

Globalizing the Science of Love:

Toward a Comprehensive Understanding of Care and Connection

Sara B. Algoe, Johan C. Karremans, & The Love Consortium Global Advisors*

*See Appendix for full authorship list and contact information, which includes representation
from 18 countries

ABSTRACT

Love is a fundamental human drive that promotes healthy and caring relationships. This may include connections between strangers, friends, family, or romantic partners, among others. Despite its worldwide relevance, theories and evidence are dominated by WEIRD scientific perspectives, leaving major gaps in understanding how people relate with love across cultures. These scientific gaps are also a societal problem: policymakers around the world increasingly recognize caring relationships as critical for public health. We introduce The Love Consortium Dataverse, a global hub for resource sharing and collaboration. We highlight the unique challenges of relationship research—such as costly dyadic and longitudinal data, training inequities, and cultural variability—and show how these challenges also create unique opportunities for collaboration. We outline initial solutions and call for an equitable, co-created global science of love. By linking diverse researchers, methods, and cultural insights, psychology can build a truly representative science of love and caring relationships.

Note: This manuscript draft has been accepted for publication at *Current Directions in Psychological Science* (June 27, 2026). The final formatted and published version may contain minor copy-edits.

Globalizing the Science of Love:

Toward a Comprehensive Understanding of Care and Connection

In his 1958 American Psychological Association Presidential Address, Harry Harlow famously asserted that love is a primary drive among humans and other animals, analogous to hunger and thirst. The need for love is a timeless, fundamental feature of the human condition. From the moment of birth, people require not just food but care (Bowlby, 1969). Throughout development, family and social groups teach the skills needed to survive and flourish. In adulthood, close ties sustain us through work, parenting, caregiving, and eventually, our own aging. In every stage of life, humans need love.

Scientific efforts to understand love have been marked by conceptual diversity. As examples, love has been defined as a complex experience including intimacy, passion, and commitment (Sternberg, 1986); as taking different forms over time within a relationship (Berscheid, 2010); as an attachment process rooted in early caregiving experiences (Hazan & Shaver, 1987); and as an affective/motivational state that drives pro-relationship behavior (Gonzaga et al., 2006). “Caring” is a central aspect of the lay prototype of love at the abstract level (Fehr, 1988). Yet rather than converging on a single definition, the science of love increasingly treats love as a multifaceted phenomenon that can be approached from multiple theoretical perspectives, making this a vibrant and re-emerging area of inquiry (Bos et al., 2025; Jankowiak & Nelson, 2025). Studying and understanding love – what it is, how it is experienced, and how it is expressed – has important implications for broader domains of research on human relationships such as attachment, loneliness, compassion, prosociality, and more generally, social connection. Research on love should be of interest to scholars working in any of these areas: insights about love can inform their work (e.g., how the experience of love may underlie social

connection, even with strangers [Jolink et al., 2026]), and conversely, research on these related topics can deepen our understanding of love (e.g., how attachment processes may affect the experience and expression of love).

Yet, what remains missing is a comprehensive scientific understanding of what love and caring relationships look like, and how they develop and are maintained across the globe. This is all the more urgent in light of the rapidly-mounting evidence for the importance of social relationships for health and wellbeing (e.g., [WHO Commission on Social Connection](#), 2025). Most evidence still comes from WEIRD countries (Western, Educated, Industrialized, Rich, and Democratic; Henrich et al., 2010), which represents only about 12% of the world's population, leaving vast cultural variation unexplored. Of all areas in psychology, the science of love and caring relationships most demands a worldwide perspective: culture is, at its core, about *how we relate to one another*. Culture shapes which connections are valued, how behaviors are interpreted, and the structures of relational life itself—from household composition to norms around marriage, friendship and caregiving (Campos & Kim, 2017; Heshmati et al., 2019; Mesquita et al., 2017; Osei-Tutu et al., 2021; Selcuk & Gunaydin, 2023).

Not only do Western perspectives dominate the theories, methods, and measures used in this area of research, but even the choice of control variables used in statistical models. Yet across the Majority World (i.e., the regions where most of humanity lives), rich ideas about love and related topics such as attachment, commitment, and compassion—ideas that are often absent from English-language journals—often remain untested and may call for revising or replacing existing theories (e.g., Selcuk, Ascigil, & Gunaydin, 2025). For example, in Indonesia, India and other regions, love toward close others may be expressed less through overt affection and more through devotion and duty (Manik & Damanik, 2025; Novianti et al., 2025). Toddlers'

attachment behaviors are perceived and valued differently by caregivers in different cultures (Cheung & Cheah, 2025; Harwood et al., 1995). Globally, grandparents are increasingly active caregivers for young children (Buchanan & Rotkirch, 2018), highlighting the importance of loving and caring networks beyond the nuclear family. And arranged marriages, which are prevalent in many societies around the world (e.g., Allendorf & Pandian, 2016), challenge the individualistic assumptions underlying most Western theories of romantic relationship formation and maintenance (Barman & Maheshwari, 2024; Sorokowski et al., 2025). In short, our current science of love is impoverished and *disconnected*. Through genuine collaboration, we can build a more representative and *comprehensive* understanding of this foundation for human flourishing.

Our authorship team has been working toward a collaborative solution centered on a resource-sharing hub. In what follows, we describe the hub we have built, the challenges of engaging researchers from across the globe, the initial solutions we implemented, and opportunities for a more inclusive and equitable science of love. We are hopeful that this will serve as an opening dialogue with like-minded researchers and organizations who want to work together to achieve these goals.

The Idea: Share Resources

One unique feature of research on love and social relationships more generally is that the most rigorous evidence often involves data from multiple partners, collected over time, and often gathered with naturalistic methods such as video-recorded interactions or experience sampling. These rich designs advance theory, but they are expensive, time-intensive, and difficult to reproduce. As a result, researchers frequently collect more data than they will analyze for their primary aims. What is “secondary” data from one study could be invaluable for another. Herein lies the opportunity.

To harness this potential, we created The Love Consortium Dataverse (TLCDv: <https://dataverse.unc.edu/dataverse/love>). TLCDv is an online hub where researchers describe their datasets and signal openness to collaboration. In turn, researchers seeking data for their projects can search the hub using our customized meta-data to find a good fit. And access is collaborative: Data are shared only under ethical agreements, with project roles and data use agreements established together, just as in any scientific collaboration.

Three interrelated goals guided the creation of TLCDv. First, TLCDv accelerates the pace of knowledge production by facilitating access to hard-to-collect data. Instead of spending years assembling new datasets for a replication, researchers can preregister confirmatory hypotheses, obtain data from the original investigators, and test hypotheses quickly, bolstering confidence in conclusions and amplifying impact. Second, TLCDv broadens participation by giving talented scholars tools they need to sharpen their skills and join collaborative networks – especially scholars without access to costly dyadic or longitudinal data. Third, TLCDv fuels innovation by embracing diverse theoretical, methodological, and cultural perspectives.

Creating this centralized repository has revealed an additional, unintended benefit: it makes visible the gaps in our collective knowledge. Most striking is the absence of *global* perspectives in theories and evidence on love (and related areas such as attachment, commitment, compassion, or social connection more broadly). Our original vision for TLCDv included fostering inclusive collaborations, a goal seemingly well within reach in the internet age. At first glance, a shared platform for data and collaboration should have been an obvious vehicle for international exchange. Yet as datasets accumulated, manuscripts took shape, and responses to funding calls came in (even one call explicitly prioritizing international

collaborations), it became clear that crucial ideas, data and voices from the Majority World were missing.

The Future of Global Collaboration on Love

This authorship team—representing researchers from 18 countries—emerged from The Love Consortium’s (TLC) initial efforts toward a globally inclusive science of love through international collaboration. A key step was the launch of the TLC Global Ambassadors Program, a team of approximately 30 love scholars from around the world who promote TLC activities and resources within their local communities and provide feedback on region-specific needs and opportunities. Together with the ambassadors, we collectively identified foundational challenges to data sharing and collaboration, especially for researchers outside WEIRD contexts, alongside promising solutions. In the following sections, we elaborate on these themes, and in Table 1, we summarize challenges, our initial steps to address them, and future opportunities for anyone (or organization) motivated to work alongside us toward these goals.

The People Make the Party

Collaboration requires collaborators. Yet, for any given researcher, identifying who around the world is conducting research on love and caring relationships is challenging for several reasons. Language barriers and the lack of translated publications are obvious obstacles. In some contexts, governments and institutions offer little support for research on love, further limiting visibility. Moreover, relevant work may be situated within different disciplines—such as anthropology rather than psychology—making discipline-specific searches or calls for collaboration easy to miss. Finally, even within a field, the topic itself – “love” – may be stigmatized or seen as unscientific, thus limiting numbers.

To build a self-sustaining scientific community on love and caring relationships, we propose an unorthodox approach. Many traditional organizations trying to globalize research emphasize centralized top-down approaches (including TLC's original approach) – yet for the above reasons, it proves difficult for international academic societies to reach and include scholars that represent voices from across the world. Based on conversations with the TLC ambassadors, it became clear that instead the field should emphasize a *bottom-up* approach: starting at the *local* level by facilitating the formation of local research communities of love researchers. As compared to a top-down approach, this has several benefits. Reaching out to colleagues in different departments at one's university or at nearby universities to identify like-minded researchers, including from adjacent disciplines, is more likely to create supportive *multidisciplinary* research communities, in turn promoting innovation (e.g., Cummings & Kiesler, 2005; Freeth & Caniglia, 2020). These local networks provide colleagues with whom to exchange ideas in real time, spark collaborations, and co-develop projects and funding proposals, providing an energizing foundation. Anyone reading this article could start one. Research in our own field shows that face-to-face interaction is more effective than mediated communication (e.g., video or text-based exchanges) for fostering bonds (e.g., Kroencke et al., 2023).

With such a foundation of support for regional research production, the second step – the one needed to make a *global* community -- is to help connect these local and regional networks at the international level. Again, we see collaboration among scientists as a key mechanism for advancing the field and creating intellectual equity within it. Thus, connecting these identified researchers together *across* their local communities by providing a central hub with tools to facilitate skill-sharing, resource coordination (e.g., data collection and sharing), and sustained

constructive dialogue through such collaborations is something unique that TLC provides. We elaborate on these ideas next.

Evidence is the Language of Scientific Dialogue

Producing scientific evidence on love and caring relationships demands extraordinary investments of time and money: researchers must recruit and retain participants, often in pairs or groups, provide compensation, and employ trained staff. These challenges intensify in contexts where participant compensation is prohibited by local ethical guidelines (e.g., Brazil). Such structural inequalities seed global inequities in the production of evidence. Institutions also vary in expectations for teaching and administrative duties, with recent findings showing that researchers in the Majority World spend significantly less time on research than those in the Minority World (Raval et al., 2023). Funding provides another divide: while competition is intense everywhere, scarcity in some contexts contrasts with the complete absence of federal funding for social sciences in others (e.g., Argentina). Finally, slower training in advanced methods and scientific writing further delays progress.

We believe that building collaborative communities from the ground up is one of the most effective ways to reduce inequities and transform the field, especially when these networks are supported by centralized online resources. In the science of love and caring relationships, the very features that make quantitative data rigorous magnify inequities. Complex dyadic and longitudinal designs require advanced statistical expertise, yet years of formal training are not standard in graduate programs worldwide. Even when researchers secure funding (such as small grants available through TLC), data documentation, management, and storage practices remain highly variable across labs and regions. These gaps reflect a training issue. Only in the past two decades have advances in methods and technology made it feasible for researchers to collect

such data. Without standardized processes, however, the investment of time and money yields limited return, as datasets become difficult to use or preserve. By contrast, research teams that adopt careful documentation procedures can generate multiple innovative findings from a single large-scale study (e.g., Righetti, 2019).

TLC has begun to address these challenges by expanding the online resources we provide, beyond TLCDv. For example, this includes online statistics support (e.g., Statistics Decision Tree, see www.theloveconsortium.org/data-analysis-resources), online symposia for best research practices in this field, and a community platform where researchers can find collaborators and support. Underlying all these initiatives is a simple principle: sharing resources and expertise so that *everyone* can fully participate in advancing the science of love and caring relationships. We approach this with intellectual humility, openness, and curiosity, recognizing how much we have to learn from one another about diverse research practices across contexts—from ethics approvals to data management or data sharing practices.

Equity Begins with You

Another significant challenge we have observed concerns invitations to “collaborate” that are not truly collaborative. Too often, these projects are investigator-driven, with international partners asked mainly to collect data on another person’s behalf. To be sure, we are thrilled that technology has expanded opportunities to broaden the geographic reach of samples, and some funders recognize the value of cross-cultural work. We understand that researchers leading such projects depend on testing the novel ideas they proposed. Simultaneously, we believe there is greater opportunity to capitalize on the wealth of knowledge that exists across diverse cultural contexts.

Because most funding flows to Western researchers, international projects are often shaped by their theories, questions, methods, and measures, reinforcing imbalances and Western biases in knowledge production (Ghai, Forscher & Chuan-Peng, 2024). This includes in the science of love. To counter this, researchers, reviewers, and funders must build in time for genuine learning and co-creation. Even when researcher-driven questions are pursued, there should be built-in opportunities for collaborators to provide feedback, suggest adaptations, and contribute culturally-grounded measures and novel ideas. Promising models exist: multi-country collaborations such as the HONORLOGIC project (Kirchner-Hausler et al., 2025; Uskul et al., 2023) and the I-SHARE Consortium (e.g., Hensel et al., 2023) demonstrate how inclusive design fosters innovation, trust, and equity. Such approaches cultivate meaningful engagement, preventing the cynicism, hurt, disillusionment and disengagement that arise when collaborations are one-sided in practice.

When it comes to resource-sharing, and data sharing in particular, TLCDv gives researchers from underrepresented countries agency in choosing their collaborators and projects. TLC supports this process with templates that prompt early conversations about key issues such as authorship (linked to field-standard guidelines) and data use agreements. This structure ensures that researchers can maximize the return on their investment of time and expertise, pursuing projects with collaborators who respect their contributions and ideas.

Notably, while TLC takes a unique approach to promoting collaboration through resources and data sharing, the factors that sideline underrepresented voices are obviously systemic. Other organizations doing complementary work in this space, funders, and individual researchers have an important opportunity to think creatively about how to create new processes

or direct attention and resources to help close the equity gaps and accelerate a truly comprehensive scientific understanding of love.

Culture is Central

If we acknowledge that we cannot know what we do not know, then cultural variability is at the heart of the issues we must tackle to globalize research. Some measures (and items) may simply not make sense in other contexts. Certain questions (e.g., about sexual orientation) may be culturally insensitive, may deter participation, or could even endanger researchers who include or participants who answer them. Finally, although we have emphasized resources related to complex quantitative data structures, the innovation we are calling for, by including concepts from a wide variety of cultures, will require us to recognize that the process of scientific discovery starts with observation and exploration. This is often qualitative research, which typically does not have a home in top English-language scientific journals (Campos & Sanchez Hernandez, 2023; Grigoropoulou & Small, 2022).

The reality of culture is therefore not a side issue, but a central opportunity for a truly integrative science of love. For researchers, this means approaching collaboration with cultural curiosity and making time for genuine co-creation. For editors, reviewers, and leaders of scientific organizations, it requires pausing to examine existing structures and building systems that actively open doors to inclusion (see Ghai et al., 2025; Ledgerwood et al., 2024).

Conclusion

A central challenge for individuals and societies alike is to form and maintain high-quality relationships undergirded by love and care—those in which others can be trusted to support our welfare in good times and through hardship. This is the seed from which everything else—daily functioning, happiness, health, a civil society—springs. Moments of connection, and the ongoing

relationships in which they are embedded, are shaped by culture and norms. These topics are relevant to researchers across subdisciplines of psychology, even if they had not yet considered that their work is relevant to “love”. By engaging in genuine dialogue across borders, and anchoring that exchange in *evidence*, together we can build a robust global science of love—one that embraces cultural variability and advances the urgent public health goal of helping people meet their fundamental need for love, care, and connection.

Table 1*Interlocking Requirements for Global Collaborations on Love and Caring Relationships*

Barrier	Initial Solutions	Direct Benefits of Addressing Barrier	Remaining Opportunities
Unidentified global scholars	TLCDv Global Ambassadors program, local/regional word-of-mouth networks	Connects previously unheard voices, sparks novel research questions	Translations of non-English work, cultural competence workshops
Limited quantitative methods training	TLCDv data access, statistics support and decision tree	Greater rigor for dyadic and longitudinal analyses	Online methods training, cross-country mentorship
Unstandardized data practices	TLCDv meta-data and templates, living best-practice documents, webinars	Faster collaborations and use of data, increased trust and transparency	Cross-cultural dialogue on ethical norms and demographics to measure
Lack of funding	TLC small grants for collaborative projects using the TLCDv data	Seeds projects, cross-national collaboration and networking, professional development of early career scholars	Grant writing workshops, structural funding equity
Fear of data sharing	TLCDv user videos and case studies	Increased trust, faster dissemination of ideas	Communication norms about collaborative use of data
Lack of time	TLC Skillverse platform for skills sharing	Pooling resources for research and writing	Structural changes in teaching and research expectations
Unequal access to mentorship in writing	TLC Skillverse platform, opportunity to ask and offer mentorship and advice	More equitable opportunities for publishing, broader global engagement with TLCDv	Online writing workshops, inclusive journal review practices

Notes: Benefits are listed in the row where they are most directly relevant, though in practice many of these benefits apply across initiatives. Remaining Opportunities are for all readers, complementary organizations, and funding agencies to consider as we work together toward these goals.

References

- Algoe, S. B. (2019). Positive interpersonal processes. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 28(2), 183-188. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0963721419827272>
- Allendorf, K., & Pandian, R. K. (2016). The decline of arranged marriage? Marital change and continuity in India. *Population and Development Review*, 42(3), 435–464.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1728-4457.2016.00149.x>
- Barman, J. D., & Maheshwari, S. (2024). Relationship sustainability: Exploring the idea of sustainable marriages among Indian married couples. *Personal Relationships*, 31(4), 886–925. <https://doi.org/10.1111/pere.12569>
- Berscheid, E. (2010). Love in the fourth dimension. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 61(1), 1-25.
<https://www.annualreviews.org/doi/10.1146/annurev.psych.093008.100318>.
- Bos, P. A., Riem, M. M., & Brummelman, E. (2025). The nature of love revisited: How social bonds shape development. *Developmental Science*, 28(3), e70005.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/desc.70005>
- Bowlby, J. (1969). *Attachment and Loss: Vol. 1. Attachment*. New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Buchanan, A., & Rotkirch, A. (2018). Twenty-first century grandparents: Global perspectives on changing roles and consequences. *Contemporary Social Science*, 13(2), 131–144. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21582041.2018.1467034>
- Campos, B., & Kim, H. S. (2017). Incorporating the cultural diversity of family and close relationships into the study of health. *American Psychologist*, 72(6), 543–554. <https://doi.org/10.1037/amp0000122>

- Campos, B., & Sánchez Hernández, H. (2023). Well-being: Strengthening and broadening a key psychological construct. *Affective Science*, 4(1), 21–23. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s42761-022-00154-1>
- Cheung, H. S., & Cheah, C. S. L. (2025). The forms and functions of parental control and parental warmth across cultures: Evidence for commonality and specificity. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 49(5), 419-430. <https://doi.org/10.1177/01650254251337734>
- Fehr, B. (1988). Prototype analysis of the concepts of love and commitment. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 55(4), 557-579. <https://doi.apa.org/doi/10.1037/0022-3514.55.4.557>
- Ghai, S., Forscher, P. S., & Chuan-Peng, H. (2024). Big-team science does not guarantee generalizability. *Nature Human Behaviour*, 8, 1053–1056. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-024-01902-y>
- Ghai, S., Thériault, R., Forscher, P., Shoda, Y., Syed, M., Puthillam, A., ... Singh, L. (2025). A manifesto for a globally diverse, equitable, and inclusive open science. *Communications Psychology*, 3(1), 16. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s44271-024-00179-1>
- Gonzaga, G. C., Keltner, D., Londahl, E. A., & Smith, M. D. (2001). Love and the commitment problem in romantic relations and friendship. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 81(2), 247-262. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.81.2.247>
- Grigoropoulou, N., & Small, M. L. (2022). The data revolution in social science needs qualitative research. *Nature Human Behavior*, 6, 904–906. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-022-01333-7>

Harlow, H. F. (1958). The nature of love. *American Psychologist*, 13(12), 673-685.

<https://doi.org/10.1037/h0047884>

Harwood, R. L., Miller, J. G., & Irizarry, N. L. (1995). *Culture and attachment: Perceptions of the child in context*. New York, NY: Guilford Press.

Hazan, C., & Shaver, P. (1987). Romantic love conceptualized as an attachment process. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 52(3), 511-524. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.52.3.511>

Henrich, J., Heine, S. J., & Norenzayan, A. (2010). The weirdest people in the world? *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 33(2–3), 61–135. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0140525X0999152X>

Hensel, D. J., Mark, K. P., Abdelhamed, A., Burns, S., Esho, T., Hendricks, J., Jobim Fischer, V., Ivanova, O., Marks, M., Michelsen, K., Nimby, F., Strizzi, J., Tucker, J., Uhlich, M., & Erausquin, J. T. (2023). Changes in solo and partnered sexual behaviors following the first COVID-19 wave: Data from an international study of 26 countries. *International Journal of Sexual Health*, 35(3), 459–480. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19317611.2023.2224777>

*Heshmati, S., Oravecz, Z., Pressman, S., Batchelder, W. H., Muth, C., & Vandekerckhove, J. (2019). What does it mean to feel loved: Cultural consensus and individual differences in felt love. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 36(1), 214-243. – <https://doi.org/10.1177/0265407517724600>

This paper nicely introduces one theoretical backdrop for understanding why love and caring concepts may vary worldwide. The data also show that people feel love from a variety of types of social partners (i.e., both nonromantic and romantic).

- Holt-Lunstad, J. (2025). Social connection or loneliness? How we frame the issue may significantly impact public policy. *Health Psychology*, 44(5), 560-562. <https://doi.org/10.1037/hea0001433>
- Jankowiak, W., & Nelson, A. J. (2025). The state of ethnological research on love: A critical review. In C.-H. Mayer & E. Vanderheiden (Eds.), *International handbook of love: Transcultural and transdisciplinary perspectives* (pp. 23-39). Springer Nature Switzerland AG. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-45996-3_2
- Jolink, T. A., Le, E., Chandler, K. R., Barry, I., Hansen, Z., Cameron, A., Murphy, B. A., & Algoe, S.B. (under review). Enacted love: Capitalization responses signal love, including toward strangers.
- Kirchner-Häusler, A., Uskul, A. K., Wohl, M. J., Vignoles, V. L., Cross, S. E., Rodriguez-Bailón, R., ... & Uchida, Y. (2025). The role of apology beliefs for apology tendencies across cultures with varying honor norms. *Current Research in Ecological and Social Psychology*, 100230. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cresp.2025.100230>
- Kroencke, L., Harari, G. M., Back, M. D., & Wagner, J. (2023). Well-being in social interactions: Examining personality-situation dynamics in face-to-face and computer-mediated communication. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 124(2), 437-460. <https://doi.org/10.31234/osf.io/g6s8f>
- Ledgerwood, A., Lawson, K. M., Kraus, M. W., Vollhardt, J. R., Remedios, J. D., Westberg, D. W., ... & Zou, L. X. (2024). Disrupting racism and global exclusion in academic publishing: Recommendations and resources for authors, reviewers, and editors. *Collabra: Psychology*, 10(1), 121394. <https://doi.org/10.1525/collabra.121394>

- Manik, L., & Damanik, B. A. R. (2025). A semantic analysis of the concept of “love” in Indonesian: A comparative study with English. *Young Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities*, 1(3), 175–186.
- Mesquita, B., Boiger, M., & De Leersnyder, J. (2017). Doing emotions: The role of culture in everyday emotions. *European Review of Social Psychology*, 28(1), 95–133.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/10463283.2017.1329107>
- *Novianti, L. E., Purba F.D., Puspitasari, S. V., Nadirah, A. A, Purba, I. N. Br., Karremans, J. C., & Agustiani, H. (2025). The meaning of marriage, the meaning of family, and the function of family among Indonesian married people. *BMC Psychology*, 13, 1410.
<https://doi.org/10.1186/s40359-025-03670-4>
- This paper provides an in-depth qualitative assessment of the meanings of marriage and family within Indonesia, highlighting their interconnectedness.*
- Osei-Tutu, A., Adams, G., Esiaka, D., Dzokoto, V. A., & Affram, A. A. (2022). The modernity/coloniality of love: Individualist lifeways and charismatic Christianity in Ghanaian worlds. *Journal of Social Issues*, 78(1), 183-208.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/josi.12432>
- Raval, V. V., Baiden, P., Espinosa-Hernandez, G., Magis-Weinberg, L., Nguyen, A. J., Titzmann, P. F., & Zheng, Y. (2024). Perspectives of researchers engaging in majority world research to promote diverse and global psychological science. *American Psychologist*, 79(3), 352-367. <https://doi.org/10.1037/amp0001229>
- Righetti, F. (2019). Sacrifice Study, 2013. *UNC Dataverse*, V1.
<https://doi.org/10.15139/S3/0YXG2J>

- Selçuk, E., Ascigil, E., & Günaydin, G. (2025). A theoretical analysis and empirical agenda for understanding the socioecology of adult attachment. *European Review of Social Psychology*, 36, 1–34. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10463283.2024.2367894>
- *Selcuk, E., & Gunaydin, G. (2023). Responsiveness in cultural-ecological context. *Current Opinion in Psychology*, 52, 101610. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.copsyc.2023.101610>
This paper provides one theoretical backdrop for understanding why and how a key construct in this area of research – perceived partner responsiveness – may vary around the world.
- Sorokowski, P., Groyecka-Bernard, A., Kowal, M., Butovskaya, M., Stefańczyk, M. M., Huanca, T., ... Jędryczka, W. (2025). Love components in free-choice and arranged marriages among five non-Western populations from Africa, Amazonia, and Himalayas. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 54(1), 85–94. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10508-024-03040-y>
- Sternberg, R. J. (1986). A triangular theory of love. *Psychological Review*, 93(2), 119-135.
<https://doi.apa.org/doi/10.1037/0033-295X.93.2.119>
- Uskul, A. K., Kirchner-Häusler, A., Vignoles, V. L., Rodriguez-Bailon, R., Castillo, V. A., Cross, S. E., ... & Uchida, Y. (2023). Neither Eastern nor Western: Patterns of independence and interdependence in Mediterranean societies. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 125(3), 471-495. <https://doi.org/10.1037/pspa0000342>
- World Health Organization. (2025). *From loneliness to social connection: Charting a path to healthier societies: Report of the WHO Commission on Social Connection*. Geneva, Switzerland: World Health Organization.

Appendix

Author Information

Order	Full Name	Email Address	University / Institutional Affiliation	Country
1	Algoe, Sara B.	algoe@unc.edu	University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill	United States
2	Karremans, Johan C.	johan.karremans@ru.nl	Radboud University and Padjadjaran University	Netherlands, Indonesia
3	Abidin, Fitri A.	fitri.ariyanti.abidin@unpad.ac.id	Universitas Padjadjaran	Indonesia
4	Arana, Fernán G.	fernandarana@gmail.com	CONICET - Universidad de Buenos Aires - CEPRI	Argentina
5	Aveyard, Mark	maveyard@aus.edu	American University of Sharjah	United Arab Emirates
6	Bode, Adam	adam.bode@anu.edu.au	Australian National University	Australia
7	Campos, Belinda	bcampos@uci.edu	University of California - Irvine	United States
8	Cheung, Hoi Shan	hoishan.cheung@nie.edu.sg	National Institute of Education, Nanyang Technological University	Singapore
9	Diamond, Emily	emilydia@umich.edu	University of Michigan	United States
10	Gunaydin, Gul	gul.gunaydin@sabanciuniv.edu	Sabanci University	Turkey
11	Hoan, Elaine	elaine.hoan@mail.utoronto.ca	University of Toronto	Canada
12	Holt-Lunstad, Julianne	julianne_holt-lunstad@byu.edu	Brigham Young University	United States
13	Hui, Chin Ming	cmhui@cuhk.edu.hk	Chinese University of Hong Kong	Hong Kong
14	Impett, Emily	emily.impett@utoronto.ca	University of Toronto	Canada
15	Kowal, Marta	marta7kowal@gmail.com	University of Wrocław	Poland
16	Kumalasari, Asteria D.	asteria.devy@unpad.ac.id	Universitas Padjadjaran	Indonesia
17	Kumar, Aneesh	aneesh.kumar@christuniversity.in	Christ University	India
18	Lamarche, Veronica	v.lamarche@essex.ac.uk	University of Essex	United Kingdom
19	Pervez, Aneeza	aneezapervez@gmail.com	University of Nottingham	United Kingdom

20	Rodrigues, David F. L.	dflrs@iscte-iul.pt	Iscte-Instituto Universitário de Lisboa	Portugal
21	Sasaki, Eri	e.sasaki@vu.nl	Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam	Netherlands
22	Stern, Jessica	jessica.stern@pomona.edu	Pomona College	United States
23	Taşfiliz, Duygu	duygu.tasfiliz@altinbas.edu.tr	Altınbaş University	Turkey
24	Teulings, Irene	i.j.e.teulings@psykologi.uio.no	University of Oslo	Norway
25	Uhlich, Maximiliane	maximiliane.uhlich@gmail.com	University of Basel	Switzerland
26	Vaish, Amrisha	av8u@virginia.edu	University of Virginia	United States
27	Zibenberg, Daniela	danizibs@gmail.com	Pontificia Universidade Catolica do Rio de Janeiro	Brazil
28	Zuo, Pei-Ying	pyzuo@tongji.edu.cn	Tongji University	China