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## 1. Text

CAUTION: If you do decide to use information contained here in a paper, please make sure that you acknowledge that you have used this program. Also should you decide to copy the exact text below, you would need to put quotes around that material to avoid plagiarism. Although great effort has been undertaken to ensure the accuracy of results, no complete guarantee can be about their accuracy. It is your responsibility to check the results and text for accuracy. If you do find an error, please report it to David A. Kenny.

## Summary of APIM Mediation Results

The focus of this study is the investigation of the mediation of effect of Other Positivity on Satisfaction by Tension within the Actor-Partner Interdependence model. All three variables are mixed variables and so the relationship between any two variables includes actor and partner effects. The variable names in the dataset are as follows: Other Positivity for Wife is OtherPos_W, Other Positivity for Husband is OtherPos_H, Satisfaction for Wife is Satisfaction_W, Satisfaction for Husband is Satisfaction_H, Tension for Wife is Tension_W, and Tension for Husband is Tension_H. The total number of dyads is 148, and there are no missing data. The dyad members are treated as if they were indistinguishable. The test of distinguishability which includes six equal actor and partner effects across members, three equal means, and three equal variances is not statistically significant (chi-square (12) = $17.29, \mathrm{p}=.139$ ), with an RMSEA of 0.055 . The structural equation models are estimated using the program lavaan. The standard errors and confidence intervals for simple, direct, and total effects uses those based on normal theory. However, the standard errors and confidence intervals for the simple and total indirect effects use the Monte Carlo method, also called the parametric bootstrap, with 40000 trials. The descriptive statistics are in Table 1.

For the estimates below to be valid, it must be assumed that there is no measurement error in Other Positivity and Tension. Additionally, it must be assumed that there are no unmeasured common causes (i.e., confounders) between Other Positivity and Tension, between Other Positivity and Satisfaction, and between Tension and Satisfaction. It must be assumed that Satisfaction does not cause Other Positivity or Tension and that Tension does not cause Other Positivity. Finally, it must be assumed that Other Positivity and Tension do not interact to cause Satisfaction.

The test of whether Other Positivity interacts with Tension can be conducted by forming four product terms: Actor for Other Positivity by Actor for Tension, Actor for Other Positivity by Partner for Tension, Partner for Other Positivity by Actor for Tension, and Partner for Other Positivity by Partner for Tension. The combined test these four moderation effects involves fitting two models, one with interaction effects and one without those effects. This combined test of interaction is statistically significant (chi-square (4) = $31.29, \mathrm{p}$ < .001), with an RMSEA of 0.215. Because the RMSEA is greater than .10 and the chi square is statistically significant, there is sufficient evidence to believe that there is an interaction and a violation of standard linear mediation model.

For the combined test the four mediation indirect effects involves fitting two models, one with four indirect effects and one without those effects. This combined test of mediation
is statistically significant (chi-square (3) = 45.66, p < .001), with an RMSEA of 0.310. (The test has three degrees of freedom because if any of three indirect effect are zero, the fourth must also be zero.) Because the RMSEA is greater than .10 and the chi square is statistically significant, there is sufficient evidence to believe that there is mediation.

Table 2 presents the effects in the mediational model. The multiple correlation for the Tension equations is . 415 and the multiple correlation for the Satisfaction equations is .696. First considered are the effects of Other Positivity on Tension. The actor effect equals -0.445 (p < . 001) with a standardized effect of -.323. The partner effect equals -0.271 (p < .001) with a standardized effect of -.196. The ratio of the partner to the actor effect or $k$ is 0.609 with a confidence interval from 0.426 to 0.704 . It can be concluded that the model is in between the actor-only ( $k=0$ ) and the couple ( $k=1$ ) models. Next considered are the effects of Tension on Satisfaction. The actor effect equals -0.302 (p < .001) with a standardized effect of -.418 . The partner effect equals -0.113 ( $p<.001$ ) with a standardized effect of -.156 . The ratio of the partner to the actor effect or $k$ is 0.373 with a confidence interval from -0.188 to 0.576 . It can be concluded that the contrast ( $k=-1$ ) and the couple ( $k=1$ ) models are implausible and that the actor-only model ( $k=0$ ) is plausible. Lastly considered are the effects of Other Positivity on Satisfaction. The actor effect equals 0.235 ( $\mathrm{p}<.001$ ) with a standardized effect of .236 . The partner effect equals 0.156 ( $p<.001$ ) with a standardized effect of .157 .

The four simple indirect, two direct, two total indirect, and two total effects of Other Positivity on Satisfaction are contained in Table 3. Consider first the actor effect from Other Positivity to Satisfaction. The total actor effect equals 0.400 ( 0.308 to 0.493 ) with a standardized effect of . 402. The direct effect equals 0.235 (confidence interval: 0.148 to 0.323 ) with a standardized effect of .236 and it explains 58.81 percent of the total effect. There are two indirect effects: The total actor indirect effect equals 0.165 (confidence interval: 0.046 to 0.286 ) with a standardized effect of .166 and it explains 41.19 percent of the total effect. The actor-actor indirect effect equals 0.134 (confidence interval: 0.065 to 0.218 ) with a standardized effect of .135 and it explains 33.57 percent of the total effect. The partner-partner indirect effect equals 0.031 (confidence interval: -0.008 to 0.078 ) with a standardized effect of .031 and it explains 7.62 percent of the total effect. Next considered is the partner effect from Other Positivity to Satisfaction. The total partner effect equals 0.288 ( 0.196 to 0.380) with a standardized effect of .369 . The direct effect equals 0.156 (confidence interval: 0.068 to 0.244 ) with a standardized effect of .157 and it explains 54.18 percent of the total effect. There are two indirect effects: The total partner indirect effect equals 0.132 (confidence interval: 0.022 to 0.262 ) with a standardized effect of .132 and it explains 45.82 percent of the total effect. The actor-partner indirect effect equals 0.050 (confidence interval: -0.014 to 0.120 ) with a standardized effect of .050 and it explains 17.40 percent of the total effect. The partner-partner indirect effect equals 0.082 (confidence interval: 0.031 to 0.147 ) with a standardized effect of .082 and it explains 28.42 percent of the total effect.

## Model with A Prior Values for the k's

The user has requested to estimate a model in which the partner effects are fixed to be equal the actor effects times a constant. That constant or $k$ for the effect from Other Positivity on Tension has been set to 1.000 and that constant or $k$ from Tension on Satisfaction has been set to 1.000. The fit of this model is a chi square with 2 degrees of freedom that equals 22.212 ( $p$ < .001). The SABIC for this model is 68.026 and the base model is 49.480. The RMSEA for this model is 0.262 . Thus, the data appear to be inconsistent with these values of $k$.

Table 4 presents the effects in the mediational model with these fixed values of $k$. The multiple correlation for the Tension equations is .407 and the multiple correlation for the Satisfaction equations is .679. (Tests of partner effects may not be very interpretable because because their effects are constrained.) First considered are the effects of Other Positivity on Tension. The actor effect equals -0.358 ( p < . 001) with a standardized effect of -.260 . The partner effect equals -0.358 ( $p<.001$ ) with a standardized effect of -.260 . Next considered are the effects of Tension on Satisfaction. The actor effect equals -0.207 (p < . 001) with a standardized effect of -.287 . The partner effect equals -0.207 ( p < .001) with a standardized effect of -.287 . Lastly considered are the effects of Other Positivity on Satisfaction. The actor effect equals 0.252 ( $p<.001$ ) with a standardized effect of .253 . The partner effect equals $0.140(p=.002)$ with a standardized effect of .140 .

The four simple indirect, two direct, two total indirect, and two total effects of Other Positivity on Satisfaction are contained in Table 5. (Tests of actor-partner, partner-actor, and partner-partner indirect effects may not be very interpretable because because partner effects are contrained.) Considered first is the actor effect from Other Positivity to Satisfaction. The total actor effect equals 0.400 ( 0.308 to 0.493 ) with a standardized effect of . 402. The direct effect equals 0.252 (confidence interval: 0.162 to 0.252 ) with a standardized effect of . 253 and it explains 62.93 percent of the total effect. There are two indirect effects: The total actor indirect effect equals 0.148 (confidence interval: 0.071 to 0.298 ) with a standardized effect of .149 and it explains 37.07 percent of the total effect. The actor-actor indirect effect equals 0.074 (confidence interval: 0.021 to 0.139 ) with a standardized effect of .075 and it explains 18.54 percent of the total effect. The partner-partner indirect effect equals 0.074 (confidence interval: 0.021 to 0.138 ) with a standardized effect of .075 and it explains 18.54 percent of the total effect. Next considered is the partner effect from Other Positivity to Satisfaction. The total partner effect equals 0.288 ( 0.196 to 0.380 ) with a standardized effect of . 402. The direct effect equals 0.252 (confidence interval: 0.050 to 0.140 ) with a standardized effect of .140 and it explains 48.45 percent of the total effect. There are two indirect effects: The total partner indirect effect equals 0.148 (confidence interval: 0.049 to 0.277 ) with a standardized effect of .149 and it explains 51.55 percent of the total effect. The actor-partner indirect effect equals 0.074 (confidence interval: 0.021 to 0.138 ) with a standardized effect of .075 and it explains 25.78 percent of the total effect. The partner-partner indirect effect equals 0.074 (confidence interval: 0.021 to 0.139 ) with a standardized effect of .075 and it explains 25.78 percent of the total effect.

## 2. Tables

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics

| Variable | Mean | SD | Minimum | Maximum |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Other Positivity | 4.264 | 0.498 | 2.600 | 5.000 |
| Satisfaction | 3.605 | 0.496 | 1.167 | 4.000 |
| Tension | 2.431 | 0.686 | 1.167 | 4.000 |

Table 2: Effects in the Mediation Model

| Cause | Effect | Type | Estimate | p | value | Lower | $95 \%$ | CI | Upper |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |


| Other Positivity SatisfactionActor 0.235 <br>  $<.001$ <br> Partner 0.156 <br>  $<.001$ <br>  0.068 to | 0.323 | 0.236 |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  |  | to | 0.244 | 0.157 |

Table 3: Total, Direct, and Indirect Effects

| Type | Effect | Estimate | p value | Lower | 95\% CI | Upper | Standardized | Percent Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Actor | Total | 0.400 | <. 001 | 0.308 | to | 0.493 | 0.402 |  |
|  | Direct | 0.235 | <. 001 | 0.148 | to | 0.323 | 0.236 | 58.81 |
|  | Total Indirect | 0.165 | <. 001 | 0.046 | to | 0.286 | 0.166 | 41.19 |
|  | Actor-Actor Indirect | 0.134 | <. 001 | 0.065 | to | 0.218 | 0.135 | 33.57 |
|  | Partner-Partner Indirect | 0.031 | . 012 | -0.008 | to | 0.078 | 0.031 | 7.62 |
| Partner | Total | 0.288 | <. 001 | 0.196 | to | 0.380 | 0.289 |  |
|  | Direct | 0.156 | <. 001 | 0.068 | to | 0.244 | 0.157 | 54.18 |
|  | Total Indirect | 0.132 | <. 001 | 0.022 | to | 0.262 | 0.270 | 45.82 |
|  | Actor-Partner Indirect | 0.050 | . 003 | -0.014 | to | 0.120 | 0.050 | 17.40 |
|  | Partner-Actor Indirect | 0.082 | <. 001 | 0.031 | to | 0.147 | 0.082 | 28.42 |

Table 4: Effects in the Mediation Model with Fixed k Values

| Cause | Effect | Type | Estimate | p | value | Lower | $95 \%$ | CI | Upper Standardized |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Other Positivity |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Tension | Actor | -0.358 | $<.001$ | -0.457 | to | -0.259 | -0.260 |  |
|  |  | Partner | -0.358 | $<.001$ | -0.457 | to | -0.259 | -0.260 |  |
| Tension Satisfaction | Actor | -0.207 | $<.001$ | -0.257 | to | -0.158 | -0.287 |  |  |
|  | Partner | -0.207 | $<.001$ | -0.257 | to | -0.158 | -0.287 |  |  |
| Other Positivity Satisfaction | Actor | 0.252 | $<.001$ | 0.162 | to | 0.342 | 0.253 |  |  |
|  |  | Partner | 0.140 | .002 | 0.050 | to | 0.229 | 0.140 |  |

Table 5: Total, Direct, and Indirect Effects with Fixed k Values

| Type |  | Effect | Estimate | p | value | Lower | $95 \%$ | CI | Upper |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | Standardized Percent Total

## 3. lavaan Computer Output

| Mediation Run with Indistinguishable Dyads |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| lavaan (0.5-22) converged normally after | 40 iterations |
| Number of observations | 148 |
| Number of missing patterns | 1 |
| Estimator | ML |



| 12 | 0.068 | 0.244 | 0.156 | 0.157 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 13 | 4.201 | 4.326 | 4.264 | 8.568 |
| 14 | 4.201 | 4.326 | 4.264 | 8.568 |
| 15 | 2.195 | 3.693 | 2.944 | 5.940 |
| 16 | 2.195 | 3.693 | 2.944 | 5.940 |
| 17 | 4.632 | 6.333 | 5.482 | 7.991 |
| 18 | 4.632 | 6.333 | 5.482 | 7.991 |
| 19 | 0.207 | 0.289 | 0.248 | 1.000 |
| 20 | 0.207 | 0.289 | 0.248 | 1.000 |
| 21 | 0.105 | 0.148 | 0.127 | 0.515 |
| 22 | 0.105 | 0.148 | 0.127 | 0.515 |
| 23 | 0.326 | 0.454 | 0.390 | 0.828 |
| 24 | 0.326 | 0.454 | 0.390 | 0.828 |
| 25 | 0.016 | 0.098 | 0.057 | 0.232 |
| 26 | 0.024 | 0.068 | 0.046 | 0.364 |
| 27 | 0.010 | 0.138 | 0.074 | 0.189 |
| 28 | 0.223 | 0.994 | 0.609 | 0.609 |
| 29 | 0.162 | 0.584 | 0.373 | 0.373 |
| 30 | 0.083 | 0.186 | 0.134 | 0.135 |
| 31 | 0.017 | 0.083 | 0.050 | 0.050 |
| 32 | 0.035 | 0.129 | 0.082 | 0.082 |
| 33 | 0.007 | 0.054 | 0.031 | 0.031 |
| 34 | 0.107 | 0.223 | 0.165 | 0.166 |
| 35 | 0.074 | 0.190 | 0.132 | 0.132 |
| 36 | 0.308 | 0.493 | 0.400 | 0.402 |
| 37 | 0.196 | 0.380 | 0.288 | 0.289 |

Mediation Run with Fixed k Values
lavaan (0.5-22) converged normally after 47 iterations

$$
\text { Number of observations } 148
$$

Number of missing patterns 1

| Estimator |  |  | ML |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Minimum Function Test Statistic |  |  | 39.504 |  |  |  |
| Degrees of freedom |  |  | 14 |  |  |  |
| P-value | (Chi-square) |  | 0.000 |  |  |  |
|  | lhs op | rhs | label | est | se | z |
| 1 | mv1 | xv 1 | aa | -0.358 | 0.051 | -7.063 |
| 2 | mv2 | xv 2 | aa | -0.358 | 0.051 | -7.063 |
| 3 | mv1 | xv 2 | pa | -0.358 | 0.051 | -7.063 |
| 4 | mv2 | xv 1 | pa | -0.358 | 0.051 | -7.063 |
| 5 | yv1 | mv1 | ab | -0.207 | 0.025 | -8.266 |
| 6 | yv2 | mv2 | ab | -0.207 | 0.025 | -8.266 |
| 7 | yv1 | mv2 | pb | -0.207 | 0.025 | -8.266 |
| 8 | yv2 | mv1 | pb | -0.207 | 0.025 | -8.266 |
| 9 | yv1 | xv 1 | ac | 0.252 | 0.046 | 5.505 |
| 10 | yv2 | xv 2 | ac | 0.252 | 0.046 | 5.505 |
| 11 | yv1 | xv 2 | pc | 0.140 | 0.046 | 3.048 |
| 12 | yv2 ~ | xv 1 | pc | 0.140 | 0.046 | 3.048 |
| 13 | xv1 ~1 |  | m1 | 4.264 | 0.032 | 132.841 |
| 14 | xv2 ~1 |  | m1a | 4.264 | 0.032 | 132.841 |
| 15 | yv1 ~1 |  | m2 | 2.944 | 0.382 | 7.708 |

$\left.\begin{array}{llllrllr}16 & \text { yv2 } & \sim 1 & & & \text { m2a } & 2.944 & 0.382 \\ 17 & & \text { mv1 } & \sim 1 & & & \text { m3 } & 5.482 \\ 0\end{array}\right)$

| 32 | 0.000 | 0.047 | 0.101 | 0.074 | 0.075 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 33 | 0.000 | 0.047 | 0.101 | 0.074 | 0.075 |
| 34 | 0.000 | 0.094 | 0.203 | 0.148 | 0.149 |
| 35 | 0.000 | 0.094 | 0.203 | 0.148 | 0.149 |
| 36 | 0.000 | 0.308 | 0.493 | 0.400 | 0.402 |
| 37 | 0.000 | 0.196 | 0.380 | 0.288 | 0.289 |

## 4. Figures

## APIM Mediation (Standardized Estimates)



## APIMeM with Fixed k Values (Standardized Estimates)



