strain. I repeated the support and strain analyses as described in the previous sections. The results of this model are reported in Table 65. Of these, one main was effect significant; those with more spousal support were more likely to be classified as "resilient" (*b*= -.37, *p* = .017). No interactions were significant.

Openness

Growth mixture model

When attempting to find subclasses of change for openness, 2, 3, and 4 class solutions each generated subclasses with ≤ 1% of the sample. Because, once again, model fit did not vary dramatically (although entropy was higher for smaller class solutions), I ultimately decided a 1-class solution best fit this data. Of course, without distinct classes to predict, I could not complete the logistic regression.

Table 57. Fit indices for 1-4 class solutions of Big 5 personality traits; HRS sample.

Trait	Class Solution	AIC	BIC	Entropy	N per Class (% of sample)
Agreeableness	1	37128.242	37195.923	NA	13630 (100%)
	2	35279.532	35369.772	0.739	2899 (21.3%)
					10731(78.7%)
	3	34589.901	34702.701	0.733	2798 (20.5%)
					507 (3.7%)
					10325 (75.8%)
	4	33641.722	33777.082	0.757	615 (4.5%)
					3595 (26.4%)
					523 (3.8%)
					8897 (65.3%)
Conscientiousness	1	36198.007	36265.691	NA	13636 (100%)
	2	35172.325	35262.571	0.656	2315 (17.0%)
					11321 (83.0%)
	3	34481.792	34594.599	0.686	2089 (15.3%)
					610 (4.5%)
					10946 (80.3%)
	4	34251.173	34386.541	0.731	95 (.01%)
					2544 (18.7%)
					502 (3.7%)
					10495 (77.0%)
Extraversion	1	43032.065	43099.751	NA	13639 (100%)
	2	42658.059	42748.307	0.865	195 (1.4%)
					13444 (98.6%)
	3	42044.575	42109.717	0.676	3031 (22.2%)
					193 (1.4%)
					10415 (76.3%)
	4	41883.04	42018.412	0.651	297 (2.2%)
					2743 (20.1%)
					224 (1.6%)
					10375 (76.1%)
Neuroticism	1	49873.922	49941.595	NA	13619 (100%)
	2	49510.5	49600.731	0.655	12488 (91.7%)
					1131 (8.3%)
	3	49360.011	49472.799	0.662	12288 (90.2%)

Table 57 (cont'd)					531 (3.9%)
					800 (5.9%)
	4	49366.008	49501.354	0.732	12287 (90.2%)
					0 (0%)
					544 (4.0%)
					788 (5.8%)
Openness	1	43503.456	43571.132	NA	13623 (100%)
	2	43265.607	43355.841	0.915	94 (.07%)
					13529 (99.3%)
	3	43079.05	43191.842	0.867	13368 (98.1%)
					132 (1.0%)
					123 (0.9%)
	4	43040.511	43175.862	0.886	113 (0.8%)
					132 (1.0%)
					15 (0.1%)
					13363 (98.1%)

Table 58. Multilevel logistic regression using actor and partner life events to predict membership in a "non-resilient" class for agreeableness; HRS sample.

	b	Exponen-tiated b	Odds of class membership (%)	LB	UB	SE	p
Intercept	0.730	-	-	0.098	1.361	0.322	0.024
Moving	-0.022	0.978	-2.176%	-0.122	0.079	0.051	0.672
Birth of child	-0.015	0.985	-1.489%	-0.226	0.196	0.108	0.890
Death of child	0.106	1.112	11.182%	-0.059	0.271	0.084	0.207
Actor: New chronic illness	-0.101	0.904	-9.607%	-0.196	-0.005	0.049	0.039
Partner: New chronic illness	0.002	1.002	0.200%	-0.092	0.097	0.048	0.960
Actor: Negative health change	0.161	1.175	17.468%	-0.069	0.390	0.117	0.171
Partner: Negative health change	0.022	1.022	2.224%	-0.222	0.267	0.125	0.859
Actor: Positive health change	-0.059	0.943	-5.729%	-0.203	0.085	0.074	0.422
Partner: Positive health change	0.094	1.099	9.856%	-0.056	0.245	0.077	0.220
Actor: Parent died	-0.180	0.835	**-16.473%**	-0.298	-0.062	0.060	**0.003**
Partner: Parent died	-0.029	0.971	-2.858%	-0.143	0.086	0.059	0.626
Actor: New job	0.210	1.234	**23.368%**	0.097	0.324	0.058	**<.001**
Partner: New job	-0.044	0.957	-4.305%	-0.155	0.067	0.057	0.434
Actor: Retired	0.030	1.030	3.045%	-0.071	0.130	0.051	0.564
Partner: Retired	0.005	1.005	0.501%	-0.092	0.102	0.049	0.917
Actor: Unemployment	0.061	1.063	6.290%	-0.167	0.288	0.116	0.603
Partner: Unemployment	-0.300	0.741	**-25.918%**	-0.516	-0.084	0.110	**0.007**
Age	0.002	1.002	0.200%	-0.004	0.008	0.003	0.551
Gender	-0.584	0.558	**-44.234%**	-0.631	-0.537	0.024	**0.000**
Person of color	0.044	1.045	4.498%	-0.073	0.162	0.060	0.458
Education	0.050	1.051	**5.127%**	0.033	0.066	0.009	**<.001**
Wealth	0.002	1.002	0.200%	-0.031	0.035	0.017	0.896

Table 58 (cont'd)

Length of marriage	-0.069	0.933	**-6.667%**	-0.129	-0.009	0.031	**0.024**

Note. "Resilient" class (i.e., those who increased in agreeableness) used as reference group. Negative odds of class membership indicate increased odds of class membership in this group.

Table 59. Multilevel logistic regression using actor and partner life events and spousal support and strain to predict membership in a "non-resilient" class for agreeableness; HRS sample.

	b	Exponen-tiated b	Odds of class membership (%)	LB	UB	SE	p
Intercept	0.713	-	-	-0.119	1.545	0.425	0.093
Moving	0.013	1.013	1.308%	-0.104	0.131	0.060	0.822
Birth of child	-0.061	0.941	-5.918%	-0.342	0.220	0.143	0.670
Death of child	0.188	1.207	20.683%	-0.002	0.378	0.097	0.052
Actor: New chronic illness	-0.022	0.978	-2.176%	-0.139	0.096	0.060	0.716
Partner: New chronic illness	0.070	1.073	7.251%	-0.045	0.186	0.059	0.231
Actor: Negative health change	0.242	1.274	27.379%	-0.020	0.504	0.134	0.070
Partner: Negative health change	-0.028	0.972	-2.761%	-0.320	0.265	0.149	0.852
Actor: Positive health change	0.000	1.000	0.000%	-0.175	0.176	0.089	0.996
Partner: Positive health change	0.174	1.190	19.006%	-0.011	0.360	0.095	0.065
Actor: Parent died	-0.177	0.838	**-16.222%**	-0.329	-0.024	0.078	**0.023**
Partner: Parent died	-0.029	0.971	-2.858%	-0.175	0.118	0.075	0.701
Actor: New job	0.217	1.242	**24.234%**	0.069	0.365	0.075	**0.004**
Partner: New job	-0.047	0.954	-4.591%	-0.192	0.097	0.074	0.520
Actor: Retired	0.029	1.029	2.942%	-0.094	0.153	0.063	0.641
Partner: Retired	0.039	1.040	3.977%	-0.079	0.157	0.060	0.517
Actor: Unemployment	0.207	1.230	22.998%	-0.117	0.531	0.165	0.210
Partner: Unemployment	-0.290	0.748	**-25.174%**	-0.593	0.013	0.155	**0.060**
Age	0.004	1.004	0.401%	-0.003	0.012	0.004	0.259
Gender	-0.661	0.516	**-48.367%**	-0.722	-0.600	0.031	**0.000**
Person of color	0.000	1.000	-0.010%	-0.156	0.156	0.080	0.999
Education	0.042	1.043	**4.289%**	0.021	0.063	0.011	**<.001**
Wealth	-0.024	0.976	-2.371%	-0.065	0.018	0.021	0.264
Length of marriage	-0.045	0.956	-4.400%	-0.122	0.032	0.039	0.250
Spousal support	0.557	1.745	**74.543%**	0.430	0.684	0.065	**0.000**
Spousal strain	-0.027	0.973	-2.664%	-0.145	0.090	0.060	0.646

Table 59 (cont'd)

Actor: Parent died*Support	-0.141	0.868	-13.151%	-0.394	0.111	0.129	0.273
Actor: New job*Support	-0.022	0.978	-2.176%	-0.279	0.235	0.131	0.867
Partner: Unemployment*Support	-0.230	0.795	-20.547%	-0.774	0.315	0.278	0.408
Actor: Parent died*Strain	-0.057	0.945	-5.541%	-0.307	0.193	0.128	0.655
Actor: New job*Strain	0.151	1.163	16.300%	-0.093	0.395	0.124	0.224
Partner: Unemployment*Strain	0.034	1.035	3.458%	-0.473	0.541	0.259	0.896

Note. "Resilient" class (i.e., those who increased in agreeableness) used as reference group. Negative odds of class membership indicate increased odds of class membership in this group.

Table 60. Multilevel logistic regression using actor and partner life events to predict membership in a "non-resilient" class for conscientiousness; HRS sample.

	b	Exponen-tiated b	Odds of class membership (%)	LB	UB	SE	p
Intercept	-0.440	-	-	-1.092	0.213	0.333	0.187
Moving	-0.020	0.980	-1.980%	-0.128	0.089	0.055	0.722
Birth of child	0.008	1.008	0.803%	-0.210	0.227	0.112	0.942
Death of child	0.088	1.092	9.199%	-0.078	0.254	0.085	0.298
Actor: New chronic illness	0.214	1.239	**23.862%**	0.107	0.320	0.054	**<.001**
Partner: New chronic illness	0.202	1.224	**22.385%**	0.096	0.307	0.054	**<.001**
Actor: Negative health change	0.061	1.063	6.290%	-0.207	0.328	0.137	0.657
Partner: Negative health change	-0.069	0.933	-6.667%	-0.328	0.191	0.132	0.603
Actor: Positive health change	0.001	1.001	0.100%	-0.156	0.157	0.080	0.995
Partner: Positive health change	-0.017	0.983	-1.686%	-0.176	0.141	0.081	0.829
Actor: Parent died	-0.056	0.946	-5.446%	-0.192	0.081	0.070	0.424
Partner: Parent died	-0.073	0.930	-7.040%	-0.204	0.059	0.067	0.278
Actor: New job	-0.301	0.740	**-25.992%**	-0.431	-0.171	0.066	**<.001**
Partner: New job	0.019	1.019	1.918%	-0.105	0.144	0.064	0.763
Actor: Retired	0.116	1.123	**12.300%**	0.006	0.226	0.056	**0.038**
Partner: Retired	0.031	1.031	3.149%	-0.077	0.139	0.055	0.572
Actor: Unemployment	0.102	1.107	10.738%	-0.155	0.359	0.131	0.437
Partner: Unemployment	-0.012	0.988	-1.193%	-0.269	0.245	0.131	0.928
Age	0.016	1.016	**1.613%**	0.009	0.023	0.003	**<.001**
Gender	0.216	1.241	**24.110%**	0.165	0.267	0.026	**<.001**
Person of color	0.030	1.030	3.045%	-0.098	0.159	0.066	0.645

Table 60 (cont'd)

Education	-0.088	0.916	**-8.424%**	-0.105	-0.071	0.009	**0.000**
Wealth	-0.126	0.882	**-11.839%**	-0.159	-0.094	0.016	**<.001**
Length of marriage	0.054	1.055	5.548%	-0.011	0.118	0.033	0.102

Note. "Resilient" class (i.e., those who remained stable in conscientiousness) used as reference group. Negative odds of class membership indicate increased odds of class membership in this group.

Table 61. Multilevel logistic regression using actor and partner life events and spousal support and strain to predict membership in a "non-resilient" class for conscientiousness; HRS sample.

	b	Exponen-tiated b	Odds of class membership (%)	LB	UB	SE	p
Intercept	-0.384	-	-	-1.278	0.509	0.456	0.399
Moving	-0.039	0.962	-3.825%	-0.167	0.089	0.065	0.550
Birth of child	0.018	1.018	1.816%	-0.271	0.306	0.147	0.905
Death of child	0.081	1.084	8.437%	-0.109	0.271	0.097	0.406
Actor: New chronic illness	0.143	1.154	**15.373%**	0.013	0.273	0.066	**0.031**
Partner: New chronic illness	0.186	1.204	**20.442%**	0.058	0.314	0.065	**0.004**
Actor: Negative health change	0.032	1.033	3.252%	-0.270	0.334	0.154	0.838
Partner: Negative health change	-0.114	0.892	-10.774%	-0.409	0.180	0.150	0.447
Actor: Positive health change	0.042	1.043	4.289%	-0.143	0.227	0.094	0.655
Partner: Positive health change	-0.039	0.962	-3.825%	-0.226	0.149	0.096	0.687
Actor: Parent died	-0.038	0.963	-3.729%	-0.211	0.134	0.088	0.664
Partner: Parent died	-0.065	0.937	-6.293%	-0.229	0.100	0.084	0.440
Actor: New job	-0.322	0.725	**-27.530%**	-0.488	-0.156	0.085	**<.001**
Partner: New job	0.002	1.002	0.200%	-0.157	0.162	0.081	0.978
Actor: Retired	0.159	1.172	**17.234%**	0.026	0.293	0.068	**0.019**
Partner: Retired	0.028	1.028	2.840%	-0.103	0.160	0.067	0.673
Actor: Unemployment	0.102	1.107	10.738%	-0.243	0.448	0.176	0.562
Partner: Unemployment	-0.210	0.811	-18.942%	-0.568	0.148	0.183	0.251
Age	0.017	1.017	**1.715%**	0.008	0.025	0.004	**<.001**
Gender	0.288	1.334	**33.376%**	0.224	0.351	0.033	**0.000**
Person of color	-0.019	0.981	-1.882%	-0.186	0.148	0.085	0.826
Education	-0.082	0.921	**-7.873%**	-0.103	-0.061	0.011	**<.001**
Wealth	-0.124	0.883	**-11.662%**	-0.167	-0.082	0.022	**<.001**

Table 61 (cont'd)

Length of marriage	0.031	1.031	3.149%	-0.053	0.115	0.043	0.469
Spousal support	-0.519	0.595	**-40.488%**	-0.759	-0.279	0.123	**<.001**
Spousal strain	0.200	1.221	22.140%	-0.032	0.432	0.119	0.092
Actor: New chronic illness*Support	0.237	1.267	**26.744%**	0.011	0.463	0.115	**0.040**
Partner: New chronic illness*Support	0.019	1.019	1.918%	-0.206	0.244	0.115	0.867
Actor: New job*Support	-0.117	0.890	-11.041%	-0.391	0.156	0.140	0.401
Actor: Retired*Support	0.028	1.028	2.840%	-0.194	0.250	0.113	0.805
Actor: New chronic illness*Strain	0.073	1.076	7.573%	-0.138	0.285	0.108	0.497
Partner: New chronic illness*Strain	-0.061	0.941	-5.918%	-0.270	0.149	0.107	0.570
Actor: New job*Strain	-0.179	0.836	-16.389%	-0.437	0.078	0.132	0.173
Actor: Retired*Strain	-0.070	0.932	-6.761%	-0.280	0.140	0.107	0.515

Note. "Resilient" class (i.e., those who remained stable in conscientiousness) used as reference group. Negative odds of class membership indicate increased odds of class membership in this group.

Table 62. Multilevel logistic regression using actor and partner life events to predict membership in a "non-resilient" class for extraversion; HRS sample.

	b	Exponen-tiated b	Odds of class membership (%)	LB	UB	SE	p
Intercept	-4.548	-	-	-6.408	-2.688	0.949	<.001
Moving	0.066	1.068	6.823%	-0.265	0.396	0.169	0.697
Birth of child	0.098	1.103	10.296%	-0.496	0.692	0.303	0.746
Death of child	0.133	1.142	14.225%	-0.355	0.621	0.249	0.592
Actor: New chronic illness	0.412	1.510	**50.983%**	0.066	0.758	0.176	**0.019**
Partner: New chronic illness	0.476	1.610	**60.962%**	0.133	0.819	0.175	**0.007**
Actor: Positive health change	0.439	1.551	**55.116%**	0.038	0.839	0.204	**0.032**
Partner: Positive health change	0.092	1.096	9.636%	-0.366	0.550	0.234	0.695
Actor: Parent died	-0.237	0.789	-21.101%	-0.682	0.208	0.227	0.296
Partner: Parent died	0.225	1.252	25.232%	-0.167	0.617	0.200	0.260
Actor: New job	-0.019	0.981	-1.882%	-0.413	0.376	0.201	0.926
Partner: New job	0.021	1.021	2.122%	-0.360	0.402	0.194	0.912
Actor: Retired	0.196	1.217	21.653%	-0.143	0.534	0.173	0.257
Partner: Retired	-0.131	0.877	-12.278%	-0.463	0.201	0.169	0.440
Actor: Unemployment	-0.075	0.928	-7.226%	-0.860	0.711	0.401	0.852
Partner: Unemployment	0.113	1.120	11.963%	-0.626	0.852	0.377	0.764
Age	0.013	1.013	1.308%	-0.007	0.034	0.010	0.196
Gender	0.067	1.069	6.930%	-0.095	0.229	0.083	0.416
Person of color	0.296	1.344	34.447%	-0.080	0.672	0.192	0.123
Education	-0.098	0.907	**-9.335%**	-0.147	-0.048	0.025	**<.001**
Wealth	-0.075	0.928	-7.226%	-0.175	0.026	0.051	0.146
Length of marriage	0.205	1.228	**22.753%**	0.001	0.410	0.104	**0.049**

Note. "Resilient" class (i.e., those who remained stable in extraversion) used as reference group. Negative odds of class membership indicate increased odds of class membership in this group. Negative health change excluded as a life event for quasi-complete separation.

Table 63. Multilevel logistic regression using actor and partner life events and spousal support and strain to predict membership in a "non-resilient" class for conscientiousness; HRS sample.

	b	Exponen-tiated b	Odds of class membership (%)	LB	UB	SE	p
Intercept	-4.964	-	-	-1.278	0.509	0.456	0.399
Moving	-0.034	0.967	-3.343%	-0.167	0.089	0.065	0.550
Birth of child	0.181	1.198	19.842%	-0.271	0.306	0.147	0.905
Death of child	0.239	1.270	26.998%	-0.109	0.271	0.097	0.406
Actor: New chronic illness	**0.486**	1.626	**62.580%**	0.013	0.273	0.066	**0.031**
Partner: New chronic illness	**0.495**	1.640	**64.050%**	0.058	0.314	0.065	**0.004**
Actor: Positive health change	0.428	1.534	53.419%	-0.143	0.227	0.094	0.655
Partner: Positive health change	-0.333	0.717	-28.323%	-0.226	0.149	0.096	0.687
Actor: Parent died	-0.428	0.652	-34.819%	-0.211	0.134	0.088	0.664
Partner: Parent died	0.392	1.480	47.994%	-0.229	0.100	0.084	0.440
Actor: New job	-0.001	0.999	**-0.100%**	-0.488	-0.156	0.085	**<.001**
Partner: New job	0.152	1.164	16.416%	-0.157	0.162	0.081	0.978
Actor: Retired	0.213	1.237	**23.738%**	0.026	0.293	0.068	**0.019**
Partner: Retired	-0.168	0.845	-15.465%	-0.103	0.160	0.067	0.673
Actor: Unemployment	0.254	1.289	28.917%	-0.243	0.448	0.176	0.562
Partner: Unemployment	0.070	1.073	7.251%	-0.568	0.148	0.183	0.251
Age	0.024	1.024	**2.429%**	0.008	0.025	0.004	**<.001**
Gender	0.049	1.050	**5.022%**	0.224	0.351	0.033	**0.000**
Person of color	0.321	1.379	37.851%	-0.186	0.148	0.085	0.826
Education	-0.081	0.922	**-7.781%**	-0.103	-0.061	0.011	**<.001**
Wealth	-0.092	0.912	**-8.789%**	-0.167	-0.082	0.022	**<.001**
Length of marriage	0.126	1.134	13.428%	-0.053	0.115	0.043	0.469
Spousal support	-0.916	0.400	**-59.988%**	-0.759	-0.279	0.123	**<.001**
Spousal strain	-0.022	0.978	-2.176%	-0.032	0.432	0.119	0.092
Actor: New chronic illness*Support	0.669	1.952	**95.228%**	0.011	0.463	0.115	**0.040**

Table 63 (cont'd)

Partner: New chronic illness*Support	0.406	1.501	50.080%	-0.206	0.244	0.115	0.867
Actor: Positive health change*Support	0.760	2.138	113.828%	-0.391	0.156	0.140	0.401
Actor: New chronic illness*Strain	0.181	1.198	19.842%	-0.194	0.250	0.113	0.805
Partner: New chronic illness*Strain	-0.133	0.875	-12.453%	-0.138	0.285	0.108	0.497
Partner: Positive health change*Strain	-0.167	0.846	-15.380%	-0.270	0.149	0.107	0.570

Note. "Resilient" class (i.e., those who remained stable in extraversion) used as reference group. Negative odds of class membership indicate increased odds of class membership in this group. Negative health change excluded as a life event for quasi-complete separation.

Table 64. Multilevel logistic regression using actor and partner life events to predict membership in a "non-resilient" class for neuroticism; HRS sample.

	b	Exponen-tiated b	Odds of class membership (%)	LB	UB	SE	p
Intercept	1.031	-	-	0.160	1.903	0.445	0.020
Moving	-0.020	0.980	-1.980%	-0.169	0.129	0.076	0.794
Birth of child	-0.236	0.790	-21.022%	-0.567	0.096	0.169	0.163
Death of child	-0.202	0.817	-18.291%	-0.446	0.042	0.125	0.105
Actor: New chronic illness	0.446	1.562	**56.205%**	0.293	0.599	0.078	**<.001**
Partner: New chronic illness	0.069	1.071	7.144%	-0.077	0.215	0.075	0.354
Actor: Negative health change	0.090	1.094	9.417%	-0.319	0.500	0.209	0.666
Partner: Negative health change	0.101	1.106	10.628%	-0.274	0.475	0.191	0.598
Actor: Positive health change	0.173	1.189	18.887%	-0.033	0.379	0.105	0.099
Partner: Positive health change	-0.035	0.966	-3.439%	-0.252	0.183	0.111	0.755
Actor: Parent died	-0.048	0.953	-4.687%	-0.219	0.123	0.087	0.583
Partner: Parent died	-0.038	0.963	-3.729%	-0.208	0.131	0.087	0.659
Actor: New job	-0.177	0.838	**-16.222%**	-0.342	-0.013	0.084	**0.035**
Partner: New job	-0.005	0.995	-0.499%	-0.168	0.158	0.083	0.954
Actor: Retired	0.087	1.091	9.090%	-0.059	0.233	0.074	0.242
Partner: Retired	-0.214	0.807	**-19.265%**	-0.364	-0.065	0.076	**0.005**
Actor: Unemployment	0.114	1.121	12.075%	-0.206	0.433	0.163	0.486
Partner: Unemployment	0.221	1.247	24.732%	-0.086	0.528	0.156	0.158
Age	-0.028	0.972	**-2.761%**	-0.037	-0.018	0.005	**<.001**
Gender	-0.185	0.831	**-16.890%**	-0.255	-0.115	0.036	**<.001**

Table 64 (cont'd)

Person of color	-0.473	0.623	**-37.687%**	-0.660	-0.285	0.096	**<.001**
Education	-0.071	0.931	**-6.854%**	-0.094	-0.047	0.012	**<.001**
Wealth	-0.109	0.897	**-10.327%**	-0.151	-0.066	0.022	**<.001**
Length of marriage	0.036	1.037	3.666%	-0.051	0.124	0.045	0.416

Note. "Resilient" class (i.e., those who remained stable in neuroticism) used as reference group. Negative odds of class membership indicate increased odds of class membership in this group.

Table 65. Multilevel logistic regression using actor and partner life events and spousal support and strain to predict membership in a "non-resilient" class for neuroticism; HRS sample.

	b	Exponen-tiated b	Odds of class membership (%)	LB	UB	SE	p
Intercept	0.920	-	-	-0.321	2.160	0.633	0.146
Moving	-0.032	0.969	-3.149%	-0.216	0.152	0.094	0.736
Birth of child	-0.131	0.877	-12.278%	-0.577	0.316	0.228	0.566
Death of child	**-0.302**	0.739	**-26.066%**	-0.601	-0.004	0.152	**0.047**
Actor: New chronic illness	**0.252**	1.287	**28.660%**	0.056	0.449	0.100	**0.012**
Partner: New chronic illness	0.041	1.042	4.185%	-0.147	0.230	0.096	0.667
Actor: Negative health change	-0.034	0.967	-3.343%	-0.487	0.419	0.231	0.883
Partner: Negative health change	0.136	1.146	14.568%	-0.293	0.564	0.219	0.535
Actor: Positive health change	0.213	1.237	23.738%	-0.042	0.468	0.130	0.102
Partner: Positive health change	-0.001	0.999	-0.100%	-0.260	0.258	0.132	0.994
Actor: Parent died	-0.046	0.955	-4.496%	-0.277	0.185	0.118	0.697
Partner: Parent died	-0.020	0.980	-1.980%	-0.251	0.210	0.118	0.863
Actor: New job	**-0.314**	0.731	**-26.948%**	-0.554	-0.073	0.123	**0.011**
Partner: New job	-0.045	0.956	-4.400%	-0.268	0.178	0.114	0.694
Actor: Retired	0.176	1.192	19.244%	-0.003	0.356	0.092	0.055
Partner: Retired	**-0.219**	0.803	**-19.668%**	-0.416	-0.021	0.101	**0.030**
Actor: Unemployment	-0.032	0.969	-3.149%	-0.528	0.465	0.253	0.901
Partner: Unemployment	0.368	1.445	44.484%	-0.048	0.784	0.212	0.083
Age	**-0.026**	0.974	**-2.566%**	-0.038	-0.013	0.007	**<.001**
Gender	**-0.118**	0.889	-11.130%	-0.210	-0.025	0.047	**0.013**
Person of color	**-0.534**	0.586	-41.374%	-0.788	-0.281	0.129	**<.001**
Education	**-0.095**	0.909	-9.063%	-0.126	-0.063	0.016	**<.001**
Wealth	**-0.092**	0.912	-8.789%	-0.152	-0.033	0.030	**0.002**

Table 65 (cont'd)

Length of marriage	0.099	1.104	10.407%	-0.026	0.224	0.064	0.122
Spousal support	**-0.370**	0.691	**-30.927%**	-0.674	-0.065	0.155	**0.017**
Spousal strain	0.228	1.256	25.609%	-0.072	0.527	0.153	0.137
Actor: New chronic illness*Support	-0.083	0.920	-7.965%	-0.401	0.235	0.162	0.607
Actor: New job*Support	-0.079	0.924	-7.596%	-0.415	0.257	0.172	0.644
Partner: Retired*Support	0.303	1.354	35.391%	-0.001	0.606	0.155	0.051
Actor: New chronic illness*Strain	-0.103	0.902	-9.787%	-0.424	0.218	0.164	0.529
Actor: New job*Strain	0.163	1.177	17.704%	-0.203	0.529	0.187	0.384
Partner: Retired*Strain	0.289	1.335	33.509%	-0.017	0.596	0.156	0.064

Note. "Resilient" class (i.e., those who remained stable in neuroticism) used as reference group. Negative odds of class membership indicate increased odds of class membership in this group.