

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

Yaliu Yang¹  Intan. Sari^{2*} 

¹ Marriage and Family Therapy Department, Iona College, New Rochelle, NY, United States

² Department of Child and Family Studies, Universitas Padjadjaran, Bandung, Indonesia

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

Article Info

Article type:

Original Article

How to cite this article:

Yang, Y., & Sari, I. (2025). Contexts of Power Asymmetry in Academic–Nonacademic Partner Dyads: A Qualitative Study. *Applied Family Therapy Journal*, 6(3), 1-8.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.61838/kman.aftj.6.3.12>



© 2025 the authors. Published by KMAN Publication Inc. (KMANPUB), Ontario, Canada. This is an open access article under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International (CC BY-NC 4.0) License.

ABSTRACT

Objective: This study aimed to explore and interpret the relational contexts and mechanisms that create and sustain power asymmetry in romantic relationships where one partner is an academic professional and the other is nonacademic.

Methods and Materials: A qualitative research design was employed using purposive sampling to recruit 20 Indonesian adults currently involved in academic–nonacademic romantic partnerships. Data were gathered through in-depth semi-structured interviews that focused on relationship dynamics, perceptions of influence and authority, and coping strategies. Interviews continued until theoretical saturation was reached, and all were transcribed verbatim. Thematic analysis was performed using NVivo 14 software. Codes were iteratively developed and clustered into subthemes and overarching themes to capture the multifaceted nature of power relations within these dyads. Credibility was ensured through member checking and peer debriefing.

Findings: Analysis revealed three overarching themes: communication and intellectual exchange, social and cultural power dynamics, and emotional and relational balance. Participants reported that academic partners often held symbolic intellectual authority, creating conversational imbalance and feelings of exclusion. Social prestige linked to academic titles reinforced status differences, while financial contributions and career stability sometimes shifted power toward the nonacademic partner. Career mobility and relocation often disrupted the nonacademic partner's professional development, fostering dependence and tension. Couples who actively validated each other's contributions, translated disciplinary knowledge, and set explicit boundaries were better able to manage and renegotiate power imbalances.

Conclusion: Power asymmetry in academic–nonacademic romantic dyads is dynamic and context-dependent, shaped by intellectual capital, mobility demands, and social recognition. Relational resilience emerges when couples address asymmetry openly and create strategies to balance influence and support.

Keywords: Power asymmetry; romantic relationships; academic partners; nonacademic partners

1. Introduction

Power dynamics within intimate partnerships have long been a focus of sociological and psychological inquiry, yet a nuanced understanding of power asymmetry when one partner belongs to the academic sphere and the other does not remains underexplored. The academic world shapes individuals' intellectual identity, career trajectory, and social status in distinctive ways that can permeate romantic relationships. Academic careers are frequently defined by mobility, prestige, and knowledge specialization (Álvarez et al., 2024; Liu & Au, 2024). For many early- and mid-career academics, extensive travel for conferences, fieldwork, and training opportunities is expected (Bujaki et al., 2025), and while this mobility generates intellectual capital, it can create emotional and logistical strain in romantic partnerships. These strains are intensified when partners come from different professional worlds, with divergent rhythms, social capital, and workplace cultures (Marquardt & Medeiros, 2025). In such dyads, the academic partner's highly specialized and often geographically mobile career contrasts with the nonacademic partner's typically more localized or stable trajectory, producing subtle but powerful relational tensions.

A central dimension of power asymmetry in these relationships lies in knowledge and intellectual authority. Academic partners often acquire symbolic capital through disciplinary expertise and research achievements (Buckland et al., 2024; Velicu et al., 2025). This authority can shift conversational patterns, leading to imbalanced intellectual exchanges and perceptions of superiority that challenge relational equality. Partners outside academia may feel excluded when conversations revolve around specialized research or institutional politics (Schels et al., 2024). Over time, this intellectual gap may reduce shared meaning-making and erode mutual validation (Brooks et al., 2025). While nonacademic partners can and do bring professional knowledge and pragmatic wisdom, their expertise is often undervalued when overshadowed by the symbolic prestige of academic work (Silva, 2025). Scholars have noted that such imbalances may trigger relational dissatisfaction or withdrawal if not navigated with care (Pardi & Herdi, 2024).

Another influential context involves career structures and their demands. Academic careers frequently require precarious and extended early stages before stability is achieved (Hajrizi et al., 2025; Oecd, 2024). These structural conditions, including temporary contracts, the pursuit of tenure, and pressure to publish, can create intense time

demands and unpredictability (Kizilirmak et al., 2025). Partners outside academia may perceive themselves as deprioritized due to the academic partner's devotion to research, grant writing, and conference attendance (Spieler et al., 2025). For some, these sacrifices feel unilateral, especially when relocation for academic appointments disrupts the nonacademic partner's career trajectory (MacIver et al., 2025). Such dynamics can lead to a "trailing partner" phenomenon, where one partner compromises professional growth for the other's advancement (Ramsarghey, 2023), exacerbating feelings of dependence and imbalance.

Social and cultural recognition further shapes these dyads' power asymmetry. Academic credentials confer high social prestige, often admired by families and communities (Folke et al., 2025). Titles such as "doctor" or "professor" signal authority and cultural capital, while nonacademic partners may struggle with subtle social comparisons at gatherings or among peers (Velicu et al., 2025). Conversely, nonacademic partners may contribute greater financial stability, especially in contexts where academic salaries remain uncertain or delayed (Hansen, 2025). Such role reversals complicate traditional gendered expectations (Álvarez et al., 2024), with some nonacademic women reporting tension when supporting male academic partners, and some academic women confronting societal discomfort with their higher earning potential or intellectual influence (Bujaki et al., 2025). Negotiating these cultural narratives requires relational resilience and open dialogue.

Importantly, emotional intimacy and coping strategies can either buffer or exacerbate power gaps. Research on couples navigating nonparallel career worlds shows that transparent communication, recognition of each other's contributions, and flexible role negotiation can mitigate imbalances (Pardi & Herdi, 2024; Silva, 2025). Yet, couples often struggle with the differing emotional vocabularies that academics and nonacademics bring into conflict resolution (Marquardt & Medeiros, 2025). The academic tendency to rationalize or intellectualize problems may clash with a partner's preference for affective expression (Brooks et al., 2025). In some cases, couples develop creative strategies such as redefining success jointly, establishing boundaries between work and personal life, and explicitly affirming the nonacademic partner's expertise (Velicu et al., 2025). Still, these strategies require deliberate effort and self-awareness, as well as navigating structural constraints beyond individual control.

Despite growing scholarship on dual-career academic couples (Schels et al., 2024; Varbanov et al., 2023), little is known about the cross-boundary dynamics of relationships where only one partner is embedded in academia. Most available research has centered on two-academic households and institutional support structures for them (Buckland et al., 2024; Kizilirmak et al., 2025). However, single-academic partnerships represent a distinct relational ecology, characterized by a mismatch in cultural capital, professional mobility, and career logic (MacIver et al., 2025). Understanding how these dyads negotiate power is critical, especially given the personal and professional implications for both partners, including wellbeing (Álvarez et al., 2024), identity development (Brooks et al., 2025), and long-term commitment (Velicu et al., 2025).

Given these gaps, this study seeks to explore the contexts of power asymmetry in romantic relationships where one partner is an academic and the other is not, focusing on how such couples perceive, experience, and manage relational imbalances shaped by intellectual authority, career structures, and social-cultural narratives.

2. Methods and Materials

2.1. Study Design and Participants

This study adopted a qualitative research design to explore the contexts of power asymmetry in academic–nonacademic partner dyads. A purposive sampling strategy was employed to ensure the inclusion of participants with direct experience in collaborative partnerships between academic institutions and nonacademic organizations. The study involved 20 participants from Indonesia, representing a range of sectors such as higher education, industry, governmental agencies, and civil society organizations. All participants had previously engaged in academic–nonacademic collaborations of varying duration and intensity. Recruitment continued until theoretical saturation was reached, meaning no new themes or insights emerged from additional interviews.

2.2. Measures

Data were collected through semi-structured, in-depth interviews to allow participants to describe their experiences and perceptions freely while enabling the researcher to probe emerging issues. An interview guide was developed, focusing on participants' roles in collaborative projects, decision-making processes, perceived balance or imbalance

of influence, negotiation practices, and conflict resolution strategies. Interviews were conducted in a flexible and conversational manner, with open-ended questions encouraging participants to share concrete examples of power asymmetry in their partnerships. Each interview lasted between 45 and 90 minutes, depending on the depth of discussion and the participant's availability. With participants' consent, all interviews were audio-recorded and later transcribed verbatim to ensure data accuracy and richness.

2.3. Data Analysis

Thematic analysis was performed using NVivo software version 14 to manage, organize, and code the data systematically. Analysis began with repeated readings of the transcripts to achieve immersion and familiarity with the content. Open coding was applied to identify initial categories and patterns related to power dynamics, decision-making authority, and resource allocation within partnerships. These codes were iteratively refined and grouped into broader categories to construct a conceptual understanding of the contexts influencing power asymmetry. Constant comparison was employed to ensure that emerging categories were grounded in the participants' narratives. Throughout the analysis, reflexivity was maintained to monitor the researcher's potential biases and their influence on data interpretation. Findings were validated through peer debriefing and member checking with selected participants to enhance credibility and trustworthiness.

3. Findings and Results

The study involved 20 Indonesian adults who were currently engaged in romantic relationships in which one partner was an academic professional (e.g., lecturer, researcher, or professor) and the other was a nonacademic professional (e.g., entrepreneur, administrative staff, technician, or freelancer). Participants ranged in age from 24 to 46 years ($M = 33.8$), with 11 females (55%) and 9 males (45%). The academic partners' professional levels varied, including 6 lecturers (30%), 4 assistant professors (20%), and 2 researchers (10%), while the nonacademic partners included individuals from diverse occupational backgrounds such as business and entrepreneurship ($n = 5$; 25%), administration and services ($n = 4$; 20%), technical fields ($n = 3$; 15%), and creative or freelance work ($n = 6$; 30%). The average relationship length was 6.4 years, with 7 couples (35%) dating for 2–5 years, 8 couples (40%) in long-term

relationships between 6–10 years, and 5 couples (25%) in partnerships exceeding 10 years. Regarding education, all academic partners held at least a master’s degree, while among nonacademic partners, 9 (45%) had completed undergraduate studies, 7 (35%) held high school diplomas, and 4 (20%) had vocational or technical certifications. Most

participants (14; 70%) reported living in urban areas, while 6 (30%) lived in semi-urban or rural regions. This diversity provided a rich range of experiences related to power asymmetry and relational dynamics within academic–nonacademic dyads.

Table 1

Themes, Subthemes, and Concepts of Power Asymmetry in Academic–Nonacademic Romantic Dyads

Category (Main Theme)	Subcategory	Concepts (Open Codes)
1. Communication and Intellectual Exchange	Intellectual Disparity in Conversations	academic jargon; difficulty simplifying ideas; partner feeling excluded; unequal dialogue flow
	Validation and Recognition	seeking approval; partner admiration of academic knowledge; lack of recognition of nonacademic expertise; need for respect
	Conflict in Knowledge Sharing	debates turning into lectures; dominance of academic arguments; partner withdrawal; feelings of inferiority
	Shared Learning Practices	storytelling; explaining in simple terms; mutual curiosity; bridging knowledge gap
	Emotional vs. Rational Communication	academic partner overanalyzing feelings; preference for evidence-based discussions; nonacademic emphasis on emotions; misalignment of communication styles
	Negotiation of Everyday Topics	overemphasis on intellectual framing; partner redirecting to practical aspects; dismissing complexity; prioritizing simple solutions
2. Social and Cultural Power Dynamics	Social Prestige and Status	academic status admired; family pressure; nonacademic partner feeling undervalued; symbolic power of “doctor/professor” title
	Economic Contribution	differences in income; unstable academic salaries; partner as breadwinner; imbalance in household decisions
	Lifestyle and Time Commitments	long working hours; conferences and travel; neglect of shared time; resentment over sacrifices
	Public Image and Social Networks	prestige at social events; unequal recognition in gatherings; partner comparison; feelings of pride mixed with insecurity
	Gendered Expectations	academic partner resisting traditional roles; nonacademic reinforcing cultural norms; negotiation of housework; clash between modern and traditional values
3. Emotional and Relational Balance	Dependency and Autonomy	financial reliance; intellectual reliance; emotional independence; striving for equality
	Power in Decision-Making	who decides on relocation; prioritizing career moves; partner compromise; unbalanced sacrifices
	Emotional Intimacy and Support	partner seeking validation; imbalance in emotional labor; difficulty expressing vulnerability; support dynamics
	Conflict Management Styles	academic tendency to argue logically; nonacademic using emotional reasoning; avoidance; escalation
	Long-Term Commitment and Future Planning	uncertainty of academic career; pressure for stability; fear of incompatibility; negotiation of life goals
	Coping Strategies for Asymmetry	humor; compartmentalizing roles; explicit agreements; focusing on shared values

The first major theme emerging from the interviews concerned communication and intellectual exchange, reflecting how knowledge differences shaped interaction and perceived influence between partners. Participants described feeling that intellectual disparity sometimes created invisible barriers. Several nonacademic partners noted that conversations could become “one-sided lectures,” making them feel excluded and overwhelmed: “Sometimes when he explains his research, I just nod, but honestly, I don’t get half of what he’s saying,” shared a nonacademic woman (P07). Others reported difficulty simplifying complex academic ideas without feeling patronizing, while

some nonacademics sought validation for their practical knowledge yet felt overlooked: “He’s brilliant with theory, but when it comes to everyday solutions, my experience is dismissed,” said one participant (P11). Couples who actively practiced shared learning—using stories or plain language—found it reduced imbalance and deepened connection. However, conflict occasionally arose when knowledge sharing became competitive rather than collaborative, with one academic man admitting: “I realized I was debating to win, not to understand her perspective” (P04). Differences in communication style were particularly salient; academic partners tended to rationalize emotions or search for

evidence, while nonacademics leaned toward intuitive and feeling-oriented dialogue. As one interviewee expressed, “When I’m upset, he wants to analyze why instead of just listening” (P15). Negotiating everyday topics also revealed subtle power struggles when one partner overintellectualized practical decisions, while the other tried to redirect to simplicity. This dynamic, while challenging, encouraged some couples to develop conscious strategies for inclusive conversation.

The second theme involved social and cultural power dynamics, where participants discussed how broader social expectations and professional status influenced relational equity. Many nonacademic partners described the academic identity as carrying symbolic prestige, particularly in social settings: “People automatically respect him because he’s a lecturer; I feel invisible next to that title,” explained a nonacademic woman (P03). Family and community perceptions sometimes heightened imbalance, with academics being celebrated while nonacademics were seen as less accomplished. Economic factors also surfaced; although some academics earned stable incomes, others faced precarious contracts, creating unexpected power reversals. One participant reflected: “Even though he’s a doctor, my job pays the bills; it’s confusing because people think he’s the main provider” (P12). Lifestyle and time demands linked to academia—long hours, conferences, and travel—were another source of tension. Partners often felt neglected or burdened with compensatory roles at home: “When she’s away presenting papers, I handle everything alone, but nobody sees that work,” said a nonacademic man (P08). Social networks amplified these imbalances; academic partners were admired and invited to elite circles, while nonacademics felt like outsiders. Gender norms complicated the picture, especially in couples negotiating traditional household expectations. Some academic women resisted being confined to domestic roles, while their partners felt threatened or conflicted: “She’s breaking stereotypes, but sometimes I feel lost about my role,” admitted a nonacademic male partner (P09). Conversely, some nonacademic women expressed cultural pressure to defer to their academic partners’ authority. These intersecting social forces created a nuanced and sometimes contradictory power landscape within the relationship.

The third major theme focused on emotional and relational balance, highlighting how partners negotiated autonomy, intimacy, and long-term commitment despite differences in professional worlds. Many couples struggled with dependency, whether financial, intellectual, or

emotional. For some, the academic partner’s uncertain career trajectory fostered economic reliance on the nonacademic partner: “His postdoc is unstable; my job keeps us afloat, but it’s a heavy load,” said one participant (P14). Others described intellectual dependence, where the nonacademic partner relied on the academic for complex problem-solving but felt vulnerable when decisions became too one-sided. Decision-making around major life choices—such as relocation for career opportunities—was a recurrent pressure point. An academic woman recounted, “I got a great fellowship abroad, but he felt like he had no say; it still lingers as resentment” (P02). Emotional intimacy was also influenced by power asymmetry. Nonacademic partners sometimes felt inadequate or hesitant to express vulnerability: “I worry he’ll analyze my feelings instead of comforting me,” said a nonacademic female partner (P17). Conflict resolution styles often mirrored these disparities, with academics preferring logical debate and nonacademics leaning toward emotional processing; this mismatch occasionally escalated disagreements. Looking ahead, uncertainty about academic career stability and compatibility of future goals caused anxiety: “She wants tenure; I want to settle down. Sometimes it feels like we’re on different timelines,” (P05). Yet many couples displayed resilience by consciously developing coping strategies—humor, explicit agreements about decision-making, or focusing on shared values. As one academic participant concluded: “We’ve learned to make power visible and talk about it; that keeps us equal enough to stay close” (P01).

4. Discussion and Conclusion

This study explored the complex and often subtle contexts of power asymmetry in romantic relationships between academic and nonacademic partners in Indonesia. Three overarching themes emerged: *communication and intellectual exchange*, *social and cultural power dynamics*, and *emotional and relational balance*. Together, these findings illuminate how couples navigate mismatches in symbolic capital, professional demands, and socio-cultural recognition, while striving to preserve intimacy and equity.

One of the most salient findings concerns communication and intellectual exchange. Many participants described struggles with conversational imbalance, where academic partners’ use of specialized terminology and tendency to frame issues through abstract reasoning left their nonacademic partners feeling excluded or inferior. Several nonacademic participants reported that “sometimes the

conversation feels like a lecture,” reflecting how intellectual prestige shapes everyday dialogue. This resonates with previous work showing that disciplinary expertise often confers symbolic authority, which can inadvertently silence nonacademic voices within intimate partnerships (Buckland et al., 2024; Velicu et al., 2025). Similarly, (Schels et al., 2024) found that when one partner’s career is rooted in research culture, there is often an unspoken hierarchy in knowledge production. However, our findings also highlight moments of resistance and adaptation: some academic partners consciously “translate” their expertise to create shared understanding, while nonacademic partners assert practical wisdom to balance discussions. This aligns with evidence that deliberate intellectual humility and inclusive dialogue can protect relationship equality (Silva, 2025).

Another significant theme was social and cultural power dynamics, where prestige and status associated with academia intersected with financial and social capital from nonacademic careers. Several participants described how families and social networks often valorized the academic partner’s title, leading to subtle comparisons and pressure. For instance, one nonacademic male partner shared, “At family events, they always ask about her research and ignore my work,” underscoring the symbolic weight of academic credentials (Álvarez et al., 2024; Folke et al., 2025). This echoes studies showing that academic titles carry cultural capital, shaping how couples are perceived in their communities (Velicu et al., 2025). Yet the power dynamic was not one-directional: in some dyads, nonacademic partners contributed greater financial stability, especially when academic careers involved precarious postdoctoral contracts or lower salaries (Hansen, 2025; Oecd, 2024). These findings parallel (Bujaki et al., 2025), who observed that career structures requiring geographic and professional mobility can make academic partners economically vulnerable. Our data also indicated that gender norms amplified these tensions. Several female academics reported that their intellectual and financial independence provoked discomfort in more traditional social environments, a pattern also noted by (Brooks et al., 2025) and (Álvarez et al., 2024). Conversely, nonacademic women supporting male academics felt invisible despite substantial sacrifices for relocation and caregiving (MacIver et al., 2025).

The theme of emotional and relational balance captured how couples negotiated intimacy while managing uneven power. Our participants emphasized that intellectual or career-based differences alone did not destabilize relationships; rather, problems arose when partners failed to

validate each other’s contributions and experiences. For example, one academic woman said, “I know my job is intense, but when he dismisses my stress because he doesn’t understand academia, I feel alone.” Such experiences echo (Spieler et al., 2025), who reported that early-career academics often feel emotionally unsupported due to partners’ unfamiliarity with research pressures. Similarly, (Marquardt & Medeiros, 2025) highlighted the emotional costs of knowledge-intensive careers when meaningful dialogue and empathy are absent. Yet our findings also reveal resilience strategies: couples created explicit agreements about work-life boundaries, celebrated each other’s career milestones, and redefined success jointly. This adaptive process resonates with (Pardi & Herdi, 2024), who demonstrated that career support programs fostering mutual recognition improve relational satisfaction in mixed-profession couples. Moreover, open acknowledgment of asymmetry, rather than denial, appeared to reduce latent tension—a finding consistent with (Silva, 2025), who advocates for explicit negotiation of roles and expectations.

A noteworthy insight concerns mobility and career unpredictability, which often shifted power over time. Academic partners described having to move for research or tenure-track positions, expecting nonacademic partners to adjust. Several nonacademics expressed that these relocations derailed their own professional development and social ties: “I left my job and friends behind so she could teach at a better university,” one participant noted. This “trailing partner” effect is well documented in global scholarship (Bujaki et al., 2025; Ramsarghey, 2023; Varbanov et al., 2023). At the same time, the academic partners acknowledged guilt and ambivalence about this privilege, particularly when their employment remained precarious (Kizilirmak et al., 2025; Oecd, 2024). These patterns mirror (Hajrizi et al., 2025), who emphasized that innovation-driven mobility can generate household strain if institutional support for dual-career families is absent.

Another important dimension emerging from the data relates to identity negotiation and self-worth. Nonacademic partners sometimes struggled with feelings of inadequacy or invisibility due to societal glorification of academic achievement. One interviewee reflected, “When people hear she’s a doctor, they look at me differently, like I’m less.” This echoes (Velicu et al., 2025) who found that homogamous academic couples often mitigate such threats by mutual understanding, but mixed-status couples lack this shared identity. Conversely, some nonacademic partners found empowerment in offering grounding and practical

insight to balance their academic partners' intense work identities, aligning with (MacIver et al., 2025) and (Brooks et al., 2025) who suggest that mutual role recognition fosters resilience. Our findings also extend (Schels et al., 2024) by highlighting that when institutional cultures assume both partners are academic, mixed-status couples face isolation and limited structural support.

Finally, the relational coping strategies identified in this study add depth to the literature on managing asymmetry. Humor, conscious simplification of academic discourse, and setting explicit boundaries were reported as protective practices. Some couples created "no work talk" evenings or weekly shared rituals to rebalance intimacy, while others developed new ways of celebrating nonacademic achievements to counteract status imbalance. These proactive strategies resonate with (Silva, 2025), who advocates intentional equity-building behaviors, and extend the work of (Pardi & Herdi, 2024), showing that small relational adjustments can buffer against the structural weight of academic career demands.

Overall, these findings enrich the understanding of romantic power asymmetry where only one partner is academic, a relationship type underrepresented in the scholarship. By integrating mobility, prestige, and relational coping into one analytical model, the study underscores that power asymmetry is not fixed but negotiated dynamically across time and context.

5. Suggestions and Limitations

Although this study provides rich qualitative insights, several limitations should be acknowledged. First, the sample was relatively small (20 participants) and recruited entirely from Indonesia. Cultural norms regarding gender, family, and academic prestige may shape the experiences reported here and may not fully generalize to other sociocultural contexts. Second, participants self-selected into the study, which may have biased the sample toward couples willing to discuss relational challenges or those with relatively constructive coping strategies. Third, the data relied solely on self-report through semi-structured interviews, which, while providing depth, may be influenced by social desirability or incomplete recall. Additionally, this study examined individual accounts rather than dyadic interviews; future work capturing both partners' simultaneous perspectives could yield a more balanced and interactional understanding of power asymmetry. Finally, while thematic analysis provided strong conceptual

categories, the findings do not establish causal relationships, and the nuances of how institutional policies intersect with personal negotiation require further exploration.

Future studies could expand this work by incorporating larger and more diverse samples across countries and cultural contexts to understand how academic prestige interacts with local gender and family norms. Comparative research between couples where both partners are academic, one is academic, or both are nonacademic would also clarify unique patterns in mixed-status dynamics. Dyadic or longitudinal qualitative studies could trace how power asymmetry evolves across career stages, especially when academics transition from precarious positions to stability or when nonacademic partners advance in their own fields. Quantitative or mixed-method approaches might further validate the identified categories and examine associations between power asymmetry and outcomes such as relationship satisfaction, mental health, and career resilience. Additionally, there is a need to explore how institutional supports—such as partner career programs, flexible mobility policies, and counseling services—mediate these dynamics over time.

For practitioners, including couple therapists and career counselors, the findings suggest several actionable points. Professionals should encourage open dialogue about knowledge gaps and career trade-offs, helping couples develop shared narratives that validate both partners' contributions. Universities and employers might consider designing partner integration programs, offering career development resources to nonacademic partners and acknowledging the relational costs of academic mobility. Relationship education workshops could integrate modules on navigating intellectual prestige and career instability, equipping couples with practical tools for equitable decision-making. Finally, fostering awareness in academic institutions about the diversity of partner arrangements can lead to more inclusive policies, reducing the unintended marginalization of nonacademic partners and strengthening the wellbeing of academic communities.

Authors' Contributions

All authors have contributed significantly to the research process and the development of the manuscript.

Declaration

In order to correct and improve the academic writing of our paper, we have used the language model ChatGPT.

Transparency Statement

Data are available for research purposes upon reasonable request to the corresponding author.

Acknowledgments

We would like to express our gratitude to all individuals helped us to do the project.

Declaration of Interest

The authors report no conflict of interest.

Funding

This research was carried out independently with personal funding and without the financial support of any governmental or private institution or organization.

Ethical Considerations

The study protocol adhered to the principles outlined in the Helsinki Declaration, which provides guidelines for ethical research involving human participants.

References

- Álvarez, I., Horáčková, C., & Všecková, J. (2024). Early Career Mobility and Health and Wellbeing of Female Doctorate Holders: A Narrative Review of the International Literature. *Gender Work and Organization*, 32(1), 202-242. <https://doi.org/10.1111/gwao.13138>
- Brooks, T. P., Hughes, A., Azim, K. A., Bender, S. H., Jones, J. L. B., Parker-Barnes, L., Frazier, K. E., Greene, J., Pennell, S. M., Richardson, I., Bielski, L. M., & Raftery-Helmer, J. N. (2025). Exploring the Identities, Barriers, and Interventions for Motherscholars During a Global Pandemic. *Journal of Career Development*, 52(3), 385-406. <https://doi.org/10.1177/08948453251323814>
- Buckland, N., Richardson, K., & Ehata, R. (2024). Applying Behaviour Change Theory to Understand PhD Supervisors' Barriers and Enablers to Supporting PhD Students With Academic and Other-Sector Careers. <https://doi.org/10.32388/y2s1i9.2>
- Bujaki, M., Gaudet, S., & Bourgeault, I. L. (2025). Generating Academic Capital Through Travel: Academic Mothers Navigating the Ideal of Mobility. *Gender Work and Organization*, 32(5), 2024-2038. <https://doi.org/10.1111/gwao.13261>
- Folke, O., Gruneau, M. F., & Rickne, J. (2025). Family Matters. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009437837>
- Hajrizi, B., Berisha-Shaqiri, A., & Veliu, L. (2025). Advancing Innovation Through University-Industry Collaboration: Empirical Evidence From a Developed Economy. *Multidisciplinary Science Journal*, 7(8), 2025435. <https://doi.org/10.31893/multiscience.2025435>
- Hansen, E. M. (2025). "So, Who's the <i>Real</i> Mother?". 160-170. <https://doi.org/10.1093/9780197793534.003.0019>
- Kizilirmak, J. M., Steinkampf, L.-M., Buchholz, S., & Ordemann, J. (2025). Beyond Tradition: Successful Career Paths to Full Professorship. <https://doi.org/10.31235/osf.io/7c6z5>
- Liu, S., & Au, A. (2024). Mobility Spaces: Geographical and Professional Distances in Career Mobility. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 61(2), 195-224. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00218863241305182>
- MacIver, E., Greenhalgh, T., & Ovseiko, P. V. (2025). Exploring the Lived Experiences of Early/Mid-Career Female Academic GPs in the UK: A Qualitative Study. *British Journal of General Practice*, 75(suppl 1), bjgp25X741849. <https://doi.org/10.3399/bjgp25x741849>
- Marquardt, A. U., & Medeiros, A. S. (2025). The Challenge of Meaningful Knowledge Mobilization of Climate Change Research in the Canadian Arctic for Early-Career Researchers. *Facets*, 10, 1-12. <https://doi.org/10.1139/facets-2024-0077>
- Oecd. (2024). The State of Academic Careers in OECD Countries. <https://doi.org/10.1787/ea9d3108-en>
- Pardi, P., & Herdi, H. (2024). Career Support Programme to Expand Career Interests of Partners. *Edukasi*, 18(1), 85-94. <https://doi.org/10.15294/edukasi.v18i1.8431>
- Ramsarghey, K. (2023). From Bean Counting to Teaching: Pathways to Accounting Academia in South Africa. *Isea*. <https://doi.org/10.7176/isea/s2-09>
- Schels, B., Connolly, S., Fuchs, S., Herschberg, C., & Vinkenburg, C. J. (2024). Navigating Treacherous Waters. Exploring the Dual Career Experiences of European Research Council Applicants. 341-371. <https://doi.org/10.5771/9783748925590-341>
- Silva, P. A. (2025). Breaking Barriers: Strategies for Achieving Equity in Academic Careers in ICT/Informatics/STEM. 243-267. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-78432-3_11
- Spieler, D., Stein, L., & Nóbrega, R. (2025). Navigating Parenthood as an Early Career Scientist: Insights and Challenges From Hydrological Sciences. <https://doi.org/10.5194/egusphere-egu24-9435>
- Varbanov, M., Bensoussan, D., & Devocelle, M. (2023). Pre-Professional International Mobility of European Pharmacy Students—A French Example. *Pharmacy*, 11(2), 59. <https://doi.org/10.3390/pharmacy11020059>
- Velicu, A., Fauvelais, M., Jerke, J., Lemaitre, B., & Rauhut, H. (2025). Does Love in the Ivory Tower Fix the Leaky Pipeline? How Academia's Homogamous Relationships Shape Careers. https://doi.org/10.31219/osf.io/qnw9j_v1