

Power in Close Intimate Relationships

JAMES J. KIM, MARIKO L. VISSERMAN,
AND EMILY A. IMPETT

Romantic relationships are one of the closest types of interpersonal relationships that people experience; indeed, people rank romantic relationships at the top of their relationship hierarchies (Clark & Mills, 2011). Because romantic partners are interdependent and one person's thoughts, feelings, and actions can hold considerable sway over the other's, the dynamics of power in close, intimate relationships are particularly important to understand. Power plays a pivotal role in the development and maintenance of close intimate relationships as it determines how partners relate to each other and how important decisions are made. Before relationships are formed, when partners feel an initial spark of attraction, one partner often takes the lead in initiating the first date or initiating a first sexual encounter. In new relationships, when norms for how partners interact and make decisions have not yet developed, one partner might have more influence over the amount of time partners will spend together, how they will spend their time, or future plans they might make as a couple. In more established relationships, one partner might have the final say in most financial decisions, whereas the other partner might have more influence over decisions related to parenting or sex. The amount of power partners have in different domains can also change as partners confront new life events such as buying their first home, having a baby, or retiring from a life-long occupation. As these examples illustrate, power pervades all aspects of intimate interactions, from the first moments when partners are getting to know each other, when they are establishing more committed bonds, and when they navigate important relationship and life transitions.

In this chapter, we provide a review of the literature on power in the context of romantic relationships, highlighting the ways in which power operates in romantic relationships and how people's experiences and expressions of power can predict whether relationships will thrive or falter. We begin by defining power in intimate relationships by reviewing key theoretical perspectives on power. Next, we review what we know about how power shapes initial attraction before relationships develop. Moving on to established relationships, we

examine who is most likely to hold power in relationships by considering the role of individual difference factors including socioeconomic and relational resources, dependence power, and attachment orientation. Then, we review the literature on the implications of having or lacking power in relationships and the outcomes of power imbalances among partners in romantic relationships. Finally, we discuss how power relates to prosocial behavior in romantic relationships, and at the conclusion of the chapter, we discuss what we see as interesting but currently unanswered questions as well as promising directions for future research on power in close, intimate relationships.

DEFINING POWER: PAST THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVES AND SOURCES OF POWER

Research on power has a long history in the social sciences, and the conceptualization of power has been informed by various theoretical perspectives across multiple disciplines including psychology, sociology, communication studies, and family science. The first attempt to identify and systematically define the major sources of power came from French and Ravin's (1959) social power theory, that defined power as the capability of a person to persuade or influence others by causing psychological change (which includes changes in a person's behaviors, attitudes, and goals). While foundational to the study of power, a main limitation of this early power theory is that it focuses on power solely at the level of the individual and does not incorporate the person being influenced or consider power in a dyadic context. Thus, power is described as an individual characteristic independent of the social relationships in which it is embedded and is expressed (Simpson et al., 2015; see Chapter 6 in this volume). Over the last half-century, several major power theories have been proposed including interdependence theory (Thibaut & Kelley, 1959), resource theory (Blood & Wolfe, 1960), dyadic power theory (Rollins & Bahr, 1976), power within relationships theory (Huston, 1983), and power-approach theory (Keltner, Gruenfeld, & Anderson, 2003). We will not discuss these theories in depth, but we direct interested readers to other chapters within this volume for a review of these theories. What is important for us to note in this chapter is that these theories have outlined several key factors that shape the dynamics of power across different relationship contexts. Individuals may have power within their relationship if they experience greater rewards and fewer costs if the relationship were to end (Thibaut & Kelley, 1959), if they hold more socioeconomic resources (Blood & Wolfe, 1960) or perceive greater resources and authority than their partner (Rollins & Bahr, 1976), if they possess certain personality traits or skills (Huston, 1983), as well as if they have the capacity to administer punishment to their partner (Keltner et al., 2003).

Although these major theoretical perspectives and definitions of power diverge with respect to the proposed bases or sources of relationship power,

the manner in which power is expressed, and the outcomes associated with having or not having power, a few key commonalities emerge. First, power is largely understood as having some form of influence or control over another person. This influence can come in the form of behavior, thoughts, and/or attitudes. Second, with the exception of social power theory and power-approach theory, a constant theme among all these theoretical perspectives is that power, particularly in romantic relationships, is a construct which is fundamentally dyadic and relational in nature. Thus, power can only be understood by taking into account *both* partners' levels of resources, authority, or dependence in relation to each other as opposed to an individual's absolute levels of these bases of power.

More recently, Simpson et al. (2015) have integrated concepts from these past theoretical perspectives on power and proposed the Dyadic Power Social-Influence Model (DPSIM), a process model that describes the experience and consequences related to power for both individuals in a relationship (see Chapter 5 in this volume). Across the numerous theoretical perspectives and varying definitions of power, we believe this to be the most compelling and refined conceptualization of power, particularly for understanding power in romantic relationships. According to the DPSIM, power is defined as "the ability or capacity to change a partner's thoughts, feelings, and/or behavior so they align with one's own desired preferences, along with the ability or capacity to resist influence attempts imposed by the partner" (Simpson et al., 2015, p. 409). Notably, this model extends the definition of power from past theories to include the ability to resist influence by one's partner. According to the DPSIM, the sources of power for partners emerge from both their individual characteristics (e.g., each partner's personality traits) and dyadic characteristics (e.g., each partner's relative level of commitment to the relationship). Partners then choose particular influence tactics to use in a given situation by selecting strategies that draw on their principal power bases. These processes also occur dyadically, reflecting the interdependence that exists between intimate partners. For example, a wife's particular characteristics (e.g., lower social status) help determine her husband's power bases (e.g., greater legitimate power; French & Raven, 1959), which if exercised, can impact the wife's feelings (in this case, generally in negative ways) as well as influence her behavior in the future.

Another advance of the DPSIM is that power is not considered to be necessarily stable, either over time or across all decision domains, within a relationship. For example, a husband who has more power over financial decision-making may have less power than his wife over household decisions. Power is also noted to have different components, including process power (i.e., control over the decision-making process itself, which can be enacted by leading conversations or proposing options and ideas) and outcome power (i.e., control over the final decisions made by a couple; Galliher et al., 1999).

In the DPSIM, both of these components are considered in order to fully understand the power dynamics within a specific relationship.

As the DPSIM has integrated the various facets of past definitions of power, the ability to measure dyadic power has also undergone developments in recent years. Farrell, Simpson, and Rothman (2015) constructed the Relationship Power Inventory (RPI), which measures an individual's ability to both use and resist power and is specifically designed for use with romantic dyads. The RPI was developed from the DPSIM, and taps into the constructs of both process power and outcome power, and identifies 10 key domains of power for romantic couples, including friends and family, finances, future plans, when/how to spend time together, parenting, purchases, relationship issues, religion, and vacations. The RPI therefore accounts for the notion that both partners in a relationship can have different power bases and to varying degrees.

In sum, over a number of decades, scholars from different disciplines have proposed multiple theories of power. The study of power in romantic relationships has been difficult as power is a general construct and there are several different definitions as well as different domains and sources of power. However, in more recent theories of power such as the DPSIM (Simpson et al., 2015), scholars have refined our conceptualization and understanding of the construct and have suggested that power is best characterized as a dyadic as opposed to individual construct given its interpersonal nature.

POWER AND INITIAL ROMANTIC ATTRACTION

Power affects feelings of initial attraction before relationships are even established. Within the context of established relationships, power is considered a relational characteristic, in which the focus pertains to relative power differences, or who holds more power in the relationship (Rusbult, 1983). However, within first encounters between potential romantic partners, power has usually been conceptualized and measured as a characteristic that an individual possesses (e.g., a person may be perceived as powerful through displays of power status cues).

Much of the literature on the role of power in the context of initial romantic attraction has focused on the role of gender differences and norms. This research mostly reveals that men hold more power than women in initial interactions (e.g., Laner & Ventrone, 2000), which is not surprising given that women seem to prefer men who display cues signaling their power (e.g., Buss, 1989). Social norms traditionally cast the male partner as the initiator and leader in heterosexual relationships, wherein the typical script for a first date depicts the man as taking the lead to ask the woman out, plan their activities, and pay their joint expenses (Rose & Frieze, 1993). More recent research has revealed that this gender difference in norms and expectations regarding

these first encounters largely persists (Laner & Ventrone, 2000; Sakaluk et al., 2014). Thus, men are initially the power holders in the interaction, as they mostly influence what to do and when, while women are encouraged to adopt a more passive role (Kiefer & Sanchez, 2007). Other research has taken an evolutionary psychology perspective (see Chapter 1 of this volume), suggesting that women feel particularly attracted to men who seem to possess high power status, indicated by good financial prospects, ambition, industriousness, social status, and a somewhat older age (Buss, 1989, 2006; Buss & Schmitt, 1993; Elliot et al., 2010; Wiederman & Allgeier, 1992). Moreover, women typically desire taller men as men's height serves as another cue for perceived power status (Bryan, Webster, & Mahaffey, 2011; Korda, 1975; Wilson, 1968), while men do not prefer taller women (Lynn & Shurgot, 1984; Pierce, 1996). However, more recent research examining women's preference for high power status in men only found this preference in ideal partners but not in actual potential partners (Eastwick & Finkel, 2008).

There may be particular domains of power, however, in which women might have a power advantage, and the domain of sexuality is one example (see Chapter 8 of this volume). When it comes to sexual interactions, literature on "sexual economics" casts the female partner as the most influential (Baumeister & Vohs, 2004). This literature describes sex as a female resource, suggesting that women tend to be more selective in agreeing to sex (e.g., because of higher costs such as pregnancy), which should provide them with power over the sexual interaction. Also, men may need to "sell" their qualities more, such as by demonstrating their power status to acquire sex (Baumeister & Vohs, 2004). Furthermore, men seem to mostly initiate sex, while women seem to be the "gatekeepers," controlling when to engage in sex (Peplau, Rubin, & Hill, 1977; Sakaluk et al., 2014). Thus, women typically feel attracted to high power mates, and may focus their selection based on this criteria, but at the same time, seem to hold more power when it comes to sexual interactions.

Although women may generally feel attracted to powerful men (e.g., Buss, 1989), male status may also pose a risk to male–female interactions during initial romantic attraction. For example, when men experience power over a potential dating partner (i.e., holding power over how to complete tasks and how to divide monetary rewards in a laboratory experiment), they tend to be more sexually motivated, and as a result, overperceive a woman's sexual interest (Kunstman & Maner, 2011). Potentially, this overperception of the other's sexual interest may result in men behaving in a more sexualized way towards women when feeling in power (Kunstman & Maner, 2011). Thus, there might be a dark side of women being attracted to powerful men, as men's overperception of women's sexual interest might lead to unwanted advances.

While gender norms are changing with more women entering positions of power in many, but not all, parts of the world (e.g., Inglehart & Norris,

2003), one may wonder if women still prefer high power status men, irrespective of their own power position. For example, are perceptions of men's power status driven by relative power differences; that is, do women feel especially attracted to potential mates who possess more power (e.g., higher income) than they do? Some recent research by Eastwick et al. (2013) has shown that power can only inspire romantic desire when the powerholder actually possesses power, and, crucially, is in fact perceived by the other as possessing this power. As perceptions of power may be largely driven by a relative power difference between partners, this finding suggests that women do indeed prefer a "higher" power mate. With women gaining power in much of the world, perceptions of a potential partner's power may decline. Thus, as society shifts to one in which there are more egalitarian roles for men and women, power status may play less of a role in the initial attraction women feel towards men, and additional research is needed to test this possibility. We also do not know if and how changing gender norms impact the relative amounts of power possessed by men and women in romantic relationships; panel research investigating changes in gender norms and power across multiple decades would be informative. A related question concerns the consequences of being in relationships in which women have greater power than their romantic partner. Some research suggests that men prefer women to have *less* power than them (Meier & Dionne, 2009), illustrating that the opposite case – women having *more* power than men – may work against women on the mating market. But as gender norms change in contemporary society, we might begin to see different patterns.

WHO POSSESSES POWER IN RELATIONSHIPS? KEY INDIVIDUAL DIFFERENCE FACTORS

Moving beyond initial attraction, in this section, we discuss several individual difference factors that play a role in shaping power dynamics in romantic relationships. Specifically, we focus on the interplay between gender and resources, dependence power, and attachment orientation, all of which influence which partner has greater power in a relationship.

Gender and Resources

In addition to influencing the power dynamics in the context of initial attraction, as outlined in the previous section, gender plays a significant role in determining who has greater power in established relationships. Perhaps no other individual factor has been discussed and studied more with regards to power in committed relationships than gender. This research has predominantly focused on how men and women differ in their experience of power, as well as the influence of gender role beliefs on power (e.g., Diekmann, Goodfriend, &

Goodwin, 2004; Sprecher & Felmlee, 1997; Tichenor, 2005). Partners and couples who hold traditional conceptions of intimate relationships endorse the idea that in heterosexual relationships, the man should have greater authority and lead while the woman should take on a passive role, and that in marital relationships, men are expected to be the breadwinners while women are expected to take on domestic responsibilities (Fitzpatrick et al., 2004; McDonald, 1980; Peplau & Campbell, 1989; Tichenor, 2005). Studies have found that men in dating relationships report more decision-making power than women, and are more likely to be viewed as the partner having more power compared to women (Felmlee, 1994; Sprecher, 1994). This result was found despite most individuals reporting they desire an egalitarian relationship (Eaton & Rose, 2011; Falbo & Peplau, 1980; Lamont, 2013; Peplau, 1979).

More recent conceptions of intimate relationships emphasize an egalitarian model in which partners share in authority and influence (see review by Impett & Peplau, 2006). Although significant differences still remain, the gender imbalance in education and income has been reduced over the past few decades in large parts of the world (DeNavas-Walt, Proctor, & Smith, 2013; Schwartz & Gonalons-Pons, 2016). Women are receiving more education and out-earning their spouses at a greater rate than in previous decades, and close relationships are becoming more flexible, fair, and egalitarian in nature, in part due to men's increased participation in household work (Fry & Cohn, 2010; Kornrich, Brines, & Leupp, 2013; Sullivan 2006; Sullivan & Coltrane 2008). Nevertheless, gender differences still remain (Bianchi et al., 2012; Blau & Kahn, 2006; Horne et al., 2018; Lothaller, Mikula, & Schoebi, 2009; Weichselbaumer & Winter-Ebmer, 2005).

Scholars have often explained the gendered nature of power in terms of the relative resources, including both socioeconomic and relational, that partners have in the relationship. Resource theory suggests that power in relationships is profoundly shaped by the relative control of *socioeconomic resources*, which includes features such as income, occupational prestige, and educational attainment (Blood & Wolfe, 1960; Blumstein & Schwartz, 1983; Menaghan & Parcel, 1990; Scanzoni & Szinovacz, 1980). Partners with these resources typically have greater influence and control over finances, the division of household labor, and the decision-making process in relationships, including having the "final say" about important matters (Blumstein & Schwartz, 1983; Tichenor, 1999; Vogler, Lyonette, & Wiggins, 2008). As research shows that partners who earn more money, are more educated, or have a more prestigious job tend to have a power advantage, this is especially true if the partner with the greater resources is a man (Bittman et al. 2003; Impett & Peplau, 2006). Indeed, women who are financially dependent on their partners experience lower relationship power, although the same is not always true for men (Tichenor, 2005).

Research on marital power has defined the capacity to exert influence based on status and economic resources as *positional power* (Fox & Blanton,

1994). Men have more positional power than women as they have historically experienced more access and opportunities to economic resources given the patriarchal norms that exist in most societies (Chen, Fiske, & Lee, 2009; Felmlee, 1994; Galliher et al., 1999). Women have also had access to fewer resources that would allow them to gain more power in relationships due to factors such as lower wages received relative to men as well as greater household and familial responsibilities (Chen et al., 2009; DeNavas-Walt, Proctor, & Smith, 2013; Felmlee, 1994; Travaglia, Overall, & Sibley, 2009). Research shows that women feel more powerful in relationships when they have economic independence, while men feel more powerful when they have control over their partner and bring home money (Harvey et al., 2002). Studies also suggest that a woman's earnings increase her financial control in the marital relationship (Blumstein & Schwartz, 1983; Pahl, 1989; Whyte, 1990).

A large body of work suggests that even when women's earnings exceed those of their husbands, the balance of power seems largely unaltered, with men continuing to exercise greater control in decision-making and women continuing to carry the burden of domestic labor (Bianchi et al., 2000; Bittman et al., 2003; Tichenor, 2005). These findings may be largely influenced by adherence to traditional gender role beliefs in which men are expected to take the position of the strong and masculine breadwinner and women are expected to take on the role of the kind and caring homemaker (Faulkner, Kolts, & Hicks, 2008; Fischer, 2006; Fitzpatrick et al., 2004). Furthermore, research has shown that men in heterosexual relationships prefer to out-earn their partners (Pierce, Dahl, & Nielsen, 2013; Zuo, 1997) and can suffer depression when they are economically dependent on their wives (Crowley, 1998), partially explaining a link between marriages with female breadwinners and increased spousal abuse (Atkinson, Greenstein, & Lang, 2005).

Although the majority of attention given to relative resources and relationship power has focused on the role of socioeconomic resources shaping men's power, romantic relationships are also more strongly influenced by the particular partner who has more control over *relational resources* (Dragon & Duck, 2005; Hanks, 1993; Safilios-Rothschild, 1976). Research suggests women are more likely to have "relational power", which Fox and Blanton (1994) define as the influence one has over emotional resources such as support, relational information, trust, attention, and love. Women often possess these resources because they are stereotyped as being higher in warmth and affection than men and because relationships are traditionally considered to be the domain of women (Knudson-Martin, 2013; Vogel et al., 2007). For example, despite holding more positional power, research shows that men can often feel powerless, especially in the domain of the family (Blanton & Vandergriff-Avery, 2001; Walsh, 1989) and husbands feel less effective than their wives in maintaining family relationships and taking care of children (McGoldrick, 1991). Evidence also suggests that women who do not have access to socioeconomic

resources may gain power by controlling love and sex in the relationship (Dragon & Duck, 2005). For example, Safilios-Rothschild (1976) found that women reported greater decision-making power when they thought their husbands were the partner more in love. Thus, women may gain power by controlling the reciprocation of a partner's love and affection, as well as use their sexuality as a resource to gain power in the relationship (Ackerman, Griskevicius, & Li, 2011; McIntosh & Zey, 1989; Safilios-Rothschild, 1977; Seabrook et al., 2016). Studies have revealed that a frequently used strategy and source of power for women is withholding sex (Harvey et al., 2002; Senn et al., 2009). As we reviewed in the section on initial attraction, this notion is also consistent with sexual economics theory, which was developed as a way to understand the "mating marketplace" among men and women. According to this theory, sex is argued to be a female resource as men have greater desire for sex and must therefore offer other resources in order to engage in sex with women (Baumeister, Catanese, & Vohs, 2001).

Dependence Power

Another factor that predicts which partner has greater power is a partner's level of involvement in the relationship and their quality of romantic alternatives. The resulting power advantage has been called *dependence power* as it arises from an individual feeling less dependent on the relationship relative to their partner (Lawler & Bacharach, 1987). Based on social exchange theory (Thibaut & Kelley, 1959; see Chapter 3 in this volume), power is structured according to the rewards and costs of being in a relationship, and one partner may experience fewer relationship rewards than the other. Thus, partners who are less invested in the relationship or have better romantic alternatives will have more power because they will have less to lose if the relationship were to end (Cloven & Roloff, 1993). This is known as the *principle of least interest* (Sprecher, Schmeckle, & Felmlee, 2006; Waller & Hill, 1951), and studies of dating relationships have found that the less interested partner perceives greater control over the continuation of their relationship and experiences greater overall power and decision-making (Felmlee, 1994; Peplau, 1979; Sprecher et al., 2006). Research has shown that men are more likely than women to be the less emotionally invested partner, suggesting that men have greater power in this respect (Sprecher & Felmlee, 1997; Sprecher et al., 2006).

Whereas dependence power relates to the ability to control rewards when individuals are less dependent on the relationship, punitive power arises when individuals can increase the costs or negative outcomes of a partner (Lawler & Bacharach, 1987). Thus, aggression may also constitute a relevant source of power in close relationships as a partner's greater power may arise from their punitive capabilities (Stets & Henderson, 1991; Straus & Gelles, 1990; see Chapter 10 in this volume). The less powerful partner may inhibit expressing

complaints due to fear that doing so will lead to conflict and aggression at the hands of their partner (Cloven & Roloff, 1993; Newell & Stutman, 1991). Notably, studies show that it is the perceptions individuals have that their partners might take punitive actions that result in this power discrepancy, and not necessarily whether the powerful partner actually or intentionally responds aggressively (Cloven & Roloff, 1993).

Adult Attachment Style

Individual differences in romantic attachment are also associated with relationship power. Romantic attachment refers to the characteristic ways individuals relate to their significant others to maintain intimacy and closeness based on their internal models of self and others (Bartholomew, 1994; Hazan & Shaver, 1987; Mikulincer & Shaver, 2016), and is typically conceptualized along two continuous dimensions of anxiety and avoidance (Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991). People who score high on attachment anxiety tend to desire closeness with romantic partners but have heightened fears of rejection and abandonment, while people who score high on attachment avoidance are typically uncomfortable with closeness in romantic relationships, have a heightened desire for self-reliance, and tend to believe that their partners cannot be relied upon (Hadden, Smith, Webster, 2014; Shaver & Mikulincer, 2005). People who score high on both avoidance and anxiety are characterized by feelings of inadequacy as well as distrust of others and have expectations that close others will hurt or reject them. People who score high on either or both of these dimensions are assumed to have an insecure adult attachment orientation, while low scores on both the anxiety and avoidance dimensions reflect attachment security, characterized by feelings of emotional closeness and intimacy with one's partner and the belief that the closeness and intimacy is adequately reciprocated (Lopez & Brennan, 2000; Wei et al., 2007).

Given that attachment is a key factor that shapes individuals' thoughts, emotions, and behaviors in romantic relationships (for a review see Birnbaum et al., 2006; also, see Chapter 2 in this volume), it is unsurprising that romantic attachment has implications for relationship power. Studies have found insecure attachment styles to be linked with lower perceived power (Overall et al., 2016) and power imbalances in romantic relationships (Rogers, Bidwell, & Wilson, 2005; Shaver, Segev, & Mikulincer, 2011). Research has also focused on the role of power to explain the association between insecure attachment and relationship aggression (Fournier, Brassard, & Shaver, 2011; Linder, Crick, & Collins, 2002; Wilson, 2010). Oka, Brown, and Miller (2016) found that power mediates the link between attachment and aggression, suggesting that when they feel insecurely attached (i.e., as indicated by high anxiety and avoidance scores), both men and women perceive less power in the relationship than their partner and engage in relational aggression to regain a sense of power.

Rogers, Bidwell, and Wilson (2005) found that both attachment anxiety and avoidance predicted greater physical aggression both when individuals had low or high perceptions of relationship power. Specifically, when individuals high in both anxiety and avoidance had low perceived relationship power, they were more physically aggressive toward their partner compared to avoidant individuals. Further, when anxious individuals and avoidant individuals had high perceptions of relationship power, they were significantly more aggressive with their partners than secure individuals. These findings are generally consistent with research showing that insecure individuals tend to react negatively if they are high in power and feel the need to gain control over the intimacy in the relationship to lessen their anxiety, as well as when they are low in power and feel that their relationship is threatened (Oka et al., 2016).

In sum, there are a variety of individual difference factors that can act as important bases of power for individuals in romantic relationships. In determining which partner may possess or perceive greater relationship power, it is pertinent to consider the ways in which features such as gender, resources, dependence, and attachment orientation shape power dynamics in couples.

POWER AND RELATIONSHIP OUTCOMES

We now turn to the implications of having or not having power in romantic relationships as well as how imbalances of power between partners predict personal and relationship outcomes. Given that the majority of the research on power and romantic relationships focuses on heterosexual relationships, we conclude by discussing power dynamics in same-sex couples.

Pursuing Power Versus Having Power

Research has yielded mixed findings on the link between power in romantic relationships and well-being, with differential effects found for having versus pursuing power (Kifer et al., 2013). Although motivations to strive for power have been shown to predict greater subjective well-being in domains of achievement such as the workplace (Baumann, Kaschel, & Kuhl, 2005; Boyd & Nowell, 2014), some research suggests that the desire or need for power – conceptualized by Winter (1973) as a stable tendency to seek an impact on others – has negative implications in affiliative contexts such as in romantic relationships. For example, in a study of heterosexual dating couples, Stewart and Rubin (1976) found that the need for power among male partners predicted greater relationship dissatisfaction and less relationship stability, potentially because these men lack the ability to handle conflict or compromise with their partners. The need for power among men is also known to be a predictor of domestic violence and aggressive sexual behavior (Dutton & Strachan, 1987; Mason & Blankenship, 1987; Zurbriggen, 2000). However, Job, Bernecker, and

Dweck (2012) showed that people with a high power motive actually reported greater relationship satisfaction if they report feeling strong and excited when thinking about their partner as opposed to calm and relaxed, suggesting implicit power motives can lead to positive outcomes if regularly accompanied by the experience of high-arousal affective states.

In contrast to this work on the need for power, other work supports the notion that people actually experience high levels of well-being, greater positive affect, as well as greater responsibility in romantic relationships when they *experience* power (Keltner et al. 2003; Smith & Hofmann, 2016), supported by evidence that this is due to enhanced feelings of authenticity (Kifer et al., 2013). Indeed, general findings on power show that it leads people to behave more consistently with their internal traits and desires (Galinsky et al., 2008; Keltner et al., 2003), and can increase feelings of authenticity in social contexts (Kraus, Chen, & Keltner, 2011). Thus, achieving and experiencing power can be an important element of authentic self-fulfillment, which then predicts greater personal well-being (Kifer et al., 2013).

In sum, this research suggests that having high motivations for power can have negative implications for the well-being of close relationships as it may impede affiliative motives in romantic relationships and the ability to manage conflict successfully. In contrast, actually experiencing or achieving power can be associated with increased personal well-being as it can lead to more positive affect and less stress, as well as enhanced authenticity. In other words, wanting versus having power can have different implications for relationship well-being. Another important distinction that to our knowledge has not yet been explored is the distinction between having power and expressing or implementing that power. Given that power is often defined as the *potential* to influence a partner, we do not know how much of the implications of power are due simply to having power versus expressing one's sources of power, or how this distinction may have different implications for oneself and for one's partner.

The Balance of Power

As power in close relationships is fundamentally dyadic and relational in nature (Simpson et al., 2015), the bulk of the literature has focused primarily on the relative levels of power between partners, and how the balance of relationship power predicts key relationship outcomes. Factors such as gender and relative levels of economic resources (e.g., income) have been a key focus in studying the distribution of relationship power, with many studies showing that the endorsement of traditional sex roles is associated with unequal power in relationships (Peplau & Campbell, 1989; Tichenor, 2005), and that greater financial disparity among partners predicts a greater imbalance of power (Blood & Wolfe, 1960; Blumstein & Schwartz, 1983; Greaves et al., 1995). Relationship power is also considered to be balanced when partners influence

the thoughts, feelings, and behaviors of each other to a similar degree, as well as have similar levels of dependency on one another (Peplau & Gordon, 1985) and share equal responsibility for maintaining the relationship (e.g., division of household labor; Knudson-Martin & Huenergardt, 2010). Relationship imbalances occur when the degree of influence for any of these factors is shifted to one of the partners.

A wealth of research has provided evidence that individuals commonly perceive power imbalances in their relationships. In one study of heterosexual couples, Sprecher and Felmlee (1997) found that the majority of both men and women reported imbalances in decision making power and general levels of power. In turn, imbalances of power can be detrimental for relationships, and various findings speak to why this may be so (Knudson-Martin, 2013; Steil, 1997). Unequal power may interfere with intimacy as partners may feel less safe to express vulnerable emotions, and this applies to both high-power and low-power partners (Beavers, 1985). Research has also shown that although low-power partners may be more inclined to behave in the best interest of the relationship, they may do so at the expense of their own interest. Again drawing from literature on “dependence power”, some studies have shown that when partners experience low power because of high dependency on the relationship, they may feel reluctant to speak their minds and confront their (often high power) partners when they engage in dissatisfying behavior (Rusbult et al., 1991) or when problematic events occur (Samp & Solomon, 2001). They are also more likely to appraise their own negative relationship behaviors as more severe (Samp & Solomon, 2001), indicating that low power partners may be overly concerned with risking the maintenance of their relationship. Thus, individuals who are overly dependent on a partner may not feel powerful enough to communicate their needs regarding important relationship issues (Cloven & Roloff, 1990, 1993; Samp & Solomon, 2001; Rusbult et al., 1991). Research taking a gendered power perspective in which power is assigned through traditional gender norms also supports this view (Hochschild, 1989). Men as higher power partners are less responsive to their intimate partners’ feelings and interests while women as lower power partners tend to automatically comply with and accommodate partners irrespective of their own needs (Knudson-Martin, 2013; Mahoney & Knudson-Martin, 2009). Women who perceive their partners as having more power also report greater levels of depression and anxiety as well as decreased sexual desire and greater fatigue (Walsh, 1989). Further, perceived inequality in the division of housework is associated with decreased psychological well-being, especially for women (Lavee & Katz, 2002; Mikula, Riederer, & Bodi, 2012). Given this research, it is unsurprising that power disparities represent one of the main reasons why couples seek therapy (Parker, 2009).

On a more positive note, the literature shows that equal power among couples helps create intimacy and relationship success. Romantic partners

who perceive their relationship as egalitarian or equitable report greater trust, happiness, commitment, security, and willingness to self-disclose compared to those who perceive their relationships to be inequitable (Grauerholz, 1987; Guerrero, Anderson, & Afifi, 2013; Walster, Walster, & Traupmann, 1978). Several studies have consistently found that higher relationship quality is linked with equal levels of emotional investment and dependency between partners (Attridge, Berscheid, & Simpson, 1995; Drigotas, Rusbult, & Verette, 1999; Sprecher, Schmeckle, & Felmlee, 2006; Stanley et al., 2016). Moreover, men who think their relationship is more egalitarian in power are more satisfied than men who perceive power inequalities (Rochlen & Mahalik, 2004). Research on shared decision making in married couples has also found that relationship satisfaction tends to be highest in egalitarian relationships (Gray-Little & Burks, 1983) and that partners experience greater relationship adjustment, less conflict, and less aggression when they are similar in their levels of commitment than when there are asymmetries in commitment (Stanley et al., 2016). Lastly, some studies focusing on the division of household labor in relationships have found that higher levels of perceived support result when partners contribute equally to household duties (Frisco & Williams, 2003; Van Willigen & Drentea, 2001) and that perceived fairness with respect to the division of housework is a key predictor of marital satisfaction (Wilkie, Ferree, & Ratcliff, 1998; Yodanis, 2010).

It is important to point out that some studies have found that imbalances in power do not always predict negative relationship outcomes. For example, Felmlee (1994) found lower rates of breakup when men were perceived to have more power in the relationship relative to women, and other studies have failed to find that equity predicts greater relationship stability (Lujansky & Mikula, 1983; Cate, Lloyd, & Henton, 1985). However, as these earlier studies were conducted during times when egalitarian relationships were less socially accepted, these findings have often been explained as being due to the distress or dissatisfaction experienced when couples break traditional gender norms (Felmlee, 1994). Indeed, as egalitarian relationships have become more normative over time, research has failed to replicate these findings and indeed finds lower rates of relationship dissolution among couples with balanced levels of power (Schwartz & Gonalons-Pons, 2016).

Research examining economic disparities among couples has been studied intensively, with a particular focus on the impact of women's income on marital outcomes. For decades, scholars have examined whether greater relative income among married women is associated with marital dissatisfaction and higher divorce rates (e.g., Parsons, 1949; Sayer et al., 2011), but the evidence has been inconclusive. Some studies suggest that women's gains in economic independence predict relationship dissolution (Dechter, 1992; Furdyna, Tucker, & James, 2008; Heckert, Nowak, and Snyder, 1998; Ruggles, 1997; Sayer et al., 2011; Schoen et al., 2002; South, 2001; Teachman, 2010),

while others find no support or at best weak support for this link (Brennan et al., 2001; Oppenheimer, 1997; Rogers & DeBoer, 2001; Sayer & Bianchi, 2000). It is likely that the inconsistency in findings is due in part to differences in the operationalization of economic independence and the use of different research methods. In addition, to understand this link, some scholars have focused on the influence of gender-role ideology, pointing out that the association between women's economic independence and divorce rates may have more to do with women gaining financial independence to exit unhappy marriages than women's economic independence leading to dissatisfaction in relationships (Oppenheimer, 1997; Sayer & Bianchi, 2000). Recent work by Schwartz and Gonalons-Pons (2016) on US couples has provided support for this notion, finding that wives' relative earnings were positively associated with the risk of divorce among couples married in the 1960s and 1970s (when traditional models of marriage were standard), but not for couples married in the 1990s (when society's norms of marriage became more egalitarian in nature).

In sum, relationships appear to be more stable and satisfying when there is an equal or equitable balance of power among partners across a number of different domains. Important questions for future research on the outcomes of the balance of power in relationships concern determining if there are "healthy" levels of relational power and if there are absolute levels of power that are harmful versus helpful for relationships. For example, a "healthy dose" of power may be beneficial for individuals and their partners, especially when pursued for approach goals (Keltner et al., 2003) and when people feel authentic about pursuing their goals (Impett et al., 2014; Kifer et al., 2013). However, once power reaches particularly high levels, it may resemble narcissism, and power holders may feel entitled and less committed to the maintenance of their relationships (Campbell & Foster, 2002; Foster, Shrira & Campbell, 2006; McNulty & Widman, 2014).

Same-Sex Couples

Although the majority of work on power in close relationships has been limited to heterosexual couples, researchers have studied the lives of same-sex couples to investigate the degree to which power dynamics may operate in a similar or different manner (see review by Peplau & Spalding, 2000). Generally, research shows that power imbalances also exist in same-sex relationships, although they are less pronounced when compared with heterosexual relationships (Caldwell & Peplau, 1984; Falbo & Peplau, 1980; Felmlee, 1994; Kurdek, 2005; Peplau & Fingerhut, 2007; Reilly & Lynch, 1990; Sprecher & Felmlee, 1997). As partners in same-sex relationships are not constrained by traditional gender norms which assign status or responsibilities, equity may be easier to achieve (Haas & Stafford, 1998), and same-sex partners have been shown to place more

emphasis on the value of equality (Kurdek 1995; Peplau & Cochran 1980). Similar to heterosexual couples, however, not all couples who strive for power equality achieve this ideal. Peplau and Cochran (1990) found that only 38% of gay men and 59% of lesbians identified their relationship as equal, consistent with other studies measuring power among lesbians and gay men (Harry & DeVall, 1978; Reilly & Lynch, 1990). In turn, several studies of lesbians and gay men have found that satisfaction is higher when partners believe they are relatively equal in power and decision making (Horne & Biss 2009; Peplau & Spalding, 2000; Schreurs & Buunk, 1996).

Same-sex couples also experience power imbalances due to economic disparities. Findings that partners with greater financial resources have greater power also apply to same-sex couples (Caldwell & Peplau, 1984; Patterson, 2000; Reilly & Lynch 1990). Studies have also found that gay men who are older and wealthier than their partner tend to have more power suggesting that income can be a particularly influential factor in determining power positions among gay male couples (Harry, 1984; Harry & DeVall, 1978). Indeed, an early study by Blumstein and Schwartz (1983) found that financial resources are significantly related to power for gay men but not for lesbian women.

Lastly, limited work has examined the extent to which dependence power operates in a similar manner among same-sex couples (Quam et al., 2010), although Caldwell and Peplau (1984) found in a sample of lesbian couples that the partner who was less committed in the relationship held greater power, supporting the principle of least interest discussed earlier in this chapter. In sum, relationships appear to be more stable and more satisfying when partners' expectations for the relationship align and when there is an equal or equitable balance of power among partners across a number of different domains. This is true for heterosexual and same-sex couples alike, however achieving these balanced relationships may be more tenable and common among same-sex couples compared to heterosexual couples.

POWER AND PRO-RELATIONSHIP BEHAVIOR

We now turn to research on the link between power and pro-relationship behavior, defined as prosocial behavior in which people engage to maintain their relationships. With a few exceptions, partners who hold more power tend to engage in fewer pro-relationship behaviors such as sacrificing their own self-interest for the good of their partner and engaging in compromise to resolve important relationship issues. However, a more nuanced view of the recent literature in this area suggests that although power can negatively impact the relationship when a power holder is self-oriented and weakly committed to the relationship, people can also use their power status to benefit their relationship if this is actually their goal, such as if they are high in commitment or are communally oriented.

General Impact of Power on Pro-Relationship Behavior

Generally, the literature reveals that when individuals are high in power (either relative to their partner, or as the result of feeling weakly dependent on the relationship), they are less motivated to engage in pro-relationship behaviors to benefit their relationship (Chen, Lee-Chai, & Bargh, 2001; Gordon & Chen, 2013; Righetti et al., 2015; Rusbult et al., 1991). This general finding follows from interdependence theory: when people are highly committed to their relationship – as a result of feeling satisfied, having made high investments and experiencing low quality of alternatives (Rusbult, 1983) – they feel more dependent on the relationship, and as a result, experience lower power (Lawler & Bacharach, 1987; Lennon, Stewart, & Ledermann, 2013). In turn, when partners report lower power and are more dependent on the relationship, they are more likely to engage in pro-relationship behaviors.

Evidence for a link between power and engaging in less pro-relationship behavior comes from research on accommodation (Rusbult et al., 1991) and sacrifice (Righetti et al., 2015). Rusbult and colleagues conducted three studies of romantic couples to examine the role of power in shaping accommodation, defined as reacting positively and constructively to a partner's negative and destructive behaviors (Rusbult et al., 1991). Their results revealed that people are more inclined to accommodate their partner when they feel highly dependent on the relationship and therefore experience low relationship power. In addition to being less accommodating of their partner's negative behavior in conflict situations, people who hold more relative power than their partner in relationships – deemed “power holders” – are also less willing to make sacrifices for the good of their partner or their relationship. Five studies of romantic couples, using questionnaires, daily diary reports, and videotaped interactions, showed that when encountering situations of conflicting interests, power holders were less likely to sacrifice their preferences to benefit their partner or relationship and were more likely to pursue their own self-interest (Righetti et al., 2015).

One exception to this general pattern of findings showing that high power is linked with less pro-relationship behavior is research on forgiveness, defined as a decrease in avoidance motivation and decreased desire to seek revenge toward a partner who has transgressed against the relationship (McCullough et al., 1998). Karremans and Smith (2010) asked people in romantic relationships to recall a past offense by their partner and report on how powerful they felt in their relationship (i.e., defined as experiencing control over outcomes and resources within the relationship). The results showed that powerful partners tended to be more forgiving of their partner's transgression than partners lower in power, especially when they felt highly committed to the relationship (i.e., when they are strongly motivated to maintain the relationship). Although these results do not correspond with the results of the studies on

accommodation and sacrifice, it is important to note that their findings generalized to other close relationships (e.g., friendships) using experimental procedures to assess the causal link between power and forgiveness in hypothetical scenarios. One possible explanation for why higher power fosters forgiveness is that feeling more powerful helps combat rumination about the offense (Karremans & Smith, 2010), which is an important predictor of whether people are able to forgive an offense (McCullough et al., 1998).

In short, partners who possess greater relative power and feel less dependent on the relationship are less inclined to behave in the best interest of the relationship, which could compromise the well-being and longevity of the relationship (Van Lange et al., 1997). However, forgiveness seems to be an exception to this general finding, with high power partners being more forgiving of their partner's transgressions.

Power and the Moderating Role of Relationship Motivation

Although the research on power and pro-relationship behavior paints a somewhat grim view of how power holders are less invested in maintaining their relationships, recent research provides a more nuanced perspective. One reason powerful partners may be less prosocially motivated in general, drawing from an interdependence theory framework, is because they tend to be less committed to their relationships (Lennon et al., 2013), and commitment is a driving force for engaging in pro-relationship behavior (e.g., Rusbult, 1983). Different levels of relationship motivations may thus differentially affect relationship maintenance behaviors. Research has shown that power heightens goal pursuit (Guinote, 2007), suggesting that in a romantic relationship that involves sufficient commitment by both partners, power should heighten pursuit of relationship-maintenance goals. Further, power should amplify thoughts and behaviors that promote relationship well-being. As reviewed above, research on forgiveness has shown that high power partners can actually be more forgiving, and interestingly, this finding was stronger for highly committed individuals, which may reflect their goal to maintain the relationship (Karremans & Smith, 2010). Thus, when a partner's goal is to maintain the relationship, they can use their power to behave in the best interest of the relationship.

Another piece of evidence for the assertion that power can heighten relationship motivation comes from communal and exchange perspectives on relationships (Clark & Mills, 1979, 2011). When people have a communal orientation they are focused on meeting their partner's needs without expectation for reciprocation, whereas when people have an exchange orientation they are concerned about making sure that comparable benefits are given by each partner in the relationship (Clark & Mills, 1979). Research has shown

that when people are exchange oriented, high power (i.e., evoked experimentally through verbal and environmental cues) promotes the pursuit of self-interested goals. However, this work has shown that power can actually promote social-responsibility goals, such as being attentive to another person's interests and social norms in general, among people who are more communally oriented (Chen et al., 2001). Similarly, relative power over a romantic partner (i.e., being the power holder) reduces the inclination to take a partner's perspective in daily life. However, this is only the case when people are self-focused but not other-focused (Gordon & Chen, 2013).

Lastly, drawing on the power-approach theory (Keltner et al., 2003), research from an approach and avoidance motivation framework has shown that when experiencing power, people are more likely to adopt an approach motivational orientation, in which they are focused on promoting positive outcomes (e.g., being more sensitive to social rewards). In contrast, low power or a lack of power is typically associated with an avoidance orientation, in which people are focused on averting negative outcomes (e.g., being more sensitive to social threat; Anderson & Berdahl, 2002; Keltner et al., 2003; Smith & Bargh, 2008). Many studies have now documented the important relationship benefits of approach motivation (see review by Gable & Impett, 2012), including being more responsive to a romantic partner's needs (Impett et al., 2010). Thus, adding to a more nuanced perspective on power and relationship maintenance behaviors, these findings again suggest that people's motivations may play an important role when it comes to choosing how to use their power status in their relationship, which can sometimes be in the best interest of the relationship.

To conclude, when partners hold more power in their relationship, they are less likely to behave in the best interest of the relationship, illustrated by a lower willingness to sacrifice their own self-interest or accommodate their partner's negative behavior. However, a more nuanced view suggests that people's relationship motivations can affect how they decide to use their power in their relationship. An important future direction for research on power and prosociality is to consider how different motivations impact power holders' pro-relationship behaviors. One example comes from work on approach-avoidance theories of motivation, documenting the relationship benefits of approach motives (Gable & Impett, 2012). Although partners with more power in general are less willing to sacrifice (Righetti et al., 2015) and accommodate their partners' negative behavior (Rusbult et al., 1991), when they do decide to act prosocially, this could translate into positive outcomes for both their own and a partner's well-being. In this way, this approach motivation could make these pro-relationship behaviors "truly" pro-relational in that they would actually benefit the relationship, an important question to examine in future research on power. We now turn to other topics ripe for additional research in this domain.

FUTURE RESEARCH ON RELATIONSHIP POWER: THE
IMPORTANCE OF THE DYAD

Research and theory on power have grown considerably over the past half-decade, especially with the DPSIM in which power is seen as a truly relational construct (Simpson et al., 2015; see Chapter 6 in this volume). As such, we think the time is ripe for relationships scholars to take stock of important questions that have yet to be answered and look toward the future of research on power in romantic relationships. We conclude our chapter by highlighting what we see as four key areas of growth in research on power and romantic relationships, all stemming from our need for more dyadic research on power that investigates influences that partners have on each other. These include (1) research on accuracy and bias in the perception of power in romantic relationships; (2) research to test theoretical predictions based on the DPSIM (Simpson et al., 2015); (3) research on if and how power might change over the course of relationships and during key relationship and life transitions; and (4) research on broader sociocultural factors that shape power and the outcomes of holding power in romantic relationships.

A crucial future direction for research on power in romantic relationships concerns understanding the extent to which partners agree about each person's level of power and the power balance in their relationship, as well as the personal and relationship consequences of this agreement or disagreement. Because so much of the work on power relies on self-report measures, often provided by only one partner, we currently know very little about the degree to which partners agree about power dynamics in their relationship. Although relationship researchers have yet to examine accuracy of perceptions of power in romantic relationships, research on person perception and status provides some clues. This research has revealed that in group settings, people are motivated to form accurate perceptions of their own status in order to be accepted by others in the group (Baumeister & Leary, 1995), and as such, are often quite accurate about estimating the degree to which they have influence over other people (Anderson, Ames, & Gosling, 2008). This work has also revealed that there are distinct costs that arise when people overestimate their status in a group setting, as those who do so are liked less by their fellow group members (Anderson et al., 2008). Thus, this work shows that in group settings where people are dependent on one another for success, people are motivated to assess their own status accurately. Romantic partners are arguably even more interdependent than those who work together in group settings, as they have coordinated their interests and built a life together (Rusbult & Van Lange, 2003). As such, it is likely that people would be motivated to know how they are seen in the eyes of their romantic partner, as the costs of overestimating one's level of influence might be higher in dyadic relationships. On the other hand, there might also be benefits of underestimating one's level of

power given that doing so might make people more willing to sacrifice their own self-interest or accommodate their partner's negative behaviour to maintain harmony in their relationship. Dyadic research in which both partners provide ratings of their own and their partner's power, ideally over a variety of domains, would be needed to test this possibility. As it is based on the DPSIM model, we see the Relationship Power Inventory (RPI; Farrell et al., 2015) as a particularly promising measure to assess power across a variety of domains.

A second future direction centers on the need for more empirical evidence for the theoretical assertions outlined in the DPSIM, the most fundamentally dyadic theory of power to date (Simpson et al., 2015). The DPSIM clearly specifies how both partners' characteristics, as well as the interaction between the two, impact both partners' bases of power, which in turn impact the specific influence strategies that both partners are able to use, which finally, impact personal outcomes and interpersonal outcomes of both partners. Existing dyadic research provides support for some of the pathways specified in the model but others are based on theoretical propositions or indirect empirical findings. Perhaps the greatest empirical support has been provided for the link between the use of specific influence tactics and the ability to change a partner's behavior. For example, Overall, Fletcher, and Simpson (2006) found that while the greater use of direct strategies of influence is perceived by both partners as less effective at getting a partner to change or improve something about themselves in the moment, these strategies often lead to greater influence over a partner over time. Further, the use of negative influence tactics is typically ineffective in inspiring partner change (Overall & Fletcher, 2010). Other work has shown that referencing the relationship (e.g., using "we" language) tends to be particularly effective in changing a partner's opinions, whereas using coercion or trying to reason with a partner tends to push them away from the relationship (Oriña, Wood, & Simpson, 2002; Oriña et al., 2008). Although this research provides some support for the link between influence strategies and personal outcomes, less work has provided empirical evidence for other paths in the DPSIM, such as the link between specific influence strategies and relationship outcomes (but see Overall et al., 2006; Overall & Fletcher, 2010), and even less work has investigated the antecedents and determinants of the use of particular influence strategies in relationships.

A third future direction that we see as particularly exciting is to examine how the dynamics of power might change in relationships over time as couples undergo important relationship and life transitions. Relationship partners confront different types of issues, challenges, and opportunities at different relationship and life stages. For example, how does the decision to buy a home together impact power dynamics, or the birth of a new baby, or partners leaving the workforce after a life-long career? According to the Relationship Stage Model of Power proposed by Simpson et al. (2015), in fledgling relationships, power should be especially salient as partners are getting to know each other, as well as

developing norms and rules for making decisions. As relationships become more established, power dynamics might be less salient as partners have developed norms and perhaps divided up different domains of decision making. However, when partners confront new life events together (such as buying their first home, welcoming a baby into the family, or even managing shared responsibilities [e.g. children] after a relationship has ended) it is likely that power will become more salient again as partners need to re-negotiate norms around decision making. While provocative, these claims remain untested, and we need dyadic, longitudinal research to examine how power changes over the course of time in relationships as partners confront relationship transitions and new life events.

Finally, it is important to point out that each person is situated in a larger sociocultural context that should affect power and the outcomes of holding power in romantic relationships. Power is impacted by more than just individual and dyadic factors, which have been the focus of much of the research on romantic relationships. Power is also shaped by societal and cultural factors, and relationship power must be considered in the context of all of these factors. For example, most of the work on power, to our knowledge, has been conducted in Western cultures, so we know little about how power might affect relationship outcomes in different cultures, or even among people in Western culture from different socioeconomic or ethnic backgrounds. For example, in societies which place a greater emphasis on maintaining group harmony (Markus & Kitayama, 1991; Singelis, 1994), it is possible that power might shape pro-relationship behaviors to a greater degree because these behaviors enable partners to maintain the harmony that they so highly value. In addition, sociocultural factors are likely to shape the financial, social, and relational resources that people have to draw upon, ultimately affecting personal and interpersonal outcomes in relationships (see Chapter 7 in this volume).

In conclusion, it is clear that power is a construct of crucial importance as it pervades the lives of romantic partners and is fundamental to understanding key relationship processes, dynamics, and outcomes. The study of power has particular relevance for romantic partners as romantic relationships represent one of the closest social bonds that people experience. We hope that research on power in romantic relationships continues to grow, now more than ever, as scholars improve upon its definition and measurement, and integrate our knowledge and theories of power to promote relationships that thrive.

REFERENCES

- Ackerman, J. M., Griskevicius, V., & Li, N. P. (2011). Let's get serious: communicating commitment in romantic relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 100*, 1079.
- Anderson, C., Ames, D. R., & Gosling, S. D. (2008). Punishing hubris: The perils of overestimating one's status in a group. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 34*, 90–101.

- Anderson, C., & Berdahl, J. L. (2002). The experience of power: examining the effects of power on approach and inhibition tendencies. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 83*, 1362–1377.
- Atkinson, M. P., Greenstein, T. N., & Lang, M. M. (2005). For women, breadwinning can be dangerous: Gendered resource theory and wife abuse. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 67*, 1137–1148.
- Attridge, M., Berscheid, E., & Simpson, J. A. (1995). Predicting relationship stability from both partners versus one. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 69*, 254–268.
- Bartholomew, K. (1994). Assessment of individual differences in adult attachment. *Psychological Inquiry, 5*, 23–67.
- Bartholomew, K., & Horowitz, L. M. (1991). Attachment styles among young adults: a test of a four-category model. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 61*, 226–244.
- Baumann, N., Kaschel, R., & Kuhl, J. (2005). Striving for unwanted goals: stress-dependent discrepancies between explicit and implicit achievement motives reduce subjective well-being and increase psychosomatic symptoms. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 89*, 781–799.
- Baumeister, R. F., Catanese, K. R., & Vohs, K. D. (2001). Is there a gender difference in strength of sex drive? Theoretical views, conceptual distinctions, and a review of relevant evidence. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 5*, 242–273.
- Baumeister, R. F., & Leary, M. R. (1995). The need to belong: desire for interpersonal attachments as a fundamental human motivation. *Psychological Bulletin, 117*, 497–529.
- Baumeister, R. F., & Vohs, K. D. (2004). Sexual economics: Sex as female resource for social exchange in heterosexual interactions. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 8*, 339–363.
- Beavers, W. R. (1985). *Successful Marriage: A Family Systems Approach to Couples Therapy*. New York: WW Norton.
- Bianchi, S. M., Milkie, M. A., Sayer, L. C., & Robinson, J. P. (2000). Is anyone doing the housework? Trends in the gender division of household labor. *Social Forces, 79*, 191–228.
- Bianchi, S. M., Sayer, L. C., Milkie, M. A., & Robinson, J. P. (2012). Housework: Who did, does or will do it, and how much does it matter? *Social Forces, 91*, 55–63.
- Birnbaum, G. E., Reis, H. T., Mikulincer, M., Gillath, O., & Orpaz, A. (2006). When sex is more than just sex: attachment orientations, sexual experience, and relationship quality. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 91*, 929–943.
- Bittman, M., England, P., Sayer, L., Folbre, N., & Matheson, G. (2003). When does gender trump money? Bargaining and time in household work. *American Journal of Sociology, 10*, 186–214.
- Blanton, P. W., & Vandergriff-Avery, M. (2001). Marital therapy and marital power: Constructing narratives of sharing relational and positional power. *Contemporary Family Therapy, 23*, 295–308.
- Blau, F. D., & Kahn, L. M. (2006). The gender pay gap: Going, going... but not gone. In F. D. Blau, M. C. Brinton, & D. B. Grusky (Eds.) *The Declining Significance of Gender* (pp. 37–66). New York: Russel Sage Foundation.
- Blood Jr, R. O., & Wolfe, D. M. (1960). *Husbands and Wives: The Dynamics of Family Living*. Oxford, UK: Free Press Glencoe.
- Blumstein, P., & Schwartz, P. (1983). *American Couples: Money, Work, Sex*. New York: William Morrow & Co.

- Boyd, N. M., & Nowell, B. (2014, January). Testing a theory of sense of community and community responsibility in non-profit organizations. Paper presented at the Academy of Management.
- Brennan, R. T., Barnett, R. C., & Gareis, K. C. (2001). When she earns more than he does: A longitudinal study of dual-earner couples. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, *63*, 168–182.
- Bryan, A. D., Webster, G. D., & Mahaffey, A. L. (2011). The big, the rich, and the powerful: Physical, financial, and social dimensions of dominance in mating and attraction. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *37*, 365–382.
- Buss, D. M. (1989). Sex differences in human mate preferences: Evolutionary hypotheses tested in 37 cultures. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, *12*, 1–14.
- (2006). Strategies of human mating. *Psihologijске teme*, *15*, 239–260.
- Buss, D. M., & Schmitt, D. P. (1993). Sexual strategies theory: An evolutionary perspective on human mating. *Psychological Review*, *100*, 204–232.
- Caldwell, M. A., & Peplau, L. A. (1984). The balance of power in lesbian relationships. *Sex Roles*, *10*, 587–599.
- Campbell, W. K., & Foster, C. A. (2002). Narcissism and commitment in romantic relationships: An investment model analysis. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *28*, 484–495.
- Cate, R. M., Lloyd, S. A., & Henton, J. M. (1985). The effect of equity, equality, and reward level on the stability of students' premarital relationships. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, *125*, 715–721.
- Chen, Z., Fiske, S. T., & Lee, T. L. (2009). Ambivalent sexism and power-related gender-role ideology in marriage. *Sex Roles*, *60*, 765–778.
- Chen, S., Lee-Chai, A. Y., & Bargh, J. A. (2001). Relationship orientation as a moderator of the effects of social power. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *80*, 173.
- Clark, M. S., & Mills, J. (1979). Interpersonal attraction in exchange and communal relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *37*, 12–24.
- Clark, M. S., & Mills, J. R. (2011). A theory of communal (and exchange) relationships. In P. A. M. Van Lange, A. W. Kruglanski, & E. T. Higgins (Eds.) *Handbook of Theories of Social Psychology* (pp. 232–250). Los Angeles: Sage.
- Cloven, D. H., & Roloff, M. E. (1990). Internal dialogue about interpersonal conflict: Communicative antecedents and relational outcomes. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Speech Communication Association, Chicago, IL.
- (1993). The chilling effect of aggressive potential on the expression of complaints in intimate relationships. *Communications Monographs*, *60*, 199–219.
- Crowley, M. S. (1998). Men's self-perceived adequacy as the family breadwinner: Implications for their psychological, marital, and work-family well-being. *Journal of Family and Economic Issues*, *19*, 7–23.
- Dechter, A. R. (June, 1992). The effect of women's economic independence on union dissolution. Paper presented at the Summer Research Workshop on Problems of the Low Income Population, University of Wisconsin, Madison, WI.
- DeNavas-Walt, C., Proctor, B. D., & Smith, J. C. (2013). Income, poverty, and health insurance coverage in the United States: 2012. *United States Census Bureau*.
- Diekmann, A. B., Goodfriend, W., & Goodwin, S. (2004). Dynamic stereotypes of power: Perceived change and stability in gender hierarchies. *Sex Roles*, *50*, 201–215.
- Dragon, W., & Duck, S. (Eds.). (2005). *Understanding Research in Personal Relationships: A Text With Readings*. London, UK: Sage.
- Drigotas, S. M., Rusbult, C. E., & Verette, J. (1999). Level of commitment, mutuality of commitment, and couple well-being. *Personal Relationships*, *6*, 389–409.

- Dutton, D. G., & Strachan, C. E. (1987). Motivational needs for power and spouse-specific assertiveness in assaultive and nonassaultive men. *Violence and Victims*, 2, 145–156.
- Eastwick, P. W., & Finkel, E. J. (2008). Sex differences in mate preferences revisited: do people know what they initially desire in a romantic partner?. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 94, 245.
- Eastwick, P. W., Wilkey, B. M., Finkel, E. J., et al. (2013). Act with authority: Romantic desire at the nexus of power possessed. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 49, 267–271.
- Eaton, A. A., & Rose, S. (2011). Has dating become more egalitarian? A 35 year review using Sex Roles. *Sex Roles*, 64, 843–862.
- Elliot, A. J., Niesta Kayser, D., Greitemeyer, T., et al. (2010). Red, rank, and romance in women viewing men. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, 139, 399–417.
- Falbo, T., & Peplau, L. A. (1980). Power strategies in intimate relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 38, 618–628.
- Farrell, A. K., Simpson, J. A., & Rothman, A. J. (2015). The relationship power inventory: Development and validation. *Personal Relationships*, 22, 387–413.
- Faulkner, G. E., Kolts, R. L., & Hicks, G. F. (2008). Sex role ideology, relationship context, and response to sexual coercion in college females. *Sex Roles*, 59, 139–150.
- Felmlee, D. H. (1994). Who's on top? Power in romantic relationships. *Sex Roles*, 31, 275–295.
- Fischer, A. R. (2006). Women's benevolent sexism as reaction to hostility. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 30, 410–416.
- Fitzpatrick, M. K., Salgado, D. M., Suvak, M. K., King, L. A., & King, D. W. (2004). Associations of gender and gender-role ideology with behavioral and attitudinal features of intimate partner aggression. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, 5, 91–102.
- Fournier, B., Brassard, A., & Shaver, P. R. (2011). Adult attachment and male aggression in couple relationships: The demand-withdraw communication pattern and relationship satisfaction as mediators. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 26, 1982–2003.
- Foster, J. D., Shrira, I., & Campbell, W. K. (2006). Theoretical models of narcissism, sexuality, and relationship commitment. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 23, 367–386.
- Fox, G. L., & Blanton, P. W. (1994). Noncustodial fathers following divorce. *Marriage & Family Review*, 20, 257–282.
- French, J. R., Jr., & Raven, B. (1959). The bases of social power. In C. Dorwin (Ed.), *Studies in Social Power* (pp. 150–167). Ann Arbor: Institute for Social Research.
- Frisco, M. L., & Williams, K. (2003). Perceived housework equity, marital happiness, and divorce in dual-earner households. *Journal of Family Issues*, 24, 51–73.
- Fry, R., & Cohn, D. (2010). *New Economics of Marriage: The Rise of Wives*. Washington, DC: Pew Research Center.
- Furdyna, H. E., Tucker, M. B., & James, A. D. (2008). Relative spousal earnings and marital happiness among African American and White women. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 70, 332–344.
- Gable, S. L., & Impett, E. A. (2012). Approach and avoidance motives and close relationships. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 6, 95–108.
- Galinsky, A. D., Magee, J. C., Gruenfeld, D. H., Whitson, J. A., & Liljenquist, K. A. (2008). Power reduces the press of the situation: implications for creativity, conformity, and dissonance. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 95, 1450–1466.

- Galliher, R. V., Rostosky, S. S., Welsh, D. P., & Kawaguchi, M. C. (1999). Power and psychological well-being in late adolescent romantic relationships. *Sex Roles, 40*, 689–710.
- Gordon, A. M., & Chen, S. (2013). Does power help or hurt? The moderating role of self–other focus on power and perspective-taking in romantic relationships. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 8*, 1097–1110.
- Grauerholz, E. (1987). Balancing the power in dating relationships. *Sex Roles, 17*, 563–571.
- Gray-Little, B., & Burks, N. (1983). Power and satisfaction in marriage: A review and critique. *Psychological Bulletin, 93*, 513–538.
- Greaves, K. M., Zvonkovic, A. M., Evans, L. S., & Hall, L. D. (1995). Economic resources, influence, and stress among married couples. *Family and Consumer Sciences Research Journal, 24*, 47–70.
- Guerrero, L. K., Anderson, P. A., & Afifi, W. A. (Eds.) (2013). *Close Encounters: Communication in Relationships*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Guinote, A. (2007). Power and goal pursuit. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 33*, 1076–1087.
- Haas, S. M., & Stafford, L. (1998). An initial examination of maintenance behaviors in gay and lesbian relationships. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 15*, 846–855.
- Hadden, B. W., Smith, C. V., & Webster, G. D. (2014). Relationship duration moderates associations between attachment and relationship quality meta-analytic support for the temporal adult romantic attachment model. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 18*, 42–58.
- Hanks, R. S. (1993). Rethinking family decision making: A family decision making model under constraints on time and information. *Marriage & Family Review, 18*, 223–240.
- Harry, J. (1984). *Gay Couples*. Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers.
- Harry, J., & DeVall, W. B. (1978). *The Social Organization of Gay Males*. Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers.
- Harvey, S. M., Beckman, L. J., Browner, C. H., & Sherman, C. A. (2002). Relationship power, decision making, and sexual relations: An exploratory study with couples of Mexican origin. *Journal of Sex Research, 39*, 284–291.
- Hazan, C., & Shaver, P. (1987). Romantic love conceptualized as an attachment process. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 52*, 511–524.
- Heckert, D. A., Nowak, T. C., & Snyder, K. A. (1998). The impact of husbands' and wives' relative earnings on marital disruption. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 60*, 690–703.
- Hochschild, A. (1989). *The Second Shift*. New York: Avon Books.
- Horne, R. M., Johnson, M. D., Galambos, N. L., & Krahn, H. J. (2018). Time, money or gender? Predictors of the division of household labor across the life stages. *Sex Roles, 78*, 731–743.
- Horne, S. G., & Biss, W. J. (2009). Equality discrepancy between women in same-sex relationships: The mediating role of attachment in relationship satisfaction. *Sex Roles, 60*, 721–730.
- Huston, T. L. (1983). Power. In H. H. Kelley, E. Berscheid, A. Christensen et al. (Eds.), *Close Relationships* (pp. 169–219). New York: W. H. Freeman.
- Impett, E. A., Gordon, A. M., Kogan, A., Oveis, C., Gable, S. L., & Keltner, D. (2010). Moving toward more perfect unions: Daily and long-term consequences of approach and avoidance goals in romantic relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 99*, 948–963.

- Impett, E. A., Le, B. M., Kogan, A., Oveis, C., & Keltner, D. (2014). When you think your partner is holding back the costs of perceived partner suppression during relationship sacrifice. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, 5, 542–549.
- Impett, E. A., & Peplau, L. A. (2006). “His” and “her” relationships? A review of the empirical evidence. In A. L. Vangelisti & D. Perlman (Eds.), *The Cambridge Handbook of Personal Relationships* (pp. 273–291). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Inglehart, R., & Norris, P. (2003). *Rising tide: Gender Equality and Cultural Change Around the World*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Job, V., Bernecker, K., & Dweck, C. S. (2012). Are implicit motives the need to feel certain affect? Motive–affect congruence predicts relationship satisfaction. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 38, 1552–1565.
- Karremans, J. C., & Smith, P. K. (2010). Having the power to forgive: When the experience of power increases interpersonal forgiveness. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 36, 1010–1023.
- Keltner, D., Gruenfeld, D. H., & Anderson, C. (2003). Power, approach, and inhibition. *Psychological Review*, 110, 265–284.
- Kiefer, A. K., & Sanchez, D. T. (2007). Scripting sexual passivity: A gender role perspective. *Personal Relationships*, 14, 269–290.
- Kifer, Y., Heller, D., Perunovic, W. Q. E., & Galinsky, A. D. (2013). The good life of the powerful: The experience of power and authenticity enhances subjective well-being. *Psychological Science*, 24, 280–288.
- Knudson-Martin, C. (2013). Why power matters: Creating a foundation of mutual support in couple relationships. *Family Process*, 52, 5–18.
- Knudson-Martin, C., & Huenergardt, D. (2010). A socio-emotional approach to couple therapy: Linking social context and couple interaction. *Family Process*, 49, 369–384.
- Korda, M. (1975). *Power! How to Get It, How to Use It*. New York: Random House.
- Kornrich, S., Brines, J., & Leupp, K. (2013). Egalitarianism, housework, and sexual frequency in marriage. *American Sociological Review*, 78, 26–50.
- Kraus, M. W., Chen, S., & Keltner, D. (2011). The power to be me: Power elevates self-concept consistency and authenticity. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 47, 974–980.
- Kunstman, J. W., & Maner, J. K. (2011). Sexual overperception: Power, mating motives, and biases in social judgment. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 100, 282–294.
- Kurdek, L. A. (1995). Developmental changes in relationship quality in gay and lesbian cohabiting couples. *Developmental Psychology*, 31, 86.
- (2005). What do we know about gay and lesbian couples? *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 14, 251–254.
- Lamont, E. (2013). Negotiating courtship reconciling egalitarian ideals with traditional gender norms. *Gender & Society*, 28, 189–211.
- Laner, M. R., & Ventrone, N. A. (2000). Dating scripts revisited. *Journal of Family Issues*, 21, 488–500.
- Lavee, Y., & Katz, R. (2002). Division of labor, perceived fairness, and marital quality: The effect of gender ideology. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 64, 27–39.
- Lawler, E. J., & Bacharach, S. B. (1987). Comparison of dependence and punitive forms of power. *Social Forces*, 66, 446–462.
- Lennon, C. A., Stewart, A. L., & Ledermann, T. (2013). The role of power in intimate relationships. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 30, 95–114.

- Linder, J. R., Crick, N. R., & Collins, W. A. (2002). Relational aggression and victimization in young adults' romantic relationships: Associations with perceptions of parent, peer, and romantic relationship quality. *Social Development, 11*, 69–86.
- Lopez, F. G., & Brennan, K. A. (2000). Dynamic processes underlying adult attachment organization: Toward an attachment theoretical perspective on the healthy and effective self. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 47*, 283.
- Lothaller, H., Mikula, G., & Schoebi, D. (2009). What contributes to the (im)balanced division of family work between the sexes? *Swiss Journal of Psychology, 68*, 143–152.
- Lujansky, H., & Mikula, G. (1983). Can equity theory explain the quality and the stability of romantic relationships? *British Journal of Social Psychology, 22*, 101–112.
- Lynn, M., & Shurgot, B. A. (1984). Responses to lonely hearts advertisements: Effects of reported physical attractiveness, physique, and coloration. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 10*, 349–357.
- Mahoney, A. R., & Knudson-Martin, C. (2009). Gender equality in intimate relationships. In C. Knudson-Martin & A. R. Mahoney (Eds.) *Couples, Gender, and Power: Creating Change in Intimate Relationships* (pp. 3–16). New York: Springer.
- Markus, H. R., & Kitayama, S. (1991). Culture and the self: Implications for cognition, emotion, and motivation. *Psychological Review, 98*, 224.
- Mason, A., & Blankenship, V. (1987). Power and affiliation motivation, stress, and abuse in intimate relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 52*, 203–210.
- McDonald, G. W. (1980). Family power: The assessment of a decade of theory and research, 1970–1979. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 42*, 841–854.
- McCullough, M. E., Rachal, K. C., Sandage, S. J., et al. (1998). Interpersonal forgiving in close relationships: II. Theoretical elaboration and measurement. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 75*, 1586–1603.
- McGoldrick, M. (1991). For love or money. In T. J. Goodrich (Ed.), *Women and Power: Perspectives for Family Therapy* (pp. 239–244). New York: Norton.
- McIntosh, A., & Zey, M. (1989). Women as gatekeepers of food consumption: a sociological critique. *Food and Foodways, 3*, 317–332.
- McNulty, J. K., & Widman, L. (2014). Sexual narcissism and infidelity in early marriage. *Archives of Sexual Behavior, 43*, 1315–1325.
- Meier, B. P., & Dionne, S. (2009). Downright sexy: Verticality, implicit power, and perceived physical attractiveness. *Social Cognition, 27*, 883–892.
- Menaghan, E. G., & Parcel, T. L. (1990). Parental employment and family life: Research in the 1980s. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 52*, 1079–1098.
- Mikula, G., Riederer, B., & Bodi, O. (2012). Perceived justice in the division of domestic labor: Actor and partner effects. *Personal Relationships, 19*, 680–695.
- Mikulincer, M., & Shaver, P. R. (2016). *Attachment in Adulthood: Structure, Dynamics, and Change*, Second edition. New York: Guilford Press.
- Newell, S. E., & Stutman, R. K. (1991). The episodic nature of social confrontation. *Annals of the International Communication Association, 14*, 359–395.
- Oka, M., Brown, C. C., & Miller, R. B. (2016). Attachment and Relational Aggression: Power as a Mediating Variable. *The American Journal of Family Therapy, 44*, 24–35.
- Oppenheimer, V. K. (1997). Women's employment and the gain to marriage: The specialization and trading model. *Annual Review of Sociology, 23*, 431–453.
- Oriña, M. M., Simpson, J. A., Ickes, W., Asada, K. J. K., & Fitzpatrick, S. (2008). Making it (inter-)personal: Self- and partner-moderated influence during marital conflict discussions. *Social Influence, 3*, 34–66.
- Oriña, M. M., Wood, W., & Simpson, J. A. (2002). Strategies of influence in close relationships. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 38*, 459–472.

- Overall, N. C., & Fletcher, G. J. (2010). Perceiving regulation from intimate partners: Reflected appraisal and self-regulation processes in close relationships. *Personal Relationships*, *17*, 433–456.
- Overall, N. C., Fletcher, G. J., & Simpson, J. A. (2006). Regulation processes in intimate relationships: The role of ideal standards. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *91*, 662–685.
- Overall, N. C., Hammond, M. D., McNulty, J. K., & Finkel, E. J. (2016). When power shapes interpersonal behavior: Low relationship power predicts men's aggressive responses to low situational power. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *111*, 195–217.
- Pahl, J. (1989). *Money and Marriage*. London, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Parker, L. (2009). Disrupting power and privilege in couples therapy. *Clinical Social Work Journal*, *37*, 248–255.
- Parsons, T. (1949). The social structure of the family. In R. N. Anshen (Ed.) *The Family: Its Function and Destiny* (pp. 173–201). Oxford, UK: Harper.
- Patterson, C. J. (2000). Family relationships of lesbians and gay men. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, *62*, 1052–1069.
- Peplau, L. A. (1979). Power in dating relationships. In J. Freeman (Ed.) *Women: A Feminist Perspective*, Second edition (pp. 106–121). Mountain View: Mayfield Publishing.
- Peplau, L. A., & Campbell, S. M. (1989). The balance of power in dating and marriage. In J. Freeman (Ed.), *Women: A Feminist Perspective*, Fourth edition (pp. 121–137). Mountain View: Mayfield Publishing.
- Peplau, L. A., & Cochran, S. D. (1980, September). Sex differences in values concerning love relationships. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, Montreal, Canada.
- (1990). A relationship perspective on homosexuality. In D. P. McWhirter, S. A. Sanders & J. M. Reinisch (Eds.) *Homosexuality/Heterosexuality: Concepts of Sexual Orientation* (pp. 321–349). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Peplau, L. A., & Fingerhut, A. W. (2007). The close relationships of lesbians and gay men. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *58*, 405–424.
- Peplau, L. A., & Gordon, S. L. (1985). Women and men in love: Gender differences in close heterosexual relationships. In V. E. O'Leary, R. K. Unger, & B. S. Wallston (Eds.), *Women, Gender, and Social Psychology* (pp. 257–291). Hillsdale: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Peplau, L. A., Rubin, Z., & Hill, C. T. (1977). Sexual intimacy in dating relationships. *Journal of Social Issues*, *33*, 86–109.
- Peplau, L. A., & Spalding, L. R. (2000). The close relationships of lesbians, gay men, and bisexuals. In C. Hendrick & S. S. Hendrick (Eds.) *Close Relationships: A Sourcebook* (pp. 111–123). Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Pierce, C. A. (1996). Body height and romantic attraction: A meta-analytic test of the male-taller norm. *Social Behavior and Personality*, *24*, 143–149.
- Pierce, L., Dahl, M. S., & Nielsen, J. (2013). In sickness and in wealth: Psychological and sexual costs of income comparison in marriage. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *39*, 359–374.
- Quam, J. K., Whitford, G. S., Dziengel, L. E., & Knochel, K. A. (2010). Exploring the nature of same-sex relationships. *Journal of Gerontological Social Work*, *53*, 702–722.
- Reilly, M. E., & Lynch, J. M. (1990). Power-sharing in lesbian partnerships. *Journal of Homosexuality*, *19*, 1–30.

- Righetti, F., Luchies, L. B., van Gils, S., et al. (2015). The prosocial versus proself power holder how power influences sacrifice in romantic relationships. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *41*, 779–790.
- Rochlen, A. B., & Mahalik, J. R. (2004). Women's perceptions of male partners' gender role conflict as predictors of psychological well-being and relationship satisfaction. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, *5*, 147–157.
- Rogers, S. J., & DeBoer, D. D. (2001). Changes in wives' income: Effects on marital happiness, psychological well-being, and the risk of divorce. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, *63*, 458–472.
- Rogers, W. S., Bidwell, J., & Wilson, L. (2005). Perception of and satisfaction with relationship power, sex, and attachment styles: A couples level analysis. *Journal of Family Violence*, *20*, 241–251.
- Rollins, B. C., & Bahr, S. J. (1976). A theory of power relationships in marriage. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, *38*, 619–627.
- Rose, S., & Frieze, I. H. (1993). Young singles' contemporary dating scripts. *Sex Roles*, *28*, 499–509.
- Ruggles, S. (1997). The rise of divorce and separation in the United States, 1880–1990. *Demography*, *34*, 455–466.
- Rusbult, C. E. (1983). A longitudinal test of the investment model: The development (and deterioration) of satisfaction and commitment in heterosexual involvements. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *45*, 101–117.
- Rusbult, C. E., & Van Lange, P. A. (2003). Interdependence, interaction, and relationships. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *54*, 351–375.
- Rusbult, C. E., Verette, J., Whitney, G. A., Slovik, L. F., & Lipkus, I. (1991). Accommodation processes in close relationships: Theory and preliminary empirical evidence. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *60*, 53–78.
- Safilios-Rothschild, C. (1976). A macro-and micro-examination of family power and love: An exchange model. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, *38*, 355–362.
- (1977). The relationship between women's work and fertility: Some methodological and theoretical issues. In S. Kupinsky (Ed.) *The Fertility of Working Women: A Synthesis of International Research* (pp. 355–368). New York: Praeger.
- Sakaluk, J. K., Todd, L. M., Milhausen, R., Lachowsky, N. J., & Undergraduate Research Group in Sexuality (URGIS). (2014). Dominant heterosexual sexual scripts in emerging adulthood: Conceptualization and measurement. *The Journal of Sex Research*, *51*, 516–531.
- Samp, J. A., & Solomon, D. H. (2001). Coping with problematic events in dating relationships: The influence of dependence power on severity appraisals and decisions to communicate. *Western Journal of Communication*, *65*, 138–160.
- Sayer, L. C., & Bianchi, S. M. (2000). Women's economic independence and the probability of divorce: A review and reexamination. *Journal of Family Issues*, *21*, 906–943.
- Sayer, L. C., England, P., Allison, P., & Kangas, N. (2011). She left, he left: How employment and satisfaction affect men's and women's decisions to leave marriages. *American journal of Sociology*, *116*, 1982.
- Scanzoni, J., & Szinovacz, M. (1980). *Family Decision-Making: A Developmental Sex Role Model*. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.
- Schoen, R., Astone, N. M., Kim, Y. J., Rothert, K., & Standish, N. J. (2002). Women's employment, marital happiness, and divorce. *Social Forces*, *81*, 643–662.
- Schreurs, K. M., & Buunk, B. P. (1996). Closeness, autonomy, equity, and relationship satisfaction in lesbian couples. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, *20*, 577–592.

- Schwartz, C. R., & Gonalons-Pons, P. (2016). Trends in relative earnings and marital dissolution: Are wives who out-earn their husbands still more likely to divorce? *The Russell Sage Foundation Journal of the Social Sciences*, 2, 218–236.
- Seabrook, R. C., Ward, L. M., Reed, L., et al. (2016). Our scripted sexuality: The development and validation of a measure of the heterosexual script and its relation to television consumption. *Emerging Adulthood*, 4, 338–355.
- Senn, T. E., Carey, M. P., Vanable, P. A., & Seward, D. X. (2009). African American men's perceptions of power in intimate relationships. *American Journal of Men's Health*, 3, 310–318.
- Shaver, P. R., & Mikulincer, M. (2005). Attachment theory and research: Resurrection of the psychodynamic approach to personality. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 39, 22–45.
- Shaver, P. R., Segev, M., & Mikulincer, M. (2011). A behavioral systems perspective on power and aggression. In P. R. Shaver & M. Mikulincer (Eds.), *Human Aggression and Violence: Causes, Manifestations and Consequences* (pp. 71–87). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Simpson, J. A., Farrell, A. K., Oriña, M. M., & Rothman, A. J. (2015). Power and social influence in relationships. In M. Mikulincer & P. R. Shaver (Eds.), *APA Handbook of Personality and Social Psychology* (pp. 393–420). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Singelis, T. M. (1994). The measurement of independent and interdependent self-construals. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 20, 580–591.
- Smith, P. K., & Bargh, J. A. (2008). Nonconscious effects of power on basic approach and avoidance tendencies. *Social Cognition*, 26, 1–24.
- Smith, P. K., & Hofmann, W. (2016). Power in everyday life. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 113, 10043–10048.
- South, S. J. (2001). Time-dependent effects of wives' employment on marital dissolution. *American Sociological Review*, 66, 226–245.
- Sprecher, S. (1994). Two sides to the breakup of dating relationships. *Personal Relationships*, 1, 199–222.
- Sprecher, S., & Felmlee, D. (1997). The balance of power in romantic heterosexual couples over time from "his" and "her" perspectives. *Sex Roles*, 37, 361–379.
- Sprecher, S., Schmeekle, M., & Felmlee, D. (2006). The principle of least interest inequality in emotional involvement in romantic relationships. *Journal of Family Issues*, 27, 1255–1280.
- Stanley, S. M., Rhoades, G. K., Scott, S. B., et al. (2016). Asymmetrically committed relationships. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 34, 1241–1259.
- Steil, J. M. I. (1997). *Marital Equality: Its Relationship to the Well-Being of Husbands and Wives*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Stets, J. E., & Henderson, D. A. (1991). Contextual factors surrounding conflict resolution while dating: Results from a national study. *Family Relations*, 40, 29–36.
- Stewart, A. J., & Rubin, Z. (1976). The power motive in the dating couple. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 34, 305–309.
- Straus, M. A., & Gelles, R. J. (1990). *Physical Violence in American Families: Risk Factors and Adaptations to Violence in 8,145 Families*. New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers.
- Sullivan, O. (2006). *Changing Gender Relations, Changing Families: Tracing the Pace of Change over Time*. New York: Rowan & Littlefield Publishers.
- Sullivan, O., & Coltrane, S. (2008, April). Men's changing contribution to housework and childcare: A discussion paper on changing family roles. Paper presented at

- the 11th Annual Conference of the Council on Contemporary Families, University of Illinois.
- Teachman, J. (2010). Wives' economic resources and risk of divorce. *Journal of Family Issues*, 31, 1305–1323.
- Thibaut, J. W., & Kelley, H. H. (1959). *The Social Psychology of Groups*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Tichenor, V. J. (1999). Status and income as gendered resources: The case of marital power. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 61, 638–650.
- Tichenor, V. (2005). Maintaining men's dominance: Negotiating identity and power when she earns more. *Sex Roles*, 53, 191–205.
- Travaglia, L. K., Overall, N. C., & Sibley, C. G. (2009). Benevolent and hostile sexism and preferences for romantic partners. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 47, 599–604.
- Van Lange, P. A., Rusbult, C. E., Drigotas, S. M., et al. (1997). Willingness to sacrifice in close relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 72, 1373.
- Van Willigen, M., & Drentea, P. (2001). Benefits of equitable relationships: The impact of sense of fairness, household division of labor, and decision making power on perceived social support. *Sex Roles*, 44, 571–597.
- Vogel, D. L., Murphy, M. J., Werner-Wilson, R. J., Cutrona, C. E., & Seeman, J. (2007). Sex differences in the use of demand and withdraw behavior in marriage: Examining the social structure hypothesis. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 54, 165.
- Vogler, C., Lyonette, C., & Wiggins, R. D. (2008). Money, power and spending decisions in intimate relationships. *The Sociological Review*, 56, 117–143.
- Waller, W., & Hill, R. (1951). *The Family: A Dynamic Interpretation*. Fort Worth: Dryden Press.
- Walsh, F. (1989). Reconsidering gender in the marital quid pro quo. In M. McGoldrick, C. M. Anderson, & F. Walsh (Eds.) *Women in Families: A Framework for Family Therapy* (pp. 267–285). New York: WW Norton.
- Walster, E., Walster, G. W., & Traupmann, J. (1978). Equity and premarital sex. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 36, 82–92.
- Wei, M., Russell, D. W., Mallinckrodt, B., & Vogel, D. L. (2007). The Experiences in Close Relationship Scale (ECR)-short form: Reliability, validity, and factor structure. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 88, 187–204.
- Weichselbaumer, D., & Winter-Ebmer, R. (2005). A meta-analysis of the international gender wage gap. *Journal of Economic Surveys*, 19, 479–511.
- Whyte, M. K. (1990). *Dating, Mating, and Marriage. Social Institutions and Social Change*. Hawthorne: Aldine Transaction.
- Wiederman, M. W., & Allgeier, E. R. (1992). Gender differences in mate selection criteria: Sociobiological or socioeconomic explanation? *Ethology and Sociobiology*, 13, 115–124.
- Wilkie, J. R., Ferree, M. M., & Ratcliff, K. S. (1998). Gender and fairness: Marital satisfaction in two-earner couples. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 60, 577–594.
- Wilson, G. D. (2010). Measurement of sex fantasy. *Sexual and Relationship Therapy*, 25, 57–67.
- Winter, D. G. (1973) *The Power Motive*. New York: Free Press.
- Wilson, P. R. (1968). Perceptual distortion of height as a function of ascribed academic status. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 74, 97–102.

- Yodanis, C. (2010). The institution of marriage. In J. Treas & S. Drobnic (Eds.) *Dividing the Domestic: Men, Women, & Housework in Cross-National Perspective* (pp. 175–191). Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Zuo, J. (1997). The effect of men's breadwinner status on their changing gender beliefs. *Sex roles*, 37, 799–816.
- Zurbriggen, E. L. (2000). Social motives and cognitive power–sex associations: Predictors of aggressive sexual behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 78, 559.

PROOF