




## Contexts of Power Asymmetry in Academic–Nonacademic Partner Dyads: A Qualitative Study

Yaliu Yang<sup>1</sup>  Intan. Sari<sup>2\*</sup> 

<sup>1</sup> Marriage and Family Therapy Department, Iona College, New Rochelle, NY, United States

<sup>2</sup> Department of Child and Family Studies, Universitas Padjadjaran, Bandung, Indonesia

\* Corresponding author email address: intan.sari@unpad.ac.id

E d i t o r	R e v i e w e r s
Shahram Vahedi <sup>1</sup>  Professor, Department of Educational Psychology, Faculty of Educational Sciences and Psychology, Tabriz University, Tabriz, Iran vahedi117@yahoo.com	<b>Reviewer 1:</b> Masoud Asadi <sup>1</sup>  Assistant Professor, Department of Psychology and Counseling, Arak University, Arak, Iran. Email: m-asadi@araku.ac.ir <b>Reviewer 2:</b> Stephen C. L. Lau <sup>1</sup>  Professor (Assistant) at Washington University in St. Louis, United States. Email: lauc@wustl.edu

### 1. Round 1

#### 1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

You state all participants are Indonesian but do not explain how Indonesia's cultural norms (gender, collectivism, family structure) might influence power dynamics. Add a paragraph explaining why Indonesia was an informative context and how cultural particularities may shape transferability.

This statement is too general. Detail how researcher positionality (e.g., your own academic status) might have shaped interpretation and what reflexive strategies (journaling, team debriefing) were used.

Provide rationale for including this range; why exclude older or newly-formed couples? Consider discussing whether life stage (early vs. mid-career) influenced themes.

The difference between “communication and intellectual exchange” and “emotional and relational balance” sometimes blurs (e.g., emotional impact of intellectualization). Provide sharper analytic boundaries and justify why certain codes were grouped under one and not the other.

Some quotes are powerful but appear isolated. For example, “Sometimes when he explains his research, I just nod...” (P07). Briefly interpret after each quote to show how it directly informs the subtheme.

You note some nonacademic partners provide financial stability, contradicting prestige-driven asymmetry. Discuss how these deviant cases were analyzed—did you refine themes to integrate or bracket them?

Response: Revised and uploaded the manuscript.

### *1.2. Reviewer 2*

Reviewer:

Clarify recruitment channels (e.g., social media, professional networks) and inclusion/exclusion criteria. Were only current couples included? Did you check relationship duration or cohabitation status as eligibility?

Describe how you operationalized “theoretical saturation.” Did you use code frequency monitoring or memoing to determine no new themes? Include a brief explanation to enhance transparency.

You mention an “interview guide” but provide no detail about how it was developed or validated. Indicate whether you piloted the guide, sought expert feedback, or iteratively refined questions.

While you reference symbolic capital and cultural prestige, you don’t explicitly integrate gender or couple adaptation theories (e.g., equity theory, role negotiation models). Embedding your findings in these frameworks would increase theoretical sophistication.

Clarify how your model advances beyond prior dual-career or mobility studies. Perhaps include a figure or table summarizing your proposed conceptual contribution.

Since interviews addressed sensitive relationship power, reflect on possible underreporting of conflict or dissatisfaction. Mention whether you used rapport-building or anonymity assurances to mitigate this bias.

Response: Revised and uploaded the manuscript.

## **2. Revised**

Editor’s decision after revisions: Accepted.

Editor in Chief’s decision: Accepted.