

# <sup>1</sup> dySEM: An *R* Package for Dyadic Structural Equation Modeling with Latent Variables

<sup>3</sup> John Kitchener Sakaluk  <sup>1</sup> and Omar J. Camanto  <sup>1</sup>

<sup>4</sup> 1 Department of Psychology, Western University, Canada

DOI: [10.xxxxxx/draft](https://doi.org/10.xxxxxx/draft)

## Software

- [Review](#) 
- [Repository](#) 
- [Archive](#) 

Editor: [Open Journals](#) 

## Reviewers:

- [@openjournals](#)

Submitted: 01 January 1970

Published: unpublished

## License

Authors of papers retain copyright and release the work under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License ([CC BY 4.0](#)).<sup>17</sup><sup>18</sup><sup>19</sup>

## <sup>5</sup> Summary

<sup>6</sup> dySEM is an *R* package ([R Core Team, 2024](#)) that was created to make it easier for users to <sup>7</sup> deploy the widely popular lavaan package ([Rosseel, 2012](#)) to fit structural equation models <sup>8</sup> (SEMs) using latent variables to data sets with dependent observations ([Little, 2013](#)) collected <sup>9</sup> from interdependent dyads (e.g., romantic partners, pairs of friends, parents, a parent and a <sup>10</sup> child, etc.) ([Kenny, Kashy, & Cook, 2006](#)). Initially, the package was exclusively designed to <sup>11</sup> facilitate the testing of dyadic invariance ([Sakaluk, Fisher, & Kilshaw, 2021](#))—the psychometric <sup>12</sup> equivalence of survey responses across members of dyads. However, the package has since <sup>13</sup> been expanded to include functions that streamline the process of specifying, fitting, and <sup>14</sup> reporting on a variety of models for dyadic data that are amenable to specification in SEM <sup>15</sup> with latent variables (e.g., [Kim & Kim, 2022](#); [Sakaluk et al., 2025](#)).

Currently, dySEM facilitates the deployment of several kinds of dyadic SEMs, including:

- “uni-construct” dyadic models: models in which both members of the dyad are measured on the same, singular construct (e.g., both partners complete a measure of relationship satisfaction)([Sakaluk, 2021](#); [Sakaluk et al., 2025](#));
- “bi-construct” dyadic models: models in which each member of the dyad is measured on two different constructs, with one being used to predict the other (e.g., the popular Actor-Partner Interdependence Model [APIM], and the less popular Common Fate Model [CFM])([Kenny, 1996, 2018](#); [Kenny et al., 2006](#); [Kim & Kim, 2022](#); [Ledermann & Kenny, 2012](#))
- “multi-construct” dyadic models: models in which each member of the dyad is measured on multiple constructs, such as when both partners are asked to complete a “multidimensional” survey measure (e.g., a measure of relationship quality with subscales for satisfaction, commitment, intimacy, etc.)

## <sup>29</sup> Statement of Need

<sup>30</sup> Models of dyadic data must simultaneously accomplish two analytic goals:

- <sup>31</sup> 1. Mitigating the impact of non-independent observations on inference when using data <sup>32</sup> collected from members of dyads (which otherwise would inflate rates of false-positive <sup>33</sup> effects)([McCoach & Adelson, 2010](#)); and
- <sup>34</sup> 2. Somehow representing the theoretical notion of interdependence or “togetherness” that <sup>35</sup> is central to dyadic research ([Kenny, 1996](#); [Rusbult & Van Lange, 2003](#))

<sup>36</sup> Though infrequently adopted ([Ledermann & Kenny, 2017](#); [Sakaluk et al., 2025](#)), the combination <sup>37</sup> of (a) the SEM framework with (b) the use of latent variables can provide researchers a <sup>38</sup> powerful analytic framework to accomplish both of these goals, while simultaneously mitigating <sup>39</sup> the biasing ([Cole & Preacher, 2014](#)) and Type-I/false-positive boosting impact of measurement

40 error (Westfall & Yarkoni, 2016) that is often present in survey data , and which is particularly  
 41 pronounced under analytic conditions common to dyadic data analysis (Sakaluk et al., 2025).

42 But whereas SEM software—like lavaan (Rosseel, 2012)—can be used to fit dyadic SEMs with  
 43 latent variables, the process of specifying, fitting, interpreting, and reporting on such models  
 44 can be arduous and error-prone, particularly for researchers who are new to SEM or to dyadic  
 45 data analysis. We see these as considerable barriers to adoption of dyadic SEM, and believe  
 46 that open-source software can help to lower these barriers (Sakaluk et al., 2025).

47 dySEM is available both on GitHub (<https://github.com/jsakaluk/dySEM>, <https://jsakaluk.github.io/dySEM/index.html>) and CRAN (<https://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/dySEM/index.html>), and  
 48 was created to simplify the process of using dyadic SEM, making it easier for researchers to  
 49 leverage the power of dyadic SEMs with latent variables in their own work. Indeed, dySEM can  
 50 typically take an analytic workflow that would otherwise require dozens—if not hundreds—of  
 51 lines of syntax to be manually written, and reduce it to but a handful or two of lines of  
 52 (more readable) syntax. For example, the lavaan script required for a user to fit a fully  
 53 distinguishable latent APIM (i.e., no dyadic equality constraints made on any portion of the  
 54 measurement or structural portions of the model; for a more detailed description, see Kim  
 55 & Kim (2022))—for hypothetical dyadic data from couples on relationship satisfaction and  
 56 commitment—would look something like:

```
apim.script <- '  
  
#Measurement Model  
  
#Loadings  
Sat1=~NA*sat.g.1_1+sat.g.1_2+sat.g.1_3+sat.g.1_4+sat.g.1_5  
Sat2=~NA*sat.g.2_1+sat.g.2_2+sat.g.2_3+sat.g.2_4+sat.g.2_5  
  
Com1=~NA*com.1_1+com.1_2+com.1_3+com.1_4+com.1_5  
Com2=~NA*com.2_1+com.2_2+com.2_3+com.2_4+com.2_5  
  
#Residual Variances  
sat.g.1_1 ~~ sat.g.1_1  
sat.g.1_2 ~~ sat.g.1_2  
sat.g.1_3 ~~ sat.g.1_3  
sat.g.1_4 ~~ sat.g.1_4  
sat.g.1_5 ~~ sat.g.1_5  
  
sat.g.2_1 ~~ sat.g.2_1  
sat.g.2_2 ~~ sat.g.2_2  
sat.g.2_3 ~~ sat.g.2_3  
sat.g.2_4 ~~ sat.g.2_4  
sat.g.2_5 ~~ sat.g.2_5  
  
com.1_1 ~~ com.1_1  
com.1_2 ~~ com.1_2  
com.1_3 ~~ com.1_3  
com.1_4 ~~ com.1_4  
com.1_5 ~~ com.1_5  
  
com.2_1 ~~ com.2_1  
com.2_2 ~~ com.2_2  
com.2_3 ~~ com.2_3  
com.2_4 ~~ com.2_4'
```

```

com.2_5 ~~ com.2_5

#Residual Covariances
sat.g.1_1 ~~ sat.g.2_1
sat.g.1_2 ~~ sat.g.2_2
sat.g.1_3 ~~ sat.g.2_3
sat.g.1_4 ~~ sat.g.2_4
sat.g.1_5 ~~ sat.g.2_5

com.1_1 ~~ com.2_1
com.1_2 ~~ com.2_2
com.1_3 ~~ com.2_3
com.1_4 ~~ com.2_4
com.1_5 ~~ com.2_5

#Structural Model

#Latent (Co)Variances
Sat1 ~~ 1*Sat1
Sat2 ~~ 1*Sat2
Sat1 ~~ Sat2

Com1 ~~ 1*Com1
Com2 ~~ 1*Com2
Com1 ~~ Com2

#Latent Actor Effects
Com1 ~ a1*Sat1
Com2 ~ a2*Sat2

#Latent Partner Effects
Com1 ~ p1*Sat2
Com2 ~ p2*Sat1
'

```

<sup>58</sup> To generate the very same script with dySEM:

```

scriptAPI(dvn, lvxname = "Sat", lvyname = "Com",
          constr_dy_x_meas = "none",
          constr_dy_y_meas = "none",
          constr_dy_x_struct = "none",
          constr_dy_y_struct = "none",
          constr_dy_xy_struct = "none")

```

## <sup>59</sup> State of the Field

<sup>60</sup> There are several other *R*-based tools for dyadic data analysis available for free use, owing  
<sup>61</sup> to a research culture that promotes the generous provision of methodological and analytic  
<sup>62</sup> support (e.g., [Campbell & Kashy, 2002](#); [Ledermann & Kenny, 2015](#); [Stas, Kenny, Mayer,](#)  
<sup>63</sup> & [Loeys, 2018](#)). dySEM, however, is distinctive in both its scope, licensing (and underlying  
<sup>64</sup> values), and analytic robustness. A comparison of dySEM versus competitor offerings for dyadic  
<sup>65</sup> SEM with latent variables and observed variable path analysis is available below in [??](#). At a  
<sup>66</sup> high level, dySEM is distinguished by being fully open-source (i.e., all source code is available  
<sup>67</sup> to interested users, and can be modified and built upon by others following a GNU General

68 Public License) and supported by a large number of (transparent) unit-tests, while offering  
 69 convenient functionality for scripting, calculating, and outputting for a large variety of dyadic  
 70 SEM models (of which, it is further distinguished by offering the greatest amount of support  
 71 for [and variety of] latent variable models). And when compared to all alternatives, dySEM  
 72 appears to be the only offering for which unit testing for quality-control is extensive (and  
 73 growing) and made transparent to the user. We therefore immodestly believe dySEM is—and  
 74 will continue to be—among the more competitive software solutions for dyadic SEM.

**Table 1:** Comparison of dyadic SEM software.

Software	Free	OS Code	OS Tests	Active	Scripting	Documentation
<i>dySEM</i> ( <i>R</i> Package: GitHub/CRAN)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	13 distinct uni-, bi-, and multi-construct dyadic SEMs	Extensive
“DyadR” Shiny Apps (GUI-Based)	Yes	No	No	Yes	6 models (only 1 latent)	Extensive
<i>srm</i> ( <i>R</i> Package: GitHub/CRAN)	Yes	Yes	No	No	1 model (non-latent)	Minimal
<i>lavaan.srm</i> ( <i>R</i> Package: GitHub)	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	1 model (non-latent)	Moderate
<i>lavaan</i> ( <i>R</i> Package: GitHub/CRAN)	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	None	Extensive
Proprietary software (MPlus, AMOS, SAS, etc..)	No	No	No	Mixed	None	Minimal

## 75 Software Design

### 76 Design Philosophy

77 *dySEM* has been designed for users to follow a generalized 4-step workflow:

- 78 1. *scrape* variable information from a data frame of dyadic data
- 79 2. *script* the dyadic SEM of interest with one of *dySEM*'s “scripter” functions
- 80 3. *fit* the scripted model with *lavaan*
- 81 4. Use *dySEM* “outputter” functions to generate reproducible tabular and graphical summaries  
82 of the fitted model

83 By building on *lavaan* (Rosseel, 2012), *dySEM* leverages a widely used, open-source SEM  
 84 package (and its companion packages) with a large and active user base, and which is under  
 85 ongoing development. *dySEM*'s capacities should therefore be able to grow alongside *lavaan*'s.

86 With *dySEM*, we strive to promote an inclusive data analytic ecosystem. The added demand  
 87 and complexity of implementing certain dyadic models or calculating certain “corrections”  
 88 (Olsen & Kenny, 2006) may be one (among many) causes of the under-representation of  
 89 certain types of couples in research (McGoray, Emery, Garr-Schultz, & Finkel, 2023). To that

90 end, all scripting functionality in dySEM has been designed to default to an “indistinguishable”  
 91 model (i.e., one amenable to analyzing gender- and sexuality-diverse couples)–the user must  
 92 deliberately over-ride these defaults, putting the burden of proof on them to defend the choice  
 93 of a distinguishable model and their distinguishing feature (Kenny et al., 2006)–and offers  
 94 helper functionality to navigate additional indices that are requested when fitting such models  
 95 (Olsen & Kenny, 2006).

## 96 Functionality

97 dySEM requires dyadic data to be available in a data frame that is in “dyad” or “wide” form  
 98 (i.e., one row per dyad) (Kenny et al., 2006), and with variable names that follow a discernible  
 99 pattern. dySEM “scrapes” this information about variables into a list, which serves as a key  
 100 input of its scripter functions. For more information, see our tutorial on naming conventions,  
 101 and documentation for `scrapeVarCross()`.

102 The largest source of value in dySEM’s code-base are its scripters (i.e., functions beginning  
 103 with the term “script”), which generate character objects of syntax for dyadic SEMs that can  
 104 be immediately passed to lavaan for model fitting, with whatever optionality (e.g., estimator  
 105 selection, missing data treatment) the user desires. These scripters generally have optionality  
 106 for:

- 107   ■ what method of scale-setting one uses (i.e., “fixed factor”/standardized latent variance  
   or “marker variable”/constraining a factor loading to 1)(Little, 2013)
- 108   ■ what kinds of dyadic equality constraints one wants to impose on the measurement  
   and/or structural portions of the model (e.g, for dyadic invariance testing; to facilitate  
   dyadic comparisons of structural parameters)(Sakaluk, Fisher, et al., 2021)
- 109   ■ whether to include lavaan syntax to compute “boutique” estimates and tests (e.g., the  
   k parameter of dyadic patterns for an APIM) (Kenny & Ledermann, 2010), and
- 110   ■ whether to write and export .txt file of the generated script (e.g, to post on the Open  
   Science Framework)

116 Some examples (with varied use of these arguments):

```
#Example 1: A fully invariant APIM with actor effects constrained
# across partners, partner effects freely estimated

apim.script <- scriptAPIM(dvnx, lvxname = "Sat", lvynname = "Com",
  constr_dy_x_meas = c("loadings", "intercepts", "residuals"),
  constr_dy_y_meas = c("loadings", "intercepts", "residuals"),
  constr_dy_xy_struct = c("actors"), est_k = TRUE,
  scaleset = "FF")

apim.mod <- lavaan::cfa(apim.script, data = commitmentQ)

#Example 2: A correlated dyadic factors model that is
# "residually invariant" (i.e., constraints on
# the pattern, loadings, intercepts, and residuals across dyad members,
#but none for the parameters in the structural portion of the model)
# and which writes ResidualInvariance.txt to working directory

sat.resid.script <- scriptCor(dvn, lvname = "Sat",
  constr_dy_meas = c("loadings",
  "intercepts",
  "residuals"),
  constr_dy_struct = "none",
  writeTo = ".")
```

```

    fileName = "ResidualInvariance" )

sat.resid.mod <- lavaan::cfa(sat.resid.script, data = commitmentM,
estimator = "mlr", missing = "ml")

117 dySEM also provides assistance with easy, reproducible reporting from these models. Outputter
118 functions (beginning with "output") can be used to:
119
120     ▪ generate tables of parameter estimates from either/both the measurement portion and/or
121         structural portion of a model
122     ▪ generate path diagrams via the semPlot package (Epskamp, 2015) for visualizing model
123         structure and parameter estimates
124     ▪ generate tables of model comparisons (e.g., in dyadic invariance testing)
125     ▪ generate tables of "boutique" estimates and tests (e.g., Langrange multiplier tests for
126         identifying item/parameter-sources of noninvariance; correlations among latent variables),
127         and
128     ▪ compute "boutique" values (e.g., alternative metrics of reliability; effect sizes of dyadic
129         noninvariance)

129 When tables are created, they can be kept in either data frame form (e.g., to supply visualiza-
130 tions), or exported as .rtf, while path diagrams are exported as .png.

131 For example:
```


```

#Example 1: Export a table of measurement parameter estimates
# named APIM_Measurement_Table, to working directory.
# Table is generated by gt::gt()
outputParamTab(dvnxy, model = "apim", gtTab = TRUE ,
               apim.mod, tabletype = "measurement",
               writeTo = ".", fileName = "APIM_Measurement_Table")
```

Latent Factor	Indicator	Loading	SE	Z	p-value	Std. Loading	Intercept
Sat1	sat.g.1_1	1.976	0.129	15.290	< .001	0.925	6.609
Sat1	sat.g.1_2	1.858	0.137	13.612	< .001	0.878	6.591
Sat1	sat.g.1_3	1.980	0.130	15.175	< .001	0.917	6.391
Sat1	sat.g.1_4	1.775	0.133	13.387	< .001	0.851	6.673
Sat1	sat.g.1_5	1.891	0.145	13.075	< .001	0.844	6.445
Sat2	sat.g.2_1	1.976	0.129	15.290	< .001	0.925	6.918
Sat2	sat.g.2_2	1.858	0.137	13.612	< .001	0.878	6.927
Sat2	sat.g.2_3	1.980	0.130	15.175	< .001	0.917	6.727
Sat2	sat.g.2_4	1.775	0.133	13.387	< .001	0.851	7.155
Sat2	sat.g.2_5	1.891	0.145	13.075	< .001	0.844	6.864
Com1	com.1_1	1.459	0.092	15.875	< .001	0.921	7.527
Com1	com.1_2	1.348	0.094	14.374	< .001	0.842	7.236
Com1	com.1_3	0.194	0.177	1.096	0.273	0.083	4.809
Com1	com.1_4	-0.076	0.176	-0.430	0.667	-0.032	4.300
Com1	com.1_5	1.440	0.090	15.933	< .001	0.918	7.282
Com2	com.2_1	1.459	0.092	15.875	< .001	0.916	7.327
Com2	com.2_2	1.348	0.094	14.374	< .001	0.835	7.345
Com2	com.2_3	0.194	0.177	1.096	0.273	0.080	5.118
Com2	com.2_4	-0.076	0.176	-0.430	0.667	-0.031	4.136
Com2	com.2_5	1.440	0.090	15.933	< .001	0.914	7.191

132 : outputParamTab( ).

#Example 2: Export a path diagram named  
# APIM\_Diagram.png to working directory  
# named APIM\_Measurement\_Table, to working directory  
outputParamFig(apim.mod, figtype = "standardized",  
writeTo = ".", fileName = "APIM Diagram")



133 : outputParamFig().

#Example 3: Generate a table of Langrange Multiplier tests  
# for a dyadic invariance model. Do not filter for  
# significance, and output as a gt::gt() table.  
outputConstraintTab(sat.resids.mod, filterSig = FALSE, gtTab = TRUE)

param1	constraint	param2	chi2	df	pvalue	sig
Satf == sat.g1_f	==	Satm == sat.g1_m	1.131	1	0.288	NA
Satf == sat.g2_f	==	Satm == sat.g2_m	0.633	1	0.426	NA
Satf == sat.g3_f	==	Satm == sat.g3_m	0.060	1	0.806	NA
Satf == sat.g4_f	==	Satm == sat.g4_m	1.839	1	0.175	NA
Satf == sat.g5_f	==	Satm == sat.g5_m	3.603	1	0.058	NA
sat.g1_f ~1	==	sat.g1_m ~1	0.057	1	0.812	NA
sat.g2_f ~1	==	sat.g2_m ~1	1.316	1	0.251	NA
sat.g3_f ~1	==	sat.g3_m ~1	0.048	1	0.827	NA
sat.g4_f ~1	==	sat.g4_m ~1	0.103	1	0.748	NA
sat.g5_f ~1	==	sat.g5_m ~1	2.090	1	0.148	NA
sat.g1_f ~~ sat.g1_f	==	sat.g1_m ~~ sat.g1_m	22.977	1	0.000	***
sat.g2_f ~~ sat.g2_f	==	sat.g2_m ~~ sat.g2_m	0.263	1	0.608	NA
sat.g3_f ~~ sat.g3_f	==	sat.g3_m ~~ sat.g3_m	0.317	1	0.573	NA
sat.g4_f ~~ sat.g4_f	==	sat.g4_m ~~ sat.g4_m	2.422	1	0.120	NA
sat.g5_f ~~ sat.g5_f	==	sat.g5_m ~~ sat.g5_m	17.185	1	0.000	***

134 : outputConstraintTab( ).

## 135 Research Impact

136 Since its initial release on GitHub in 2021, dySEM has been accepted to CRAN (where it has  
137 been downloaded more than 4,000 times). dySEM has been used in published research, both by  
138 members of our research team (e.g., [Sakaluk, Quinn-Nilas, et al., 2021](#)) and by other teams in  
139 the field (e.g., [Girme & Overall, 2025](#)). dySEM has also featured in workshops we have delivered  
140 at conferences for which dyadic data analysis is an emphasis, and dyadic SEM as a framework,  
141 more generally, is enjoying a phase of renewed methodological interest (e.g. [Joel, Eastwick, &](#)  
142 [Khera, 2025](#); [Sakaluk et al., 2025](#)).

## 143 AI Usage Disclosure

144 dySEM's development began in 2019, well before the advent of mainstream AI tools, and the  
145 bulk of the package's current design, functionality, and roadmap have been developed without  
146 AI assistance. Our development team now uses AI tools (e.g., Copilot autocompletion within  
147 RStudio; increasing use of Cursor as an AI-boosted IDE), though primarily to assist with  
148 rote and/or repetitious tasks (e.g., to increase testing coverage of various input or output  
149 requirements; to increase consistency of documentation across related functions, etc.). A  
150 critical mass of new functionality and its more substantive testing remains done "by hand", and  
151 this manuscript was written almost exclusively without AI assistance (save for spotting/resolving  
152 an error with the Markdown table formatting).

## 153 Acknowledgements

154 We wish to thank Drs. William Chopik, Christopher Chartier, Lorne Campbell, and Brent  
155 Donnellan for their facilitating the special issue of Personal Relationships that led to dySEM's  
156 creation ([Chopik, Chartier, Campbell, & Brent Donnellan, 2020](#)). We are also very appreciative  
157 for the late Dr. Deborah Kashy's enthusiasm towards dySEM's creation and functionality.

158 The development of dySEM has been supported by three internal grants from Western University:

- 159   ■ Western Knowledge Mobilization and Research-Creation Grant (2024-2025)
- 160   ■ Western Research Mobilization, Creation, & Innovation Grants for SSHRC-related  
161       Research (2023-2024)
- 162   ■ Western Knowledge Mobilization Innovation Grants (2021-2022)

## 163 References

- 164 Campbell, L., & Kashy, D. A. (2002). Estimating actor, partner, and interaction effects for  
165 dyadic data using PROC MIXED and HLM: A user-friendly guide. *Personal Relationships*,  
166 9(3), 327–342. doi:[10.1111/1475-6811.00023](https://doi.org/10.1111/1475-6811.00023)
- 167 Chopik, W. J., Chartier, C. R., Campbell, L., & Brent Donnellan, M. (2020). Relationship  
168 science and the credibility revolution: An introduction to the first part of the special issue.  
169 *Personal Relationships*, 27(1), 132–137. doi:[10.1111/pere.12312](https://doi.org/10.1111/pere.12312)
- 170 Cole, D. A., & Preacher, K. J. (2014). Manifest variable path analysis: Potentially serious and  
171 misleading consequences due to uncorrected measurement error. *Psychological Methods*,  
172 19(2), 300–315. doi:[10.1037/a0033805](https://doi.org/10.1037/a0033805)
- 173 Epskamp, S. (2015). semPlot: Unified visualizations of structural equation models. *Structural Equation Modeling: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, 22(3), 474–483.  
174 doi:[10.1080/10705511.2014.937847](https://doi.org/10.1080/10705511.2014.937847)
- 176 Girme, Y. U., & Overall, N. C. (2025). Greater average levels of relatedness need fulfilment

- 177 across daily and monthly life predict lower attachment insecurities across time. *Journal of  
178 Social and Personal Relationships*, 42(5), 1127–1148. doi:[10.1177/02654075231162390](https://doi.org/10.1177/02654075231162390)
- 179 Joel, S., Eastwick, P. W., & Khera, D. (2025). A credibility revolution for relationship science:  
180 Where can we step up our game? *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 19(2).  
181 doi:[10.1111/spc3.70042](https://doi.org/10.1111/spc3.70042)
- 182 Kenny, D. A. (1996). Models of non-independence in dyadic research. *Journal of Social and  
183 Personal Relationships*, 13(2), 279–294. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1177/0265407596132007>
- 184 Kenny, D. A. (2018). Reflections on the actor-partner interdependence model. *Personal  
185 Relationships*, 25(2), 160–170. doi:[10.1111/pere.12240](https://doi.org/10.1111/pere.12240)
- 186 Kenny, D. A., Kashy, D. A., & Cook, W. L. (2006). *Dyadic data analysis*. New York, NY:  
187 Guilford Press.
- 188 Kenny, D. A., & Ledermann, T. (2010). Detecting, measuring, and testing dyadic patterns in  
189 the actor–partner interdependence model. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 24(3), 359–366.  
190 doi:[10.1037/a0019651](https://doi.org/10.1037/a0019651)
- 191 Kim, H., & Kim, J.-S. (2022). Extending the actor–partner interdependence model to  
192 accommodate multivariate dyadic data using latent variables. *Psychological Methods*.  
193 doi:[10.1037/met0000531](https://doi.org/10.1037/met0000531)
- 194 Ledermann, T., & Kenny, D. A. (2012). The common fate model for dyadic data: Variations  
195 of a theoretically important but underutilized model. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 26(1),  
196 140–148. doi:[10.1037/a0026624](https://doi.org/10.1037/a0026624)
- 197 Ledermann, T., & Kenny, D. A. (2015). A toolbox with programs to restructure and  
198 describe dyadic data. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 32(8), 997–1011.  
199 doi:[10.1177/0265407514555273](https://doi.org/10.1177/0265407514555273)
- 200 Ledermann, T., & Kenny, D. A. (2017). Analyzing dyadic data with multilevel modeling versus  
201 structural equation modeling: A tale of two methods. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 31(4),  
202 442–452. doi:[10.1037/fam0000290](https://doi.org/10.1037/fam0000290)
- 203 Little, T. D. (2013). *Longitudinal structural equation modeling*. New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- 204 McCoach, D. B., & Adelson, J. L. (2010). Dealing with dependence (part i): Under-  
205 standing the effects of clustered data. *Gifted Child Quarterly*, 54(2), 152–155.  
206 doi:[10.1177/0016986210363076](https://doi.org/10.1177/0016986210363076)
- 207 McGorray, E. L., Emery, L. F., Garr-Schultz, A., & Finkel, E. J. (2023). “Mostly white, hetero-  
208 sexual couples”: Examining demographic diversity and reporting practices in relationship  
209 science research samples. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 125(2), 316–344.  
210 doi:[10.1037/pspi0000417](https://doi.org/10.1037/pspi0000417)
- 211 Olsen, J. A., & Kenny, D. A. (2006). Structural equation modeling with interchangeable dyads.  
212 *Psychological Methods*, 11(2), 127–141. doi:[10.1037/1082-989X.11.2.127](https://doi.org/10.1037/1082-989X.11.2.127)
- 213 R Core Team. (2024). R: A language and environment for statistical computing. Vienna,  
214 Austria: R Foundation for Statistical Computing. Retrieved from <https://www.R-project.org/>
- 216 Rosseel, Y. (2012). Lavaan : An r package for structural equation modeling. *Journal of  
217 Statistical Software*, 48(2). doi:[10.18637/jss.v048.i02](https://doi.org/10.18637/jss.v048.i02)
- 218 Rusbult, C. E., & Van Lange, P. A. M. (2003). Interdependence, interaction, and  
219 relationships. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 54(1), 351–375. doi:[10.1146/annurev.psych.54.101601.145059](https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.54.101601.145059)
- 221 Sakaluk, J. K. (2021). Introducing the bifactor dyadic (BiDy) model: New possibilities for the  
222 analysis of dyads. Presented at the Relationships preconference of the annual meeting of

- 223 the society for personality and social psychology, Virtual/Online.
- 224 Sakaluk, J. K., Fisher, A. N., & Kilshaw, R. E. (2021). Dyadic measurement invariance and its  
225 importance for replicability in romantic relationship science. *Personal Relationships*, 28(1),  
226 190–226. doi:[10.1111/pere.12341](https://doi.org/10.1111/pere.12341)
- 227 Sakaluk, J. K., Joel, S., Quinn-Nilas, C., Camanto, O. J., Pevie, N. W., Tu, E., & Jorgensen-  
228 Wells, M. A. (2025). A renewal of dyadic structural equation modeling with latent variables:  
229 Clarifications, methodological advantages, and new directions. *Social and Personality  
Psychology Compass*, 19, e70045. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1111/spc3.70045>
- 231 Sakaluk, J. K., Quinn-Nilas, C., Fisher, A. N., Leshner, C. E., Huber, E., & Wood, J. R.  
232 (2021). Sameness and difference in psychological research on consensually non-monogamous  
233 relationships: The need for invariance and equivalence testing. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*,  
234 50(4), 1341–1365. doi:[10.1007/s10508-020-01794-9](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10508-020-01794-9)
- 235 Stas, L., Kenny, D. A., Mayer, A., & Loeys, T. (2018). Giving dyadic data analysis away: A  
236 user-friendly app for actor–partner interdependence models. *Personal Relationships*, 25(1),  
237 103–119. doi:[10.1111/pere.12230](https://doi.org/10.1111/pere.12230)
- 238 Westfall, J., & Yarkoni, T. (2016). Statistically controlling for confounding constructs is  
239 harder than you think. (U. S. Tran, Ed.) *PLOS ONE*, 11(3), e0152719. doi:[10.1371/journal.pone.0152719](https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0152719)

DRAFT