

Commentary on Salvatore et al:

Dyadic research can clarify nonshared environmental influences on alcohol use disorder and divorce

James A. Cranford, Ph.D.¹

¹Addiction Center, Department of Psychiatry, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI

Email: jcranfor@med.umich.edu

Word count (excluding abstract, references, tables, and figures): **728**.

Declarations of competing interest: This research was supported by grants R03 AA016780 and R21 AA015105 from the National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism (NIAAA), National Institutes of Health. The NIAAA had no further role in study design; in the analysis and interpretation of data; in the writing of the report; or in the decision to submit the paper for publication.

Key Words: Alcohol use disorder; Divorce; nonshared environment; Partner effects; Social psychological theory

Research on the genetic and environmental influences on alcohol use disorder (AUD) and divorce (DIV) tends to focus on individuals. Theory and research that includes both partners can clarify the nature of genetic and environmental effects on AUD and the marital relationship and enhance prevention and treatment efforts.

In a large-scale study of twin and sibling papers in Sweden, Salvatore et al.¹ replicated a long line of previous work²⁻³ showing a relationship between alcohol use disorder (AUD) and divorce (DIV). Although most of the covariance between AUD and DIV was attributable to genetic factors, almost half was accounted for by nonshared environmental factors, leading Salvatore et al. to suggest that “one’s partner may be a meaningful nonshared environment that contributes to the propensity to develop AUD or become divorced.” A similar conclusion about the partner as a source of nonshared environmental variance in marital outcomes was reached in previous studies of genetic influence on risk of divorce⁴⁻⁵ and marital quality⁶⁻⁸, and by a genetically informed study of alcohol use and marital conflict⁹.

One implication of Salvatore et al.’s suggestion is that better understanding of the influence of nonshared environment on the covariation between AUD and DIV can be achieved by theory and research that incorporates both spouses¹⁰. For example, results from a study of Swedish twin

This is the author manuscript accepted for publication and has undergone full peer review but has not been through the copyediting, typesetting, pagination and proofreading process, which may lead to differences between this version and the Version of Record. Please cite this article as doi: [10.1111/add.13768](https://doi.org/10.1111/add.13768)

women and their male partners showed large nonshared environment influences on both partners' marital quality, and on the overlap in wives' and husbands' marital quality⁸. The translation of findings from genetically informed studies indicating partner influence can be facilitated by theoretical frameworks from social psychology. Dyadic models have a long history in social psychology¹¹, and the recent evolution of relationship science has motivated the development of models that explicitly focus on the dyadic context of substance use. For example, the Actor-Partner Interdependence Model (APIM) provides a conceptual and statistical framework for examining dyadic relationships by distinguishing *actor effects* (i.e., the effect of a person's score on some predictor variable with the same person's score on an outcome variable) and *partner effects* (i.e., the effect of a person's score on some predictor variable with their partner's score on an outcome variable)¹²⁻¹³. This dyadic model is ideally suited to address questions about "partner effects" as a "nonshared environment" with implications for AUD and DIV. For example, we used the APIM to test hypotheses about the longitudinal association between husbands' and wives' AUD, marital interactions, and marital adjustment. Husbands' AUD predicted a lower ratio of positive to negative behaviors among wives 3 years later but was not associated with their own marital behavior, nor was it associated with their own or their wives' marital adjustment 9 years later. By contrast, wives' AUD and P/N ratio were independently associated with their own and their husbands' marital adjustment. These findings suggested that marital adjustment in ALC couples may be driven more by the wives' than the husbands' AUD and marital behaviors¹⁴.

Salvatore et al. also acknowledged remaining questions about "the specific factors and mechanisms that contribute to these latent genetic and environmental correlations." Recent extensions of the APIM focusing on cognitive and behavioral mediators of associations between alcohol use and marital outcomes have been advanced¹⁵, and the availability of large dyadic data sets¹⁶ that include genetic and substance use data offers the opportunity to test dyadic hypotheses about genetic and environmental influences on alcohol and marital outcomes. In addition, a recently advanced Social-Attributional Model of alcohol reinforcement¹⁷ suggests possible mechanisms for the effects of relationship processes on alcohol use. This model predicts that the degree of reinforcement from alcohol varies as a function of social context. In a large-scale laboratory study of marital interactions, alcohol consumption reduced negative behaviors, reduced negative reciprocity, and increased self-reported reward selectively among couples who were dissatisfied with their relationships¹⁸. These results indicate acute alcohol reinforcement as one mechanism explaining prospective links between marital distress and alcohol problems.

In summary, Salvatore et al.'s conclusions about relationship partners as important sources of nonshared variance and their questions about specific mechanisms underlying associations between AUD and DIV are amenable to social psychological theory and research on partner effects and potential mediators of the bidirectional relationships between social interaction and substance use. As noted by others¹⁹, we believe that continued collaboration between scientists studying genetics

and social behavior will advance our understanding of the developmental dynamics of alcohol involvement and marriage and maximize the impact of prevention and treatment efforts.

References

1. Salvatore JE, Lönn SL, Sundquist J, Lichtenstein P, Sundquist K, Kendler KS. Alcohol use disorder and divorce: Evidence for a genetic correlation in a population-based Swedish sample. *Addiction*. [published online December 16, 2016]
2. U.S. Department of Labor. 1889. A report on marriage and divorce in the United States, 1867 to 1886. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.
3. Leonard KE, Smith PH, Homish GG. Concordant and discordant alcohol, tobacco, and marijuana use as predictors of marital dissolution. *Psychol Addict Behav*. 2014;28(3):780-9.
4. McGue M, Lykken DT. Genetic influence on risk of divorce. *Psychol Sci*. 1992;3(6):368-73.
5. Jocklin V, McGue M, Lykken DT. Personality and divorce: A genetic analysis. *J Pers Soc Psychol*. 1996;71(2):288-99.
6. Spotts EL, Ganiban JM. Spouse, parent, and co-workers: Relationships and roles during adulthood. In: Horwitz BN, Neiderhiser JM, editors. *Gene-environment interplay in interpersonal relationships across the lifespan*. Advances in Behavior Genetics. 3. New York, NY: Springer 2015. pp. 171-202.
7. Spotts EL, Prescott C, Kendler K. Examining the origins of gender differences in marital quality: A behavior genetic analysis. *J Fam Psychol*. 2006;20(4):605-13.
8. Spotts EL, Neiderhiser JM, Towers H, Hansson K, Lichtenstein P, Cederblad M, et al. Genetic and environmental influences on marital relationships. *J Fam Psychol*. 2004;18(1):107-19.
9. Salvatore JE, Prom-Wormley E, Prescott CA, Kendler KS. Overlapping genetic and environmental influences among men's alcohol consumption and problems, romantic quality and social support. *Psychol Med*. 2015;45(11):2353-64.
10. Whisman MA, Uebelacker LA, Weinstock LM. Psychopathology and marital satisfaction: The importance of evaluating both partners. *J Consult Clin Psych*. 2004;72(5):830-8.
11. Sears RR. A theoretical framework for personality and social behavior. *Am Psychol*. 1951;6(9):476-82.
12. Kenny DA, Ledermann T. Detecting, measuring, and testing dyadic patterns in the actor-partner interdependence model. *J Fam Psychol*. 2010;24(3):359-66.
13. Reed RG, Butler EA, Kenny DA. Dyadic models for the study of health. *Soc Personal Psychol Compass*. 2013;7(4):228-45.
14. Cranford JA, Floyd FJ, Schulenberg JE, Zucker RA. Husbands' and wives' alcohol use disorders and marital interactions as longitudinal predictors of marital adjustment. *J Abnorm Psychol*. 2011;120(1):210-22.

15. Rodriguez LM, Neighbors C, Knee CR. Problematic alcohol use and marital distress: An interdependence theory perspective. *Addict Res Theory*. 2014;22(4):294-312.
16. Birditt KS, Cranford JA, Manalel JA, Antonucci TC. Drinking patterns among older couples: Longitudinal associations with negative marital quality. *J Gerontol B Psychol Sci Soc Sci*. 2016;71(5):775-85.
17. Fairbairn CE, Testa M. Relationship quality and alcohol-related social reinforcement during couples interaction. *Clin Psychol Sci*. [published online September 7, 2016]
18. Fairbairn CE, Sayette MA. A social-attributional analysis of alcohol response. *Psychol Bull*. 2014;140(5):1361-82.
19. Institute of Medicine. *Genes, Behavior, and the Social Environment: Moving Beyond the Nature/Nurture Debate*. Hernandez LM, Blazer DG, editors: The National Academies Press; 2006.

Author Manuscript