

Measuring the Experience of Social Connection Within Specific Social Interactions:

The Connection During Conversations Scale (CDCS)

Karynna Okabe-Miyamoto, Lisa C. Walsh, Daniel J. Ozer, and Sonja Lyubomirsky

University of California, Riverside

in press, *PLoS ONE*

Author Note

Karynna Okabe-Miyamoto  <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4225-3164>

Lisa C. Walsh  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9689-4824>

Daniel J. Ozer  <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1052-3078>

Sonja Lyubomirsky  <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0727-5595>

We have no known conflicts of interest to disclose. The authors received no specific funding for this work. Data and R code are available at: <https://osf.io/ns5mv/>

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Karynna Okabe-Miyamoto, University of California, Riverside, Department of Psychology, 900 University Avenue, Riverside, CA 92521. Email: karynnaom@gmail.com

Abstract

Decades of research have demonstrated that social connection is fundamental to health and well-being. The benefits of connection are observed with both close and distant others, within both new and established relationships, and even with exchanges that unfold over a relatively short timeframe. Because social connection is fundamental to well-being, many existing measures in the literature aim to assess either a global sense of connection or partner-specific (relationship-specific) connection. What is missing are measures of connection felt in specific social interactions or conversations. In three studies (Study 1: $N = 351$; Study 2: Time 1 $N = 397$, Time 2 $N = 336$, Time 3 $N = 299$; Study 3: $N = 235$), we developed the Connection During Conversations Scale (CDCS), a 14-item measure of conversation-specific social connection that assesses connection experienced during a social interaction (or conversation). Confirmatory factor analyses demonstrated that a four-factor model fit our samples well, which resulted in four subscales: Shared Reality, Partner Responsiveness, Participant Interest, and Affective Experience. The overall CDCS measure, along with its four subscales, was significantly correlated with established measures of loneliness, partner responsiveness, relatedness, positivity resonance, and shared reality. Because of the importance of frequent interactions—whether with family, friends, coworkers, or strangers—our new scale will allow researchers to better understand how, when, and where such conversations may contribute to social connection and well-being. (225 words)

Keywords: social interactions, connection, connectedness, belonging, well-being

**Measuring the Experience of Social Connection Within Specific Social Interactions:
The Connection During Conversations Scale (CDCS).**

Social connection (or belonging) is essential for optimal human functioning (Baumeister & Leary, 1995; Maslow, 1943). A great deal of evidence has demonstrated that social connection is associated with well-being (Cacioppo et al., 2008; Diener & Seligman, 2002; Lyubomirsky et al., 2005), and that lack of social connection is a major health risk factor (Cole et al., 2007; Holt-Lunstad et al., 2010, p., 2017; House et al., 1988). According to self-determination theory (Ryan & Deci, 2000), relatedness (i.e., connectedness)—along with competence and autonomy—is one of the three basic psychological needs that, when fulfilled, promotes well-being. Additional research indicates that people with extraverted personalities experience greater happiness than introverts, and that engaging in extraverted behaviors (such as socially interacting with others) can enhance well-being (Margolis & Lyubomirsky, 2020). Taken together, research over the past several decades has revealed the fundamental nature of relationships for human health and well-being.

Social connection can be defined as the experience of feeling close and connected to others, encompassing a sense of belonging, attachment, and interpersonal relationships (Baumeister & Leary, 1995; Holt-Lunstad et al., 2010; Lee & Robbins, 1995; Reis et al., 2004). It includes the quality and quantity of social interactions, as well as the subjective experience of being connected to others. Using a variety of methodologies, a large literature has explored the well-being outcomes associated with feelings of social connection, as well as the specific constructs and facets (e.g., partner responsiveness, shared positive affect) that may compose connecting experiences. For example, in a longitudinal study that followed married or cohabiting couples over the course of 10 years, partner responsiveness (that is, feeling understood, valued,

and cared for) predicted greater eudaimonic well-being (Selcuk et al., 2016). During the stressful transition into parenthood, parents who reported stronger social support were less depressed during the transition period (Bost et al., 2002). Moreover, using the Day Reconstruction Method, participants who reported greater perceived positivity resonance (i.e., shared positive affect and mutual concern) with their interaction partner, also reported greater flourishing mental health (Major et al., 2018). As such, correlational evidence suggests that social connection is related to beneficial well-being outcomes.

In addition to correlational studies, experimental work has also explored the link between social connection and well-being. In a study of prosocial spending, those who gave away a gift card were happier than those who kept the gift card for themselves, with the greatest well-being benefits for individuals who reported feeling connected with their gift card recipient (Aknin et al., 2013). These results demonstrate that social connection can be leveraged to develop or strengthen happiness-boosting interventions. Importantly, individuals instructed to engage socially report relatively more connectedness and positive emotion (Fritz et al., 2021; Jacques-Hamilton et al., 2019; Margolis & Lyubomirsky, 2020). Overall, these studies support the notion that stronger self-reported feelings of social connection—assessed and induced in a variety of ways—are related to myriad well-being outcomes throughout the lifespan and during major life transitions.

In addition to well-being outcomes, social connection has also been associated with positive physical health and improved cognitive outcomes. In a meta-analysis of 148 studies, researchers found that individuals who reported having relatively stronger social relationships, regardless of age or gender, had a 50% greater likelihood of surviving than those without strong relationships (Holt-Lunstad et al., 2010). In the longitudinal study of married or cohabiting

couples, partner responsiveness also predicted healthier cortisol levels at a 10-year follow-up (Slatcher et al., 2015). In one experiment that administered mock personality tests then provided false personality feedback, participants who were told that they would have meaningful relationships in the future performed better on verbal, math, and spatial assessments compared to those told that they would end up alone later in life (Baumeister et al., 2002). As such, induced feelings of social connection are not only linked to improved well-being outcomes but improved cognitive functioning as well.

What is it about felt social connection that facilitates well-being? To investigate this question, researchers have begun to use varied methodologies to probe people's social interactions. For example, both self-report and audio recording data using the Electronically Activated Recorder (EAR) have shown that engaging in more conversations is related to greater well-being (Bernstein et al., 2018; Mehl et al., 2010; Milek et al., 2018). Furthermore, people who connect through conversations report to be happier than those who do not, whether those conversations are with close others (Kahneman et al., 2004) or strangers (e.g., baristas, bus strangers; Epley & Schroeder, 2014; Sandstrom & Dunn, 2013, 2014). Moreover, both engaging in a relatively larger number of conversations and having deeper (versus small talk) social interactions have been found to be related to greater well-being (Sun et al., 2019). Interestingly, the quantity and quality of social interactions may be valued differently depending on one's age, such that individuals in their 20s may prefer quantity while those in their 30s may prefer quality (Carmichael et al., 2015; cf. Carstensen et al., 1999). Therefore, not only are the number of conversations important for well-being, but so is their quality—or sense of connection or understanding they provide.

In sum, a number of correlational and experimental studies have provided evidence that social interactions and conversations, with both close others and strangers, are associated with greater happiness (e.g., Epley & Schroeder, 2014; Fritz et al., 2021; Jacques-Hamilton et al., 2019; Kahneman et al., 2004; Margolis & Lyubomirsky, 2020; Sandstrom & Dunn, 2013, 2014). However, little is known about how connected people feel during these conversations or interactions. Most research on social connection relies on either of two approaches to assess felt social connection: global relationship measures (e.g., how satisfied someone feels with the amount and quality of their social connection across all connections) and specific partner measures (e.g., how satisfied someone feels with their connection with a spouse, friend, sister, etc.). An alternative approach might examine the degree of social connection experienced in a specific social interaction (e.g., how satisfied someone feels with their connection during or after a particular conversation). In other words, research is needed to assess the quality of social connection moments, such as a phone call with a parent or a chat with a co-worker. Whether a particular conversation is lengthy or hasty, it has the capacity to influence how connected people feel. Indeed, brief interactions with weak ties, such as chats with baristas or Lyft drivers, have been shown to lead to feelings of social connection and well-being (see Van Lange & Columbus, 2021, for a review), and almost all interpersonal relationships essentially comprise a series of multiple social interactions. Accordingly, it is imperative to possess tools to advance understanding of how individual social interactions influence social connection and well-being. Before we introduce such a tool in this paper, we first briefly review a selection of measures of social connection previously used in the literature.

Existing Measures of Social Connection

Social connection can be explored at multiple levels, ranging from global (e.g., “Do you feel a sense of intimacy and closeness with others?”) to partner-specific (e.g., “Do you feel close to your” husband or parent) to interaction-specific (e.g., “Did you feel a sense of connection during this conversation?”). As a result, many existing relevant measures—global and partner-specific ones, in particular—can be found in the literature. We outline several representative measures below. Additionally, we present a full list and description of all existing measures identified in Supplemental Materials (see Table S1).

Global Relationship Measures

Global relationship measures typically ask respondents to holistically evaluate their relationships (see Global section of Table S1). For example, the Social Provisions Scale (Cutrona & Russell, 1987) includes items like “There are people I can depend on to help me if I really need it,” and the Balanced Measure of Psychological Needs (BMPN; Sheldon & Hilpert, 2012) has items like “I felt close and connected with other people who are important to me.” Similar measures include the Multi-Dimensional Scale of Perceived Social Support (MSPSS; Zimet et al., 1988), with items such as “There is a special person with whom I can share my joys and sorrows”; the Social Connectedness Scale (Lee et al., 2001), with items like “I feel understood by the people I know”; and the support (“There are people who give me support and encouragement”) and belonging (“I feel a sense of belonging in my community”) subscales of the Comprehensive Inventory of Thriving (CITI; Su et al., 2014). The UCLA Loneliness scale (Russell et al., 1980) assesses the general lack of connection, or feelings of loneliness, with items such as “No one really knows me well.” These measures are critical vis-à-vis their ability to tap into how much connectedness an individual feels in general. However, they were not designed to

examine the strength of a person's connection in specific relationships or during specific conversations.

Partner-Specific Relationship Measures

Another category of connection measures asks individuals about the connection they feel with a specific partner (see Partner-Specific section of Table S1). One type of partner-specific relationship measure assesses the connection people feel *from* their relationship partner. Examples include the Partner Responsiveness Scale (Reis et al., 2011, 2017), with items such as “Compared to most experiences I’ve had meeting somebody new, I get the feeling that this person sees the ‘real’ me”; and the Relationship Closeness Inventory (Berscheid et al., 1989), with items such as “[My partner] influences important things in my life.” Another type of partner-specific relationship measure assesses the connection people feel *toward* their relationship partner. Such measures include the Relationship Assessment Scale (Hendrick et al., 1998) with items like, “How much do you love your partner?” Finally, some scales measure both connection people feel *from* and *toward* their relationship partner. These include the Inclusion of Other in the Self Scale (Aron et al., 1992), which displays seven options involving two circles that range from separate to increasingly close (and eventually overlapping) to tap perceived closeness between self and partner; and the Two-Way Social Support Scale (Shakespeare-Finch & Obst, 2011), with items like, “I am there to listen to others’ problems” and “There is someone I can talk to about the pressures in my life.” In sum, these three types of partner-specific measures allow researchers to examine connection with a specific partner, but they do not capture people’s sense of connection during a specific social interaction.

Interaction-Specific Connection

Despite research evidence demonstrating links between well-being and the frequency of social interactions, to our knowledge, only two measures—both recently developed—gauge the amount or quality of connection felt during a particular social interaction. The Positivity Resonance Scale (Major et al., 2018) asks respondents questions such as, what percentage of time (from 0 to 100%) “Did you feel ‘in sync’ with the other(s)?” among other questions about several features of an interaction. Motivated by the theory of positivity resonance, this 7-item scale aims to measure its three hypothesized facets—namely, shared positive affect, mutual care and concern, and behavioral and biological synchrony (Fredrickson, 2016), with some items tapping more than one facet. However, when assessing social connection felt during an interaction, the Positivity Resonance Scale might miss important features of the interaction, such as general affective experience. Furthermore, because the scale follows the positivity resonance theory, this might be limiting, such that connection might be found not only during shared positive affect but also shared negative affect (e.g., shared misery). Additionally, respondents have reported that percent conversation time from 0 to 100 is complicated to estimate accurately, potentially making the scale relatively time consuming and cognitively taxing (Funke et al., 2010). As such, a different measure may be needed to assess types of connecting experiences that may not cover all three of these elements or feature additional elements.

The Generalized Shared Reality Measure (Rossignac-Milon et al., 2021), published after our data collection had completed, is another interaction-specific measure of connection that can be used for both close others and strangers. It includes items such as “during our interaction we thought of things at the same time.” However, this measure, which is also theoretically motivated, is designed to focus on only one facet of social connection—namely, shared reality.

Overall, the literature is still missing a scale that more broadly assesses felt social connection during specific social interactions which greatly limits the study of social connection. For example, in order to create interventions to help people connect, researchers must understand how people connect in daily conversations. A measure of connection felt during an interaction can help researchers understand what aspects of conversations make for the most connecting experiences (e.g., commonalities). Thus, researchers can identify strategies to target these key aspects of conversations in order to boost overall connection (e.g., arming people with questions to ask others that might reveal commonalities). Additionally, a measure of connection felt during an interaction may allow researchers to identify profiles of those struggling to connect with others, such as those who have trouble finding commonalities with others or those who view all interactions in a negative light. By identifying these profiles, researchers may more easily create overarching strategies to help people who fall under different social connection profiles.

The Present Studies

Our aim was to create a measure of social connection to assess connection felt during interactions or conversations with both close others and strangers in daily life. To this end, we conducted a set of programmatic studies to develop and validate the Connection During Conversations Scale. For Study 1, we collected a broad pool of items from existing measures of social connection, including the Positivity Resonance Scale (Major et al., 2018), the Partner Responsiveness Scale (Reis et al., 2011, 2017) and the Social Provisions Scale (Cutrona & Russell, 1987), to create our new scale (see Table S1 in Supplemental Materials for a full list and description of these existing measures). Next, we evaluated our new measure—the 16-item version in Studies 2a, 2b, and 2c and the 14-item version in Study 3—by correlating it with the most commonly used and most relevant social connection measures in the literature and provided

construct validity evidence by examining correlations with personality, well-being, and demographic variables.

Study 1

Our first study focused on creating the Connection During Conversations Scale (CDCS), designed to be a measure of social connection felt during a specific interpersonal interaction. Based on a comprehensive search of social connection scales (again, see Table S1 for a full list of scales used to develop the CDCS), we selected 53 items (i.e., items that were the most relevant to social connection, adapted, and edited for clarity) to construct our new measure. Additionally, to ensure strong recall and deep reflection of a recent social interaction, we also created an open-ended prompt that asked participants to write about this interaction. Following the prompt, participants completed the 53-item measure, then provided details about where, when, and with whom the interaction occurred.

Method

Participants

Participants ($N = 351$) were recruited from Prolific Academic based on available department funding, an online platform used to recruit subjects that has been shown to provide good quality online data (Peer et al., 2017). To join the study, they had to be fluent in English and have an “approval rating” of over 90% on Prolific. Participants ranged in age from 18 to 66 ($M = 30.92$, $SD = 10.12$). They were mostly male (56%) and Caucasian (63%), and nearly half were single and never married (42%). They also resided around the world, with 34% from the U.S., 17% from the U.K., 11% from Canada, and the remaining 38% from 26 other international countries (e.g., Australia, South Korea).

Procedure

Participants joined a 15-min study entitled “Social Interaction Psychological Research Study.” Following written consent online, they completed our writing prompt, which asked them to take a few moments to describe a social interaction that had taken place within the last 2 days:

For the next few minutes, think about *a recent interaction or conversation* you had with another (one) person that lasted for at least a few moments...Now, we would like you to briefly describe this interaction...What happened during the interaction or conversation? What were you thinking and/or feeling during the interaction? Where were you?

The resulting qualitative data from this prompt are beyond the scope of the present study and are not presented here. Next, participants completed our 53-item connection measure, followed by questions about their target social interaction (e.g., whether the interaction was positive, negative, or neutral), their interaction partner (e.g., how long they had known them), and demographic items (e.g., their own age, gender). Participants who completed the study were compensated \$2.00 for their time.

Materials

Connection Scale Item Pool

To compile a pool of items, we turned to reliable and valid scales already published in the empirical literature that aim to assess aspects of social connection and interpersonal relationships (again, see Table S1 for existing scales used in scale creation). While examining each measure, we identified items that were most closely aligned with social connection during conversations, resulting in a pool of 53 items. Furthermore, we modified and updated some items for clarity (e.g., removed or separated double-barreled questions). Of the 53 items, 33 were categorized as being toward one’s partner (e.g., “I felt ‘in sync’ with them”), 15 were categorized as being from one’s partner (e.g., “They were responsive to me”), and 5 were categorized as being general items (e.g., “The interaction brightened my day”). Each of the items within each category was

presented together with blocks counterbalanced and items within the blocks randomized. Each category was presented in separate blocks to reduce participant burden, as switching between these types of questions could increase cognitive load. Participants rated their level of agreement with each item on a 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 7 (*strongly agree*) Likert scale.

Interaction Partner Demographics and Interaction Details

We asked participants to respond to several questions about their interaction partners, including their partner's gender, age, ethnicity, how long the participant has known their partner (ranging from just met to many years), and who their partner was (e.g., close friend, brother/sister, stranger). We also asked participants to indicate when the interaction occurred, its mode of communication, and the interaction's duration and valence. See Table 1 for a breakdown of demographics and details for this study (as well as Study 2 and 3).

Results

Exploratory Factor Analysis

To determine the number of factors that emerged from our 53 items, we calculated eigenvalues for each of our dimensions and then graphed the eigenvalues¹ using a scree plot. It appeared that 2 or 4 factors may be present in our data. Based on Horn's Parallel Analysis for component retention using 5000 iterations, 4 components were retained. Each of the 4 components contained 4 items, for a total of 16 retained items. Therefore, we decided to extract four factors with our data. We fit the four-factor model to our data using the *fa* function in the psych package in R. We used the maximum likelihood method with oblimin rotation (because we expected our factors to be correlated), which resulted in a solution that accounted for 57% of the cumulative variance.

¹ Eigenvalues: 25.88, 2.16, 2.07, 1.89, 1.39, 1.31, 1.15, 0.96

The 16 retained items were correlated (average inter-item $r = .54$). The four factors were also correlated (average $r = .63$). The correlation between the Shared Reality latent variable was stronger with the Partner Responsiveness latent variable ($r = .70$) and the Participant Interest latent variable ($r = .51$) than with the Affective Experience latent variance ($r = -.49$). The Partner Responsiveness latent variable were oppositely correlated with the Participant Interest latent variable ($r = .52$) and the Affective Experience latent variable ($r = -.50$). Finally, the Participant Interest latent variable and the Affective Experience latent variable were also negatively correlated ($r = -.37$).

Furthermore, the items within each of the four factors appeared to cluster in ways that represented meaningful constructs in the literature (e.g., partner responsiveness). To determine the final items within each of our four factors, we first removed items that loaded below .50. If items were semantically similar, the item with the highest factor loading was chosen (e.g., “they respected my beliefs and opinions” over “they valued my beliefs and opinions”). Based on these criteria, 16 final items were chosen (4 items in each factor; see Table 2 for factor loadings). The final four-factor structure closely represents four constructs found in the literature to be theoretically related to social connection: (1) Shared Reality, (2) Partner Responsiveness, (3) Participant Interest, and (4) Affective Experience.

Confirmatory Factor Analysis

Next, we conducted a confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) using the *cfa* function in the lavaan package in R based on our 16-item measure of connection (4 items for each of our 4 subscales) to determine whether our four-factor solution was a good fit. A four-factor CFA fit our connection items well, $\chi^2(98) = 336.84$, CFI = .933, TLI = .918, RMSEA = .083, 90% CI [.074, .093], SRMR = .054 (see Table 2 for factor loadings).

The 16-items of the CDCS were correlated (average inter-item $r = .54$). The four subscales of this scale were also correlated (average $r = .63$). Correlations among latent variables were strong. The Shared Reality latent variable was strongly correlated with the Partner Responsiveness latent variable ($r = .86$), the Participant Interest latent variable ($r = .76$), and the Affective Experience latent variance ($r = -.78$). The Partner Responsiveness was also strongly correlated with the Participant Interest latent variable ($r = .77$) and the Affective Experience latent variable ($r = -.72$). Finally, the Participant Interest latent variable and the Affective Experience latent variable were also negatively correlated ($r = -.80$). Notably, Affective Experience was negatively correlated with the three other latent variables (Shared Reality, Participant Interest, and Partner Responsiveness).

Brief Discussion

In Study 1, we developed a 16-item, four-factor measure. In Study 2, we aimed to evaluate this 16-item interaction-specific social connection measure in a sample of participants surveyed three times between February 2020 and May 2020, by correlating it with commonly used connection measures (e.g., positivity resonance), as well as with measures of related constructs (e.g., personality, well-being).

Study 2

Our second set of studies (involving three timepoints, labeled Time 1, 2, and 3) aimed to test the psychometric properties of the Connection During Conversations Scale. We also correlated this new scale with other similar measures of social connection-relevant constructs—namely, loneliness, relatedness, partner responsiveness, shared reality, and positivity resonance—to establish construct validity.

Method

Participants

At Time 1, a new set of participants ($N = 399$) were recruited from Prolific in January/February 2020, with the same eligibility criteria and sample size reasoning as Study 1. We removed 2 participants because they reported being younger than 18, yielding a final sample of $N = 397$. Participants at Time 1 ranged in age from 18 to 76 ($M = 31.59$, $SD = 11.87$), with 55% male, 80% Caucasian, and 47% single. Most were from the U.S. (32%) and the U.K. (27%), with the remainder (41%) from 26 other countries (e.g., Ireland, Portugal, Canada). Participants who returned at Time 2 ($N = 336$; April 2020) and Time 3 ($N = 299$; May 2020) were re-recruited from Time 1 and thus showed almost identical demographics. Those at Time 2 ranged in age from 18 to 72 ($M = 32.03$, $SD = 11.94$), with 55% male, 80% Caucasian, and 45% single. They resided around the world, with 31% from the U.S., 27% from the U.K., and the remaining 42% of participants from 26 international countries. Participants at Time 3 ranged in age from 18 to 69 ($M = 32.13$, $SD = 11.92$), with 53% male, 81% Caucasian, and 43% mostly single, 28% from the U.S., 27% from the U.K., and the remaining 45% of participants from 25 international countries.

Procedure

The procedures and surveys completed at Time 1, 2, and 3 were highly similar and were designed to assess test-retest reliability (or correlations among the CDCS and its subscales) across the three time points. At all three timepoints, participants were reimbursed \$3.75 on Prolific for a study titled “A Social Interaction Psychological Research Survey,” with their participation lasting 25, 19, and 20 mins, respectively. Following written consent online, participants first completed our prompt asking them to take a few moments to describe an

interpersonal interaction that had taken place within the last 2 days, to ensure the interaction was fresh and cognitively accessible in their minds. Then participants completed our 16-item connection measure, followed by questions about their specific social interaction, their interaction partner, and demographic items about themselves. Participants at Time 1 completed our full set of measures (e.g., positivity resonance, loneliness, personality), while at Time 2 and 3, participants responded to a subset of these measures (outlined below). Although we expected that test-retest stability may be relatively low (due to the uniqueness of each social interaction and partner), this repeated assessment allowed us to examine the stability and consistency of the CDCS over time.

Materials

In addition to various demographic and interaction specific variables, seven measures were used in Study 2. The sample means, standard deviations, and reliability coefficients (Cronbach's alphas and McDonald's omegas) for each measure are reported in Table 3.

Interaction-Specific Measures

Connection During Conversations Scale. Participants were asked to respond to our 16-item measure of interaction-specific social connection developed in Study 1 on a 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 7 (*strongly agree*) Likert scale. These items, including those that were reverse coded in analyses, are shown in Table 2.

Interaction Partner Demographics and Interaction Details. Participants again reported the interaction partner demographics and interaction details from Study 1 (see Table 1).

Partner Responsiveness. The 12-item Partner Responsiveness Scale (Reis et al., 2011, 2017), again completed about their interaction partner, contains items like "...understands me" and "...sees the 'real' me" (1 = *strongly disagree*, 7 = *strongly agree*).

Positivity Resonance. Participants completed the 7-item Positivity Resonance Scale about their specific interaction (Major et al., 2018; e.g., “Did you feel a sense of mutual trust with (your interaction partner)?” and “Did thoughts and feelings flow with ease between you and your interaction partner?”). Responses were made as percentages of time spent on the social interaction, on a sliding 0 to 100 percent scale, where higher numbers indicated greater positivity resonance.

Shared Reality. Participants also responded to the 8-item Shared Reality Scale about the social interaction (Rossignac-Milon et al., 2021; e.g., “...the way we thought became more similar” and “...we saw the world in the same way”), using a 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 7 (*strongly agree*) Likert scale.

General Measures

Relatedness. Participants responded to the 6-item relatedness subscale of the BMPN (Sheldon & Hilpert, 2012), which has items such as “I felt a sense of contact with people who care for me, and whom I care for” and “I felt close and connected with other people who are important to me,” rated on 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 7 (*strongly agree*) Likert scales.

Loneliness. Participants completed the 20-item UCLA Loneliness Scale (Russell et al., 1980). Sample items include “No one really knows me well” and “My social relationships are superficial,” rated on 1 (*never*) to 4 (*often*) Likert scales, with higher scores indicating greater loneliness.

Personality. Participants responded to the extraversion facet only (Time 1: $M = 2.90$, $SD = 0.78$, $\alpha = .87$; Time 2: $M = 3.86$, $SD = 1.09$, $\alpha = .89$; Time 3: $M = 3.91$, $SD = 1.10$, $\alpha = .89$) of the 60-item Big Five Inventory-2 (Soto & John, 2017) on 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*) scales.

Results

Confirmatory Factor Analysis

We conducted CFAs at each of our three timepoints on our 16-item measure of connection to assess whether our four-factor solution was a good fit. All CFAs were conducted in R using the *cfa* function in the lavaan package, with maximum likelihood estimation applied. At time 1, the four-factor CFA fit our connection items well, $\chi^2(98) = 378.80$, CFI = .932, TLI = .916, RMSEA = .085, 90% CI [.076, .094], SRMR = .054. At Time 2, again, the four-factor solution was a good fit, $\chi^2(98) = 378.84$, CFI = .925, TLI = .908, RMSEA = .092, 90% CI [.083, .102], SRMR = .059. At Time 3, a four-factor CFA also fit our connection items well, $\chi^2(98) = 367.39$, CFI = .930, TLI = .915, RMSEA = .096, 90% CI [.086, .106], SRMR = .050.

We also conducted correlations among each of the latent variables for each of our three timepoints. The Shared Reality latent variable was strongly correlated with the Partner Responsiveness latent variable ($r = .86$), the Participant Interest latent variable ($r = .76$), and the Affective Experience latent variance ($r = -.78$). The Partner Responsiveness was also strongly correlated with the Participant Interest latent variable ($r = .77$) and the Affective Experience latent variable ($r = -.72$). Finally, the Participant Interest latent variable and the Affective Experience latent variable were also negatively correlated ($r = -.80$).

Correlations Among the Connection During Conversations Scale and Other Measures

Table 3 displays representative correlations for participants at Time 1 between our Connection During Conversations Scale, its four subscales, and similar scales that measure social connection in the literature. First, as expected, our overall scale was highly correlated (r s ranging from .68 to .84) with the Positivity Resonance Scale, Partner Responsiveness Scale, and Shared Reality Scale (the latter two being reflected in two of the subscales in our measure) and

moderately correlated (r 's ranging from .25 to .34) with the relatedness subscale of the BMPN, loneliness, and extraversion. Again, as expected, the four subscales were highly correlated with one another, with r s ranging from .54 (between the Shared Reality subscale and Participant Interest subscale) to .84 (between the Shared Reality subscale and Partner Responsiveness subscale).

When examining the correlation between the four subscales of our Connection During Conversations Scale and previous social connection measures, the correlations followed similar patterns to the overall scale. For example, our Shared Reality subscale was highly correlated with the Positivity Resonance Scale, Partner Responsiveness Scale, and Shared Reality Scale (r s ranging from .76 to .79) and relatively more weakly correlated with relatedness, loneliness, and extraversion (r s between .26 and -.15). The other three subscales followed a similar trend, revealing strong correlations with the Positivity Resonance Scale, Partner Responsiveness Scale, and Shared Reality Scale. See Table 3 for the full correlation matrix.

Correlations Among Study 2 Timepoints 1, 2, and 3.

Table 4 displays correlations among each of the timepoints in Study 2 to examine correlates on the CDCS, its subscales, and related scales. Correlations of the CDCS from Time 1, 2, and 3 were all significant and moderate (r s ranging from .27 – .32). For item-level correlations see Supplemental Materials Table S2.

Study 3

Because two items in all three Study 2 timepoints (items 12 and 13 in Table 2) had factor loadings below .50, the generally accepted cutoff for newly developed items (Awang, 2015), we recruited a new sample to validate the CDCS without these two items.

Method

Participants

In Study 3, a new set of participants ($N = 235$) were recruited from a medium-sized public university in the U.S. and were granted research credit for their participation. The study was approved by the University of California, Riverside Institutional Review Board, and participants provided written consent to the study online. Participants ranged in age from 18 to 40 ($M = 19.82$, $SD = 2.02$) and were slightly more female (58%), plurality Asian (42%), and majority never married (64%). Their parents' highest level of education was some college (25%) or a 4-year college (20%).

Procedure

Participants completed a 30-min survey online, which comprised the Connection During Conversations Scale, as well as some measures used in Study 2, as well as new measures (e.g., Satisfaction With Life Scale, BMPN), to further assess construct and discriminant validity. In this study, the participants were asked to recall and write about their social interaction, but they were not asked to rate the interaction or their partner. Participants also responded to items about the COVID-19 pandemic, but analysis of these items is beyond the scope of the present study.

Materials

Interaction-Specific Measures

Connection During Conversations Scale. Participants were asked to respond to our reduced 14-item measure of interaction-specific social connection developed in Study 1. These items, including those that were reverse coded in all analyses, are shown in Table 3.

General Measures

Affect. Participants responded to a modified 15-item version of the Affect Adjective Scale (Diener & Emmons, 1984), which includes both high and low arousal positive affect (PA; e.g., joyful, peaceful/serene) and negative affect (NA; e.g., angry/hostile, dull/bored, embarrassed) that participants used to assess their affect in the past 7 days (PA: $M = 4.14$, $SD = 1.17$, $\alpha = .91$; NA: $M = 3.58$, $SD = 1.18$, $\alpha = .85$).

Autonomy, Competence, and Relatedness. Participants in Study 3 completed the full 18-item BMPN, using 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 7 (*strongly agree*) Likert scales, which included the autonomy ($M = 4.19$, $SD = 0.62$, $\alpha = .51$), competence ($M = 3.91$, $SD = 0.74$, $\alpha = .71$), and relatedness subscales ($M = 4.37$, $SD = 0.75$, $\alpha = .69$).

Loneliness. Participants again responded to the UCLA Loneliness Scale ($M = 2.08$, $SD = 0.56$, $\alpha = .93$).

Life Satisfaction. The 5-item Satisfaction With Life Scale (Diener et al., 1985) includes items such as “I am satisfied with my life” (1 = *strongly disagree*, 7 = *strongly agree*; $M = 4.06$, $SD = 1.29$, $\alpha = .86$).

Personality. Participants responded to the 60-item Big Five Inventory-2 for all five facets (Extraversion $M = 3.09$, $SD = 0.69$, $\alpha = .86$; Conscientiousness $M = 3.34$, $SD = .62$, $\alpha = .84$; Neuroticism $M = 3.07$, $SD = .72$, $\alpha = .86$; Openness $M = 3.58$, $SD = .62$, $\alpha = .82$; and Agreeableness $M = 3.67$, $SD = .53$, $\alpha = .77$).

Results

Confirmatory Factor Analysis

We conducted a CFA using the *cfa* function in the lavaan package in R using maximum likelihood estimation on our reduced 14-item measure of connection to assess whether our four-factor solution was a good fit. A four-factor CFA fit our connection items well, $\chi^2(71) = 149.360$,

CFI = .949, TLI = .935, RMSEA = .069; 90%CI [.053, .084], SRMR = .045. Correlations among latent variables were strong. The Shared Reality latent variable was strongly correlated with the Partner Responsiveness latent variable ($r = .86$), the Participant Interest latent variable ($r = .76$), and the Affective Experience latent variance ($r = -.78$). The Partner Responsiveness was also strongly correlated with the Participant Interest latent variable ($r = .77$) and the Affective Experience latent variable ($r = -.72$). Finally, the Participant Interest latent variable and the Affective Experience latent variable were also negatively correlated ($r = -.80$).

Correlations Among the Connection During Conversations Scale and Other Measures

Table 5 displays correlations between the CDCS, its four subscales, and the other social connection scales included in this study. These correlations slightly diverge from Study 2 because we removed two items—one item from the Participant Interest subscale and one item from the Affective Experience subscale. First, as expected, our scale overall was moderately correlated with the relatedness subscale of the BMPN ($r = .58$) and loneliness ($r = -.61$) but relatively more weakly correlated with extraversion ($r = .36$). The four subscales were also highly correlated with one another, with r s ranging from .40 (between Shared Reality and Affective Experience) to .80 (between Shared Reality and Partner Responsiveness).

When examining the associations between the four subscales of our Connection During Conversations Scale and similar scales that assess social connection in the literature, again the correlations replicated the patterns obtained with the full (now) 14-item measure. For example, the Partner Responsiveness subscale was moderately correlated with relatedness ($r = .51$) and loneliness ($r = -.58$) but more relatively weakly correlated with extraversion ($r = .32$). All other subscales followed a similar trend. See Table 5 for the full correlation matrix.

Regression Analyses

Because our subscales were highly inter-correlated (r s ranging from .40 to .80), we conducted a series of regression analyses where each of the various outcome variables was regressed on the four subscales of the CDCS. Indeed, we found that our four subscales uniquely predicted various outcomes. For example, only Partner Responsiveness significantly predicted life satisfaction ($b = .30, SE = .13, p = .014$) and general PA in the past 7 days ($b = .32, SE = .12, p = .011$), only Affective Experience significantly predicted general NA ($b = -.30, SE = .07, p < .001$), and only Shared Reality significantly predicted conscientiousness ($b = -.14, SE = .07, p = .034$). Additionally, both Partner Responsiveness and Affective Experience significantly predicted relatedness (Partner Responsiveness: $b = .17, SE = .07, p = .014$; Affective Experience: $b = .16, SE = .04, p < .001$) and loneliness (Partner Responsiveness: $b = -.16, SE = .05, p < .001$; Affective Experience: $b = -.09, SE = .03, p = .001$). Given the high correlations among the CDCS subscales, we also calculated the variance inflation factors (VIFs) for each subscale in the regression models. Since all VIFs fell below the commonly used threshold of 10 (VIFs ranged from 1.62 to 2.85), this suggests multicollinearity was not a major concern in our analyses (Salmerón et al., 2018). Table 6 displays the full set of regression analyses. In sum, each of our four subscales, despite being highly correlated, uniquely predicted several positive and negative psychological outcomes.

Discussion

By compiling and updating items from existing measures in the literature that assess different aspects of social connection and interpersonal relationships, we created a new 14-item measure of social connection felt in a specific social interaction. Across three studies, we documented the reliability and validity of the Connection During Conversations Scale in measuring social connection in different social interactions. Furthermore, in Study 3, we

demonstrated the uniqueness of each of our four subscales in predicting different outcomes. For example, the Shared Reality subscale was uniquely associated with conscientiousness; the Affective Experience subscale was uniquely associated with autonomy and loneliness; and the Partner Responsiveness subscale was uniquely associated with life satisfaction and positive affect in the last 7 days. As such, should researchers wish to look at connection as a whole (all 14 items) or a specific facet of connection, our findings provide preliminary evidence that each piece of the CDCS may offer unique information about the conversation and about the respondent.

Our measure fills a gap in the literature, as few existing scales specifically target aspects of social connection experienced during a specific interaction. Both researchers and laypeople have long known that fulfilling relationships are vital for social connection and well-being. However, what are interpersonal relationships but arguably simply a series of joint experiences, interactions, and conversations? Thus, not surprisingly, emerging research demonstrates that happy and socially connected people report having relatively frequent interactions (see Van Lange & Columbus, 2021, for a review). Accordingly, we hope the CDCS will allow researchers to advance understanding of the psychological causes, mechanisms, and consequences of the connection felt during specific interactions. Future work as such may be able to identify what makes a conversation feel connecting. As just one example, researchers could test whether the common social etiquette of “not talking about religion or politics” really is an outdated sentiment and, if not, to identify potential boundary conditions (e.g., conversation length or type of interaction partner) that impact when hot-button topics are (or are not) connecting.

Furthermore, our measure contributes to the literature in that it captures four important facets or ingredients of social connection: shared reality, partner responsiveness, participant

interest, and affective (or negative) experience. An extensive literature has already detailed the critical role that the experience of shared reality and partner responsiveness play in a sense of overall social connection (for reviews, see Echterhoff et al., 2009; Reis et al., 2004). That is, it is not surprising that two individuals who feel a commonality between one another (shared reality) or feel especially understood and valued by their partner (partner responsiveness) would report a strong sense of connection and a high-quality relationship.

Based on the regression analyses in Study 3, we have preliminary evidence demonstrating that participant interest and affective experience may also be important for various psychological outcomes, such as neuroticism and negative affect, respectively. That is, perhaps some of the items in the CDCS that specifically tap into a person's subjective experience during the interaction may be related to their personality and emotional state. Indeed, past research has shown that neurotic individuals often focus on the negatives and report relatively worse relationship satisfaction; our measure appears to pick up on this well-established phenomenon (for review, see Ozer & Benet-Martínez, 2006). However, this study did not explicitly test this connection, but rather, the results presented provide preliminary evidence for such a phenomenon. Nonetheless, future research may benefit from aggregating multiple CDCS scores over time to see if this phenomenon holds true. Accordingly, our four subscales may provide meaningful insight into a variety of psychological outcomes.

In Study 2, we found that the 16-item version of the Connection During Conversations Scale was highly correlated with both existing conversation-specific measures of connection—namely, the Shared Reality ($r = .68$) and Positivity Resonance scales ($r = .84$). Although these correlations are high, our measure is different in a few key ways. First, the CDCS comprises three additional subscales beyond shared reality. Second, because our measure was not motivated

by positivity resonance theory, it aims to assess social connection both as a broader and more comprehensive construct (i.e., the average of all items) and as tapping into four critical but separate ingredients of connection (i.e., the individual subscales of shared reality, partner responsiveness, participant interest, and affective experience). Furthermore, the CDCS can be used to measure each of these features not only individually but in combination with one or two others (e.g., affective experience and participant interest but not partner responsiveness or shared reality). Such analyses may lead to unexpected insights—for example, what types of relationships, partners, or circumstances give rise to conversations that are interesting and engaging but do not lead one to feel in sync, valued, and understood? As such, our measure is not aligned with a specific theory of connection or limited to one feature of connection, but rather can tap into one to four critical ingredients of a connecting interaction depending on the research question.

Limitations

A few limitations need to be addressed. First, the CDCS along with all other measures used across our three studies rely on self-reported data. This is a concern because we may see inflated relationships due to common method variance (Campbell & Fiske, 1959) or overly positive responses due to self-enhancement biases (Heintzleman et al., 2014; John & Robins, 1994; Wojcik & Ditto, 2014), the latter which is a problem for any socially desirable questionnaire such as those that measure happiness or life satisfaction (van de Mortel, 2008; Wojcik & Ditto, 2014). Although we did not assess common method variance in our statistical analyses, we employed various study design and data collection strategies to mitigate its potential impact, such as collecting multiple samples, providing clear instructions, and ensuring participant anonymity (Podsakoff et al., 2004). Second, the CFAs in Study 2 showed slightly

elevated RMSEA values, which may raise concerns about model fit. It is important to note, however, that the other fit indices (CFI, TLI, and SRMR) demonstrated a good fit for the model, and the RMSEA is known to be a sensitive model that may overestimate lack of model fit (Marsh et al., 2004). Next, the sample sizes and composition of our samples, while relatively diverse in age (ranging from 18 to 70s), relationship status, and spanning countries around the world (e.g., the U.S., the U.K., Germany), were insufficient to make fine grained and complex comparisons. For example, our samples were too small to examine interactions between participant ethnicity and type of partner. Additionally, the samples recruited for Study 1 and 2 (predominantly White, male, internationally-based adults) differed substantially from the sample recruited for Study 3 (predominantly Asian, female, U.S. college students) — making specific comparisons more complex and difficult. Future investigators could oversample particular demographics or types of conversations and conversation partners in order to test comparisons and interaction effects. Another limitation is that our measure is designed to apply only to dyadic interactions—that is, to conversations between two individuals rather than groups of three or more. Of course, many conversations and social interactions—whether at a dinner party or Zoom brainstorming meeting—occur in a group or team context. Although not validated or intended to be used in this way, future studies could administer the CDCS multiple times (e.g., about Person A, B, and C) to assess felt social connection felt in a group conversation or adapt the instructions to refer to the group (e.g., whether one felt in sync with the group versus with a particular person).

Future Directions

Although we have outlined a few ideas for future directions above, there are further ways in which the CDCS can benefit future theory and research. Future investigators could bolster the

generalizability of the CDCS by asking respondents to rate conversations with particular (and relatively infrequent) interaction partners, such as strangers, distant family members, and coworkers, or, alternatively, target long-term committed relationship partners. This approach may help to further establish the validity and reliability of our new scale within different types of relationships. However, as mentioned earlier, it is important to note that, when comparing scores on the CDCS for a single participant across several conversations (and conversation partners), test-retest stability is not likely to be high, because each social interaction is expected to be unique. Regardless, we did find moderate correlations across three points in time on the connection measure in Study 2 (see Table 5).

Additionally, the CDCS can be used to assess whether certain types of interactions are more connecting than others. To address this question, researchers can focus on different aspects of conversations, such as interactions among specific types of interaction partners (e.g., family versus strangers, same-sex versus opposite sex, same versus different ethnicities, younger versus older dyads), the mode of communication (e.g., phone versus video), and the length of the conversation predicting feelings of connection. Relatedly, the CDCS can help identify which individual characteristics (e.g., personality, religious beliefs, political orientations) or conversation topics (e.g., personal stories, shared opinions, gossip) that make for more or less connecting moments. The results from such studies may help researchers identify both rifts and pinnacles of felt social connection and, thereby, to develop tools to repair or strengthen connecting moments in dyadic conversations.

We also recommend investigating alternative models, such as the bifactor model, to enhance understanding of the scale's underlying dimensions (Rodriguez et al., 2016). For example, do the four factors assess an essentially unidimensional construct of social connection?

A bifactor approach could potentially reveal a general factor alongside specific factors, offering a more comprehensive perspective on the scale's internal structure and its relationship with other constructs.

Future investigators could also leverage a number of different methodologies in using the CDCS in studying human social interactions. For example, daily diary studies could examine how repeated interactions with the same person over time might predict feelings of connection. Furthermore, in experimental studies, participants could be instructed to have different types of conversations—for example, with a stranger who is matched versus mismatched on the Big Five; after a joy versus sadness mood induction, and face-to-face versus on video. Such studies would give researchers the opportunity to compare differences in the features or quality of connection experiences, as measured by the CDCS, after conversations with different types of partners, under different conditions, and using different modes of communication. For example, feelings of shared reality may be stronger for those conversing face-to-face than virtually because of the shared physical space, while negative affective experience may be higher for virtual conversations, due to awkwardness felt when someone is frozen or lagging. Notably, using the CDCS in face-to-face laboratory studies may also allow researchers to code nonverbal behaviors (e.g., leaning towards partner, arms crossed, fidgeting) during the conversations to add another dimension to help assess the quantity and quality of connection felt in conversation. Additionally, researchers could use the CDCS as part of ecologic momentary assessment to track, in real time, whether people are engaging in a conversation and, in that moment, how connected they are feeling. Such ratings could then be compared to the participants' retrospective self-reports (i.e., using the CDCS to rate the conversation at end of day or next day); differences

between the “real-time” and retrospective reports could tap into social cognitive aspects of social connection.

Importantly, the CDCS may be valuable to investigate the antecedents, causes, mechanisms, and consequences of felt social connection. For example, by comparing different types of dyads (e.g., mother-daughter versus mother-son) that vary in closeness (e.g., interact daily versus monthly), mode of interaction (e.g., in person versus phone), conversation starting point (e.g., small talk vs. deep talk), and conversation topics (e.g., small talk versus problem solving versus reminiscing), future investigators may be able to disentangle which conversation features foster felt connection (e.g., begin with genuine interest), which maintain connection (e.g., shared memories), and which predict particular facets of connection, like partner responsiveness (e.g., in person conversations).

Conclusion

An individual’s overall sense of closeness, connection, and belonging is arguably derived from multiple conversations or social interactions—not only with partners, family members, and friends but with coworkers, acquaintances, and strangers. Because extensive research has shown that connection is vital for both mental and physical well-being (for review, see Holt-Lunstad et al., 2017), it is imperative for researchers to better understand how, when, where, and with whom people experience moments of connection in conversations. To this end, using a bottom-up approach, we developed our new Connection During Conversations Scale (CDCS), comprising four key facets of connection. The CDCS joins a very short list of measures that tap social connection felt during such specific conversations and interactions. We hope that this measure will allow researchers to identify what factors are associated with and promote the most connecting conversations in all kinds of dyads (including those diverging in closeness,

personality, or political values) and in all kinds of circumstances (including conversations that are rushed, virtual, or glitchy). Ultimately, this work aims to inform future interventions that could both boost overall feelings of connection and help people connect across divides during specific social interactions.

References

- Aknin, L. B., Dunn, E. W., Sandstrom, G. M., & Norton, M. I. (2013). Does social connection turn good deeds into good feelings? On the value of putting the “social” in prosocial spending. *International Journal of Happiness and Development, 1*(2), 155–171. <https://doi.org/10.1504/IJHD.2013.055643>
- Aron, A., Aron, E. N., & Smollan, D. (1992). Inclusion of Other in the Self Scale and the structure of interpersonal closeness. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 63*(4), 596–612. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.63.4.596>
- Awang, Z. (2015). Validating the measurement model: CFA. In *A handbook on SEM* (2nd ed., pp. 54–73). Universiti Sultan Zainal Abidin.
- Barrera, M., Sandler, I. N., & Ramsay, T. B. (1981). Preliminary development of a scale of social support: Studies on college students. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 9*(4), 435–447. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00918174>
- Baumeister, R. F., & Leary, M. R. (1995). The need to belong: Desire for interpersonal attachments as a fundamental human motivation. *Psychological Bulletin, 117*(3), 497–529. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.117.3.497>
- Baumeister, R. F., Twenge, J. M., & Nuss, C. K. (2002). Effects of social exclusion on cognitive processes: Anticipated aloneness reduces intelligent thought. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 83*(4), 817–827. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.83.4.817>
- Bengtson, P. L., & Grotevant, H. D. (1999). The individuality and connectedness Q-sort: A measure for assessing individuality and connectedness in dyadic relationships. *Personal Relationships, 6*(2), 213–225. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-6811.1999.tb00188.x>

- Bernstein, M. J., Zawadzki, M. J., Juth, V., Benfield, J. A., & Smyth, J. M. (2018). Social interactions in daily life: Within-person associations between momentary social experiences and psychological and physical health indicators. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 35*(3), 371–394. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0265407517691366>
- Berscheid, E., Snyder, M., & Omoto, A. M. (1989). The Relationship Closeness Inventory: Assessing the closeness of interpersonal relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 57*(5), 792–807. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.57.5.792>
- Bost, K. K., Cox, M. J., Burchinal, M. R., & Payne, C. (2002). Structural and supportive changes in couples' family and friendship networks across the transition to parenthood. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 64*(2), 517–531. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3737.2002.00517.x>
- Buckner, J. C. (1988). The development of an instrument to measure neighborhood cohesion. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 16*(6), 771–791. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00930892>
- Cacioppo, J. T., Kalil, A., Huges, M. E., Waite, L., & Thisted, R. A. (2008). Happiness and the invisible threads of social connection: The Chicago Health, Aging, and Social Relations Study. In *The Science of Subjective Well-Being*. Guilford Press.
- Campbell, D. T., & Fiske, D. W. (1959). Convergent and discriminant validation of the multitrait-multi-method matrix. *Psychological Bulletin, 56*, 81–105.
- Carmichael, C. L., Reis, H. T., & Duberstein, P. R. (2015). In your 20s it's quantity, in your 30s it's quality: The prognostic value of social activity across 30 years of adulthood. *Psychology and Aging, 30*(1), 95–105. <https://doi.org/10.1037/pag0000014>

- Carstensen, L. L., Isaacowitz, D. M., & Charles, S. T. (1999). Taking time seriously. A theory of socioemotional selectivity. *The American Psychologist*, *54*(3), 165–181.
<https://doi.org/10.1037//0003-066x.54.3.165>
- Clark, M. S., Oullette, R., Powell, M. C., & Milberg, S. (1987). Recipient's mood, relationship type, and helping. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *53*(1), 94–103.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.53.1.94>
- Cole, S. W., Hawkley, L. C., Arevalo, J. M., Sung, C. Y., Rose, R. M., & Cacioppo, J. T. (2007). Social regulation of gene expression in human leukocytes. *Genome Biology*, *8*(9), R189.
<https://doi.org/10.1186/gb-2007-8-9-r189>
- Cross, S. E., Bacon, P. L., & Morris, M. L. (2000). The relational-interdependent self-construal and relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *78*(4), 791–808.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.78.4.791>
- Cutrona, C. E., & Russel, D. (1987). The provisions of social relationships and adaptation to stress. In W. H. Jones & D. Periman (Eds.), *Advances in personal relationships* (Vol. 1, pp. 37–68). JAI Press.
- Davis, M. (1980). A multidimensional approach to individual differences in empathy. *JSAS Catalog Selected Documents in Psychology*, *10*.
- Descutner, C. J., & Thelen, M. H. (1991). Development and validation of a fear-of-intimacy scale. *Psychological Assessment: A Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, *3*(2), 218–225. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1040-3590.3.2.218>
- Diener, E., & Emmons, R. A. (1984). The independence of positive and negative affect. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *47*(5), 1105–1117. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.47.5.1105>

- Diener, E., Emmons, R. A., Larsen, R. J., & Griffin, S. (1985). The Satisfaction With Life Scale. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, *49*(1), 71–75.
https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327752jpa4901_13
- Diener, E., & Seligman, M. E. P. (2002). Very happy people. *Psychological Science*, *13*(1), 81–84. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9280.00415>
- Echterhoff, G., Higgins, E. T., & Levine, J. M. (2009). Shared reality: Experiencing commonality with others' inner states about the world. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, *4*(5), 496–521. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-6924.2009.01161.x>
- Eisenberger, N. I., Gable, S. L., & Lieberman, M. D. (2007). Functional magnetic resonance imaging responses relate to differences in real-world social experience. *Emotion*, *7*(4), 745–754. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1528-3542.7.4.745>
- Epley, N., & Schroeder, J. (2014). Mistakenly seeking solitude. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, *143*(5), 1980–1999. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0037323>
- Evans, N. J., & Jarvis, P. A. (1986). The group attitude scale: A measure of attraction to group. *Small Group Behavior*, *17*(2), 203–216. <https://doi.org/10.1177/104649648601700205>
- Fincham, F. D., & Bradbury, T. N. (1992). Assessing attributions in marriage: The relationship attribution measure. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *62*(3), 457–468.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.62.3.457>
- Fraley, R. C., Heffernan, M. E., Vicary, A. M., & Brumbaugh, C. C. (2011). The Experiences in Close Relationships-Relationship Structures Questionnaire: A method for assessing attachment orientations across relationships. *Psychological Assessment*, *23*(3), 615–625.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/a0022898>

- Fredrickson, B. L. (2016). Love: Positivity resonance as a fresh, evidence-based perspective on an age-old topic. In L. F. Barrett & J. M. Haviland (Eds.), *Handbook of emotions* (4th edition, pp. 847–858). Guilford Press.
- Fritz, M. M., Margolis, S., Revord, J. C., Kellerman, G. R., Nieminen, L. R. G., Reece, A., & Lyubomirsky, S. (2021). Examining the social in the prosocial: Episode-level features of social interactions and kind acts predict social connection and well-being. *Under Review*.
- Funk, J. L., & Rogge, R. D. (2007). Testing the ruler with item response theory: Increasing precision of measurement for relationship satisfaction with the Couples Satisfaction Index. *Journal of Family Psychology, 21*(4), 572–583. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0893-3200.21.4.572>
- Funke, F., Reips, U., & Thomas, R. K. (2010). Sliders for the smart: Type of rating scale on the web interacts with educational level. *Social Science Computer Review, 29*(2), 221–231. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0894439310376896>
- Grieve, R., Indian, M., Witteveen, K., Anne Tolan, G., & Marrington, J. (2013). Face-to-face or Facebook: Can social connectedness be derived online? *Computers in Human Behavior, 29*(3), 604–609. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2012.11.017>
- Hagerty, B. M. K., & Patusky, K. (1995). Developing a measure of sense of belonging. *Nursing Research, 44*(1), 9–13. <https://doi.org/10.1097/00006199-199501000-00003>
- Hatfield, E., & Sprecher, S. (1986). Measuring passionate love in intimate relationships. *Journal of Adolescence, 9*(4), 383–410. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-1971\(86\)80043-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-1971(86)80043-4)
- Heintzelman, S., Trent, J., & King, L. (2014). Revisiting desirable response bias in well-being reports. *Journal of Positive Psychology: Dedicated to Furthering Research and Promoting Good Practice, 10*(2), 167–178.

Hendrick, S. S., Dicke, A., & Hendrick, C. (1998). The relationship assessment scale. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 15*(1), 137–142.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/0265407598151009>

Holt-Lunstad, J., Robles, T. F., & Sbarra, D. A. (2017). Advancing social connection as a public health priority in the United States. *American Psychologist, 72*(6), 517–530.

<https://doi.org/10.1037/amp0000103>

Holt-Lunstad, J., Smith, T. B., & Layton, J. B. (2010). Social relationships and mortality risk: A meta-analytic review. *PLOS Medicine, 7*(7), e1000316.

<https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pmed.1000316>

House, J. S., Umberson, D., & Landis, K. R. (1988). Structures and processes of social support. *Annual Review of Sociology, 14*(1), 293–318.

<https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.so.14.080188.001453>

Huynh, J. Y., Metzger, J. C., & Winefield, A. H. (2012). Validation of the four-dimensional connectedness scale in a multisample volunteer study: A distinct construct from work engagement and organizational commitment. *VOLUNTAS: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations, 23*(4), 1056–1082.

<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11266-011-9259-4>

Ickes, W., Hutchison, J., & Mashek, D. (2004). Closeness as intersubjectivity: Social absorption and social individuation. In J. Mashek & A. P. Aron (Eds.), *Handbook of Closeness and Intimacy* (pp. 357–373). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.

Jackson, S. A., & Marsh, H. W. (1996). Development and validation of a scale to measure optimal experience: The Flow State Scale. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology, 18*(1), 17–35. <https://doi.org/10.1123/jsep.18.1.17>

- Jacques-Hamilton, R., Sun, J., & Smillie, L. D. (2019). Costs and benefits of acting extraverted: A randomized controlled trial. *Journal of Experimental Psychology, 148*(9), 1538–1556. <https://doi.org/10.1037/xge0000516>
- John, O. P., & Robins, R. W. (1994). Accuracy and bias in self-perception: Individual differences in self-enhancement and the role of narcissism. In *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* (Vol. 66, Issue 1, pp. 206–219).
- Kahneman, D., Krueger, A. B., Schkade, D. A., Schwarz, N., & Stone, A. A. (2004). A survey method for characterizing daily life experience: The day reconstruction method. *Science, 306*(5702), 1776. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1103572>
- Kaufman, V. A., Perez, J. C., Reise, S. P., Bradbury, T. N., & Karney, B. R. (2021). Friendship Network Satisfaction: A multifaceted construct scored as a unidimensional scale. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 02654075211025639*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/02654075211025639>
- King, L. A., & Emmons, R. A. (1990). Conflict over emotional expression: Psychological and physical correlates. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 58*(5), 864–877. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.58.5.864>
- Lay, C., Fairlie, P., Jackson, S., Ricci, T., Eisenberg, J., Sato, T., Teeaar, A., & Melamud, A. (1998). Domain-specific allocentrism-idiocentrism: A measure of family connectedness. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 29*(3), 434–460. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022198293004>
- Lee, R. M., Draper, M., & Lee, S. (2001). Social connectedness, dysfunctional interpersonal behaviors, and psychological distress: Testing a mediator model. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 48*(3), 310–318. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0167.48.3.310>

- Lee, R. M., & Robbins, S. B. (1995). Measuring belongingness: The Social Connectedness and the Social Assurance scales. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 42*(2), 232–241.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0167.42.2.232>
- Lounsbury, J. W., & DeNeui, D. (1996). Collegiate psychological sense of community in relation to size of college/university and extroversion. *Journal of Community Psychology, 24*(4), 381–394. [https://doi.org/10.1002/\(SICI\)1520-6629\(199610\)24:4<381::AID-JCOP7>3.0.CO;2-X](https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1520-6629(199610)24:4<381::AID-JCOP7>3.0.CO;2-X)
- Luhtanen, R., & Crocker, J. (1992). A collective self-esteem scale: Self-evaluation of one's social identity. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 18*(3), 302–318.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167292183006>
- Lund, M. (1985). The development of Investment and Commitment Scales for predicting continuity of personal relationships. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 2*(1), 3–23. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0265407585021001>
- Lyubomirsky, S., Sheldon, K. M., & Schkade, D. (2005). Pursuing happiness: The architecture of sustainable change. *Review of General Psychology, 9*(2), 111–131.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/1089-2680.9.2.111>
- Major, B. C., Le Nguyen, K. D., Lundberg, K. B., & Fredrickson, B. L. (2018). Well-being correlates of positivity resonance: Evidence from trait and episode-level assessments. *Personality and Social Psychological Bulletin, 44*(12), 1631–1647.
- Margolis, S., & Lyubomirsky, S. (2020). Experimental manipulation of extraverted and introverted behavior and its effects on well-being. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General, 149*(4), 719–731. <https://doi.org/10.1037/xge0000668>

- Marsh, H. W., Hau, K.-T., & Wen, Z. (2004). In search of golden rules: Comment on hypothesis-testing approaches to setting cutoff values for fit indexes and dangers in overgeneralizing Hu and Bentler's (1999) findings. *Structural Equation Modeling: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, *11*(3), 320-341. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15328007sem1103_2
- Mashek, D., Cannaday, L. W., & Tangney, J. P. (2007). Inclusion of community in self scale: A single-item pictorial measure of community connectedness. *Journal of Community Psychology*, *35*(2), 257–275. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jcop.20146>
- Maslow, A. H. (1943). A theory of human motivation. *Psychological Review*, *50*(4), 370–396. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0054346>
- Mayer, F. S., & Frantz, C. M. (2004). The connectedness to nature scale: A measure of individuals' feeling in community with nature. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, *24*(4), 503–515. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvp.2004.10.001>
- Mehl, M. R., Vazire, S., Holleran, S. E., & Clark, C. S. (2010). Eavesdropping on happiness: Well-Being is related to having less small talk and more substantive conversations. *Psychological Science*, *21*(4), 539–541. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797610362675>
- Milek, A., Butler, E. A., Tackman, A. M., Kaplan, D. M., Raison, C. L., Sbarra, D. A., Vazire, S., & Mehl, M. R. (2018). "Eavesdropping on Happiness" revisited: A pooled, multisample replication of the association between life satisfaction and observed daily conversation quantity and quality. *Psychological Science*, *29*(9), 1451–1462. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797618774252>
- Miller, L. C., Berg, J. H., & Archer, R. L. (1983). Openers: Individuals who elicit intimate self-disclosure. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *44*(6), 1234–1244. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.44.6.1234>

- Miller, R. S., & Lefcourt, H. M. (1982). The assessment of social intimacy. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, *46*(5), 514–518. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327752jpa4605_12
- Mills, J., Clark, M. S., Ford, T. E., & Johnson, M. (2004). Measurement of communal strength. *Personal Relationships*, *11*(2), 213–230. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-6811.2004.00079.x>
- Obst, P., Smith, S. G., & Zinkiewicz, L. (2002). An exploration of sense of community, part 3: Dimensions and predictors of psychological sense of community in geographical communities. *Journal of Community Psychology*, *30*(1), 119–133. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jcop.1054>
- Ozer, D. J., & Benet-Martínez, V. (2006). Personality and the prediction of consequential outcomes. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *57*(1), 401–421. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.57.102904.190127>
- Peer, E., Brandimarte, L., Samat, S., & Acquisti, A. (2017). Beyond the Turk: Alternative platforms for crowdsourcing behavioral research. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *70*, 153–163. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2017.01.006>
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Lee, J.-Y., & Podsakoff, N. P. (2003). Common method biases in behavioral research: A critical review of the literature and recommended remedies. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *88*, 879–903. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.88.5.879>
- Procidano, M. E., & Heller, K. (1983). Measures of perceived social support from friends and from family: Three validation studies. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, *11*(1), 1–24. <https://doi.org/0091-0562/83/0200-0001503.00/>

- Realo, A., Allik, J., & Vadi, M. (1997). The hierarchical structure of collectivism. *Journal of Research in Personality, 31*(1), 93–116. <https://doi.org/10.1006/jrpe.1997.2170>
- Register, M. E., Herman, J., & Tavakoli, A. S. (2011). Development and psychometric testing of the register – connectedness scale for older adults. *Research in Nursing & Health, 34*(1), 60–72. <https://doi.org/10.1002/nur.20415>
- Reis, H. T., Clark, M. S., & Holmes, J. G. (2004). Perceived partner responsiveness as an organizing construct in the study of intimacy and closeness. In D. J. Mashek & A. P. Aron (Eds.), *Handbook of closeness and intimacy* (pp. 201–225). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.
- Reis, H. T., Crasta, D., Rogge, R. D., Maniaci, M. R., & Carmichael, C. L. (2017). Perceived partner responsiveness scale (PPRS). In *The Sourcebook of Listening Research* (pp. 516–521). John Wiley & Sons, Ltd. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781119102991.ch57>
- Reis, H. T., Maniaci, M. R., Caprariello, P. A., Eastwick, P. W., & Finkel, E. J. (2011). Familiarity does indeed promote attraction in live interaction. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 101*(3), 557–570. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0022885>
- Rodriguez, A., Reise, S. P., & Haviland, M. G. (2016). Evaluating bifactor models: Calculating and interpreting statistical indices. *Psychological Methods, 21*(2), 137-150. <https://doi.org/10.1037/met0000045>
- Rossignac-Milon, M., Bolger, N., Zee, K. S., Boothby, E. J., & Higgins, E. T. (2021). Merged minds: Generalized shared reality in dyadic relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 120*(4), 882–911. <https://doi.org/10.1037/pspi0000266>
- Rubin, Z. (1970). Measurement of romantic love. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 16*(2), 265–273. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0029841>

- Russell, D., Peplau, L. A., & Cutrona, C. E. (1980). The revised UCLA Loneliness Scale: Concurrent and discriminant validity evidence. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 39*(3), 472–480.
- Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000). Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development, and well-being. *American Psychologist, 55*(1), 68–78.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.55.1.68>
- Salmerón, R., García, C. B., & García, J. (2018). Variance inflation factor and condition number in multiple linear regression. *Journal of Statistical Computation and Simulation, 88*(12), 2365-2384. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00949655.2018.1463376>
- Sandstrom, G. M., & Dunn, E. W. (2013). Is efficiency overrated?: Minimal social interactions lead to belonging and positive affect. *Social Psychological and Personality Science, 5*(4), 437–442. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1948550613502990>
- Sandstrom, G. M., & Dunn, E. W. (2014). Social interactions and well-being: The surprising power of weak ties. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 40*(7), 910–922.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167214529799>
- Sarason, I. G., Levine, H. M., Basham, R. B., & Sarason, B. R. (1983). Assessing social support: The Social Support Questionnaire. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 44*(1), 127–139. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.44.1.127>
- Schaefer, M. T., & Olson, D. H. (1981). Assessing intimacy: The pair inventory. *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy, 7*(1), 47–60. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1752-0606.1981.tb01351.x>
- Schutte, N. S., Malouff, J. M., Hall, L. E., Haggerty, D. J., Cooper, J. T., Golden, C. J., & Dornheim, L. (1998). Development and validation of a measure of emotional

- intelligence. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 25(2), 167–177.
[https://doi.org/10.1016/S0191-8869\(98\)00001-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0191-8869(98)00001-4)
- Selcuk, E., Gunaydin, G., Ong, A. D., & Almeida, D. M. (2016). Does partner responsiveness predict hedonic and eudaimonic well-being? A 10-year longitudinal study. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 78(2), 311–325. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jomf.12272>
- Seligman, M. E. P., Steen, T. A., Park, N., & Peterson, C. (2005). Positive psychology progress: Empirical validation of interventions. *American Psychologist*, 60(5), 410–421.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.60.5.410>
- Shakespeare-Finch, J., & Obst, P. L. (2011). The development of the 2-Way social support scale: A measure of giving and receiving emotional and instrumental support. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 93(5), 483–490. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00223891.2011.594124>
- Sheldon, K. M., & Hilpert, J. C. (2012). The balanced measure of psychological needs (BMPN) scale: An alternative domain general measure of need satisfaction. *Motivation and Emotion*, 36, 439–451. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11031-012-9279-4>
- Sibley, C. G., Fischer, R., & Liu, J. H. (2005). Reliability and validity of the revised Experiences in Close Relationships (ECR-R) self-report measure of adult romantic attachment. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 31(11), 1524–1536.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167205276865>
- Singelis, T. M. (1994). The measurement of independent and interdependent self-construals. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 20(5), 580–591.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167294205014>

- Slatcher, R. B., Selcuk, E., & Ong, A. D. (2015). Perceived partner responsiveness predicts diurnal cortisol profiles 10 years later. *Psychological Science, 26*(7), 972–982.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797615575022>
- Soto, C. J., & John, O. P. (2017). The next Big Five Inventory (BFI-2): Developing and assessing a hierarchical model with 15 facets to enhance bandwidth, fidelity, and predictive power. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 113*(1), 117–143.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/pspp0000096>
- Spanier, G. B. (1976). Measuring dyadic adjustment: New scales for assessing the quality of marriage and similar dyads. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 38*(1), 15–28. JSTOR.
<https://doi.org/10.2307/350547>
- Sternberg, R. J. (1997). Construct validation of a triangular love scale. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 27*(3), 313–335. [https://doi.org/10.1002/\(SICI\)1099-0992\(199705\)27:3<313::AID-EJSP824>3.0.CO;2-4](https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1099-0992(199705)27:3<313::AID-EJSP824>3.0.CO;2-4)
- Su, R., Tay, L., & Diener, E. (2014). The development and validation of the comprehensive inventory of thriving (CIT) and the brief inventory of thriving (BIT). *Applied Psychology: Health and Well-Being, 6*(3), 251–279. <https://doi.org/10.1111/aphw.12027>
- Sun, J., Harris, K., & Vazire, S. (2019). Is well-being associated with the quantity and quality of social interactions. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/pspp0000272>
- Tilden, V. P., Nelson, C. A., & May, B. A. (1990). The IPR Inventory: Development and psychometric characteristics. *Nursing Research, 39*(6).
https://journals.lww.com/nursingresearchonline/Fulltext/1990/11000/The_IPR_Inventory_Development_And_Psychometric.4.aspx

- van de Mortel, T. F. (2008). Faking it: Social desirability response bias in self-report research. *Australian Journal of Advanced Nursing, 25*(4), 40–48.
- Van Lange, P. A. M., & Columbus, S. (2021). Vitamin S: Why is social contact, even with strangers, so important to well-being. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 09637214211002538*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/09637214211002538>
- Wang, C. L., & Mowen, J. C. (1997). The separateness-connectedness self-schema: Scale development and application to message construction. *Psychology & Marketing, 14*(2), 185–207. [https://doi.org/10.1002/\(SICI\)1520-6793\(199703\)14:2<185::AID-MAR5>3.0.CO;2-9](https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1520-6793(199703)14:2<185::AID-MAR5>3.0.CO;2-9)
- Watson, D., & Friend, R. (1969). Measurement of social-evaluative anxiety. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 33*(4), 448–457. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0027806>
- Williams, K. D., Cheung, C. K. T., & Choi, W. (2000). Cyberostracism: Effects of being ignored over the Internet. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 79*(5), 748–762. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.79.5.748>
- Winefield, H. R., Winefield, A. H., & Tiggemann, M. (1992). Social support and psychological well-being in young adults: The Multi-Dimensional Support Scale. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 58*(1), 198–210. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327752jpa5801_17
- Wojcik, S. P., & Ditto, P. H. (2014). Motivated happiness: Self-enhancement inflates self-reported subjective well-being. *Social Psychological and Personality Science, 5*(7), 825–834.
- Zimet, G. D., Dahlem, N. W., Zimet, S. G., & Farley, G. K. (1988). The multidimensional scale of perceived social support. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 52*(1), 30–41. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327752jpa5201_2

Table 1. Partner Demographics and Interaction Details.

		Study 1	Study 2		
			Time 1	Time 2	Time 3
<i>Interaction Partner Demographics</i>					
<i>Gender</i>	47% Male 52% Female 1% Nonbinary < 1% Unknown	49% Male 51% Female 0% Nonbinary 0% Unknown	46% Male 54% Female 0% Nonbinary 0% Unknown	48% Male 52% Female 0% Nonbinary 0% Unknown	
<i>Age</i>	$M = 35.74, SD = 15.88$ Range: 14 – 87	$M = 35.28, SD = 15.63$ Range: 8 – 92	$M = 38.04, SD = 6.71$ Range: 6 – 86	$M = 38.70, SD = 15.73$ Range: 8 – 82	
<i>Ethnicity</i>	0% Native American/Alaskan 14% Asian 3% Black/African American 0% Hawaiian/Pacific Islander 66% White/Caucasian 11% Hispanic/Latino 2% Middle Eastern 1% More Than One 1% Other 3% Unknown	< 1% Native American/Alaskan 8% Asian 5% Black/African American 0% Hawaiian/Pacific Islander 77% White/Caucasian 5% Hispanic/Latino 2% Middle Eastern 1% More Than One 1% Other < 1% Unknown	< 1% Native American/Alaskan 7% Asian 3% Black/African American 1% Hawaiian/Pacific Islander 79% White/Caucasian 5% Hispanic/Latino 1% Middle Eastern 1% More Than One 1% Other 2% Unknown	< 1% Native American/Alaskan 8% Asian 4% Black/African American < 1% Hawaiian/Pacific Islander 78% White/Caucasian 5% Hispanic/Latino 1% Middle Eastern 1% More Than One 1% Other 1% Unknown	
<i>How Long Have You Known Your Interaction Partner</i>	11% We Just Met 2% A Few Hours 1% A Few Days 4% A Few Weeks 9% A Few Months 10% About A Year 26% A Few Years 36% Many Years	9% We Just Met 1% A Few Hours 2% A Few Days 3% A Few Weeks 10% A Few Months 9% About A Year 25% A Few Years 42% Many Years	9% We Just Met < 1% A Few Hours 1% A Few Days 2% A Few Weeks 4% A Few Months 7% About A Year 18% A Few Years 57% Many Years	8% We Just Met 1% A Few Hours 1% A Few Days 2% A Few Weeks 4% A Few Months 6% About A Year 19% A Few Years 59% Many Years	
<i>Who Is Your Interaction Partner?</i>	11% Stranger 7% Acquaintance 12% Casual (Non-Romantic) Friend 18% Close (Non-Romantic) Friend 11% Parent 3% Child 4% Brother/Sister	8% Stranger 7% Acquaintance 12% Casual (Non-Romantic) Friend 25% Close (Non-Romantic) Friend 11% Parent 2% Child 4% Brother/Sister	9% Stranger 4% Acquaintance 7% Casual (Non-Romantic) Friend 24% Close (Non-Romantic) Friend 18% Parent 1% Child 7% Brother/Sister	7% Stranger 5% Acquaintance 11% Casual (Non-Romantic) Friend 23% Close (Non-Romantic) Friend 19% Parent 1% Child 7% Brother/Sister	

	1% Grandparent < 1% Aunt/Uncle 7% Coworker 4% Boss/Supervisor < 1% Someone You Supervise 1% Professor/TA 6% Husband/Wife 8% Serious Relationship partner 1% Casual Relationship Partner 1% New Romantic Partner 5% Other	1% Grandparent 1% Aunt/Uncle 8% Coworker 1% Boss/Supervisor 1% Someone You Supervise 1% Professor/TA 5% Husband/Wife 7% Serious Relationship Partner 1% Casual Relationship Partner 1% New Romantic Partner 6% Other	1% Grandparent 1% Aunt/Uncle 5% Coworker 2% Boss/Supervisor < 1% Someone You Supervise < 1% Professor/TA 6% Husband/Wife 8% Serious Relationship Partner 1% Casual Relationship Partner 2% New Romantic Partner 4% Other	0% Grandparent 1% Aunt/Uncle 5% Coworker 2% Boss/Supervisor 0% Someone You Supervise 0% Professor/TA 6% Husband/Wife 8% Serious Relationship Partner 1% Casual Relationship Partner 1% New Romantic Partner 4% Other
Interaction Details				
<i>When Did the Interaction Occur?</i>	46% Today 50% Yesterday 4% Other	48% Today 47% Yesterday 5% Other	57% Today 71% Yesterday 6% Other	31% Today 63% Yesterday 6% Other
<i>Where Did the Interaction Occur?</i>	65% Face-to-Face 10% Phone (Audio) 2% Video Chat 14% Text 4% Social Media 5% Other	63% Face-to-Face 14% Phone (Audio) 4% Video Chat 10% Text 5% Social Media 4% Other	41% Face-to-Face 20% Phone (Audio) 15% Video Chat 13% Text 6% Social Media 4% Other	46% Face-to-Face 21% Phone (Audio) 12% Video Chat 8% Text 8% Social Media 5% Other
<i>How Long Was the Interaction?</i>	19% ≤ 5 mins 46% 5 – 30 mins 15% 30 mins – 1 hour 11% 1 – 2 hours 5% 2 – 3 hours 2% 3 – 4 hours 1% 4 – 5 hours 1% 5+ hours	19% ≤ 5 mins 49% 5 – 30 mins 14% 30 mins – 1 hour 10% 1 – 2 hours 5% 2 – 3 hours 2% 3 – 4 hours 1% 4 – 5 hours 1% 5+ hours	16% ≤ 5 mins 52% 5 – 30 mins 20% 30 mins – 1 hour 6% 1 – 2 hours 2% 2 – 3 hours 1% 3 – 4 hours 1% 4 – 5 hours 1% 5+ hours	13% ≤ 5 mins 48% 5 – 30 mins 17% 30 mins – 1 hour 13% 1 – 2 hours 6% 2 – 3 hours 2% 3 – 4 hours 0% 4 – 5 hours 1% 5+ hours
<i>Valence</i> <i>1 = Negative</i> <i>4 = Neutral</i> <i>7 = Positive</i>	<i>M</i> = 5.42, <i>SD</i> = 1.51 2% Rated as a 1 5% Rated as a 2 6% Rated as a 3 11% Rated as a 4 15% Rated as a 5 37% Rated as a 6 25% Rated as a 7	<i>M</i> = 5.47, <i>SD</i> = 1.59 2% Rated as a 1 7% Rated as a 2 6% Rated as a 3 10% Rated as a 4 13% Rated as a 5 31% Rated as a 6 32% Rated as 7	<i>M</i> = 5.10, <i>SD</i> = 1.66 2% Rated as a 1 9% Rated as a 2 9% Rated as a 3 13% Rated as a 4 14% Rated as a 5 33% Rated as a 6 21% Rated as a 7	<i>M</i> = 5.27, <i>SD</i> = 1.65 4% Rated as a 1 5% Rated as a 2 6% Rated as a 3 14% Rated as a 4 9% Rated as a 5 39% Rated as a 6 23% Rated as a 7

Table 2. Items and Factor Loadings (Study 1, 2, and 3).

			Study 1	Study 2			Study 3
				Time 1	Time 2	Time 3	
		<i>N</i>	351	397	336	299	235
		Mean	5.24	5.40	5.51	5.48	5.13
		Standard Deviation	1.08	1.11	1.08	1.16	.95
		Alpha	.93	.93	.93	.95	.91
		Omega	.95	.95	.95	.96	.94
Item	Factor		Loadings				
1	I felt “in sync” with them	SR	.91	.86	.91	.90	.78
2	I felt like we shared a lot in common	SR	.85	.84	.87	.89	.80
3	I felt that we saw the world in the same way	SR	.82	.83	.85	.88	.55
4	They were able to relate to my experiences	SR	.77	.80	.84	.84	.75
5	They were interested in my thoughts and feelings	PR	.86	.87	.88	.85	.78
6	They respected my beliefs and opinions	PR	.81	.82	.84	.88	.75
7	I felt that they cared about me	PR	.80	.85	.87	.79	.74
8	They really understood who I am	PR	.80	.84	.80	.85	.78
9	I was truly attentive during the interaction	PI	.62	.54	.57	.64	.64
10	I was interested in their thoughts and feelings	PI	.79	.70	.80	.81	.68
11	I thought that they were boring (R)	PI	-.75	-.75	-.69	-.79	-.70
12	I was distracted during the conversation (R)	PI	-.52	-.47	-.42	-.55	-
13	I was nervous during the interaction (R)	AE	.57	.44	.37	.47	-

14	I felt that my energy was drained by the interaction (R)	AE	.71	.74	.74	.80	.75
15	I couldn't wait for the interaction to end (R)	AE	.81	.81	.82	.86	.75
16	I felt that it was hard to communicate with them (R)	AE	.81	.80	.78	.84	.57

Note. SR = Shared Reality factor. PR = Partner Responsiveness factor. PI = Participant Interest factor. AE = Affective Experience factor. The items used in Study 3 are the final 14-items in our measure.

Table 3. Correlations among the Connection During Conversations Scale (CDCS), its four subscales, and other relevant connection scales (Study 2).

Study 2 Time 1											
	CDCS (1)	SR (2)	PR (3)	PI (4)	AE (5)	Extraversion (6)	Loneliness (7)	Relatedness (8)	Partner Responsive (9)	Shared Reality (10)	Positivity Resonance (11)
<i>Mean (SD)</i>	5.40 (1.11)	5.08 (1.40)	5.41 (1.30)	5.70 (1.03)	5.39 (1.44)	2.90 (.78)	2.17 (.65)	4.88 (1.10)	5.37 (1.27)	4.82 (1.21)	70.73 (24.14)
<i>Alpha</i>	.93	.90	.91	.73	.80	.87	.94	.76	.97	.94	.96
<i>Omega</i>	.95	.91	.92	.80	.81	.90	.95	.88	.97	.95	.97
1	-										
2	.89**	-									
3	.90**	.84**	-								
4	.77**	.54**	.61**	-							
5	.85**	.64**	.63**	.58**	-						
6	.18**	.11*	.16**	.18**	.17**	-					
7	-.25**	-.15**	-.25**	-.22**	-.23**	-.57**	-				
8	.34**	.26**	.35**	.26**	.29**	.35**	-.70**	-			
9	.79**	.76**	.83**	.51**	.58**	.21**	-.29**	.39**	-		
10	.68**	.76**	.68**	.40**	.47**	.15**	-.18**	.26**	.73**	-	
11	.84**	.79**	.79**	.57**	.70**	.17**	-.26**	.36**	.80**	.70**	-
Study 2 Time 2											
	CDCS (1)	SR (2)	PR (3)	PI (4)	AE (5)	Extraversion (6)	Loneliness (7)	Relatedness (8)			
<i>Mean (SD)</i>	5.51 (1.08)	5.28 (1.41)	5.54 (1.29)	5.79 (.98)	5.44 (1.38)	3.86 (1.09)	2.16 (.49)	4.91 (1.14)			
<i>Alpha</i>	.93	.92	.91	.75	.79	.89	.94	.77			
<i>Omega</i>	.95	.95	.91	.82	.80	.92	.95	.89			
1	-										
2	.89**	-									
3	.91**	.83**	-								
4	.74**	.51**	.59**	-							
5	.84**	.64**	.83**	.54**	-						
6	.12+	.13+	.07	.14**	.06	-					
7	-.33**	-.27**	.26**	-.32**	-.29**	-.51**	-				
8	.36**	.27**	.31**	.33**	.34**	.29**	-.64**	-			

Study 2 Time 3								
	CDCS (1)	SR (2)	PR (3)	PI (4)	AE (5)	Extraversion (6)	Loneliness (7)	Relatedness (8)
<i>Mean (SD)</i>	5.48 (1.17)	5.19 (1.47)	5.43 (1.34)	5.80 (1.02)	5.51 (1.44)	3.91 (1.10)	2.27 (.63)	4.91 (1.16)
<i>Alpha</i>	.95	.93	.91	.81	.83	.89	.93	.80
<i>Omega</i>	.96	.93	.94	.84	.86	.92	.96	.88
1	-							
2	.92**	-						
3	.92**	.87**	-					
4	.82**	.66**	.67**	-				
5	.86**	.69**	.68**	.64**	-			
6	.26**	.20**	.20**	.22**	.28**	-		
7	-.33**	-.23**	-.29**	-.34**	-.32**	-.55**	-	
8	.36**	.27**	.30**	.38**	.34**	.34**	-.71**	-

Note. SR = Shared Reality subscale. PR = Partner Responsiveness subscale. PI = Participant Interest subscale. AE = Affective Experience subscale. Study 3 used a 14-item version of the CDCS. + $p < .05$. * $p < .01$. ** $p < .001$.

Table 4. Correlations among the Connection During Conversations Scale (CDCS), its four subscales, and other relevant connection scales, across three occasions (Times 1, 2, and 3) in Study 2.

	CDCS	SR	PR	PI	AE	Extraversion	Loneliness	Relatedness
Correlations between Time 1 and Time 2								
CDCS	.31**							
SR	.24**	.20**						
PR	.29**	.21**	.30**					
PI	.24**	.14+	.22**	.28**				
AE	.30**	.19**	.24**	.30**	.31**			
Extraversion	.14+	.10	.10	.13+	.15**	.89**		
Loneliness	-.21**	-.13+	-.17*	-.24**	-.20**	-.47**	.80**	
Relatedness	.18**	.10	.13+	.25**	.16**	.24**	-.47**	.50**
Correlations between Time 1 and Time 3								
CDCS	.27**							
SR	.19**	.15**						
PR	.19**	.14+	.21**					
PI	.19**	.19**	.22**	.32**				
AE	.28**	.21**	.26**	.27**	.32**			
Extraversion	.22**	.16*	.17**	.21**	.24**	.89**		
Loneliness	-.29**	-.21**	-.25**	-.28**	-.29**	-.56**	.81**	
Relatedness	.20**	.12**	.17**	.23**	.19**	.33**	-.59**	.55**
Correlations between Time 2 and Time 3								
CDCS	.32**							
SR	.27**	.28**						
PR	.28**	.26**	.30**					
PI	.32**	.20**	.30**	.37**				
AE	.26**	.19**	.21**	.19**	.30**			
Extraversion	.11	.12+	.07	.10	.07	.92**		
Loneliness	-.34**	-.25**	-.27**	-.30**	-.32**	-.49**	.87**	
Relatedness	.32**	.24**	.25**	.29**	.31**	.28**	-.59**	.61**

Note. SR = Shared Reality subscale. PR = Partner Responsiveness subscale. PI = Participant Interest subscale. AE = Affective Experience subscale. + $p < .05$. * $p < .01$. ** $p < .001$.

Table 5. Correlations among the Connection During Conversations Scale (CDCS), its four subscales, and other relevant scales (Study 3).

Study 3																		
	CDCS (1)	SR (2)	PR (3)	PI (4)	AE (5)	Extraversion (6)	Loneliness (7)	Relatedness (8)	Autonomy (9)	Competence (10)	Life Satisfaction (11)	Positive Affect (12)	Negative Affect (13)	Neuroticism (14)	Agreeable (15)	Conscientious (16)	Open (17)	
<i>Mean</i>	5.13	5.11	5.45	5.27	4.68	3.09	2.08	3.63	4.19	3.91	4.06	4.14	3.58	3.07	3.67	3.34	3.58	
<i>(SD)</i>	(.95)	(1.13)	(1.02)	(1.10)	(1.35)	(.69)	(.56)	(.53)	(.62)	(.74)	(1.29)	(1.17)	(1.18)	(.72)	(.53)	(.62)	(.62)	
<i>Alpha</i>	.92	.88	.89	.75	.75	.86	.93	.69	.51	.71	.86	.91	.85	.86	.77	.84	.82	
<i>Omega</i>	.94	.91	.92	.80	.82	.90	.94	.82	.59	.87	.87	.93	.91	.89	.86	.90	.84	
1	-																	
2	.84**	-																
3	.87**	.80**	-															
4	.88**	.68**	.72**	-														
5	.77**	.40**	.47**	.58**	-													
6	.36**	.32**	.32**	.23*	.32**	-												
7	-.61**	-.53**	-.58**	-.51**	-.44**	-.47**	-											
8	.58**	.43**	.51**	.53**	.48**	.21*	-.62*	-										
9	0.31**	0.18*	0.32**	0.29**	0.26**	0.26*	-.46**	0.40**	-									
10	0.27**	0.19**	0.23**	0.29**	0.21**	0.34**	-.51**	0.37**	0.44**	-								
11	0.31**	0.33**	0.36**	0.24*	0.13+	0.17+	-.46**	0.38**	0.15**	0.36**	-							
12	0.37**	0.37**	0.41**	0.34**	0.15**	0.26*	-.49**	0.45**	0.32**	0.49**	0.56**	-						
13	-.023**	-.08	-.08	-.024**	-.033**	-.10	0.39**	-.043**	-.035**	-.046**	-.016**	-.023**	-					
14	-.027**	-.014	-.019+	-.031**	-.025*	-.016+	0.50**	-.042**	-.031**	-.054**	-.033**	-.038**	0.56**	-				
15	0.40**	0.27**	0.32**	0.37**	0.35**	0.23**	-.037**	0.31**	0.31**	0.25*	0.16+	0.18+	-.023**	-.020*	-			
16	0.21**	0.06	0.16+	0.23**	0.24*	0.22**	-.035**	0.23**	0.32**	0.49**	0.26**	0.21**	-.023**	-.036**	0.39**	-		
17	0.24*	0.24*	0.23*	0.19+	0.14	0.28**	-.017+	0.15	0.17+	0.15	0.17+	0.16+	-.003	0.06**	0.20+	0.16**	-	

Note. SR = Shared Reality subscale. PR = Partner Responsiveness subscale. PI = Participant Interest subscale. AE = Affective Experience subscale. Study 3 used a 14-item version of the CDCS. + $p < .05$. * $p < .01$. ** $p < .001$.

Table 6. Results of regression analyses of each of the four subscales of the Connection During Conversations Scale (CDCS) predicting our primary outcomes (Study 3).

	Adj R ²	b(SE)	95% CI	β	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
Life Satisfaction	.11					
Shared Reality		.16 (.12)	[-.07, .39]	.14	1.39	.167
Partner Responsiveness		.34 (.13)	[.07, .60]	.26	2.49	.014
Participant Interest		-.07 (.11)	[-.29, .15]	-.06	-.64	.525
Affective Experience		.01 (.07)	[-.14, .15]	.01	.10	.918
Positive Affect (Last 7 days)	.19					
Shared Reality		.10 (.10)	[-.10, .29]	.09	.98	.330
Partner Responsiveness		.30 (.12)	[.07, .53]	.26	2.58	.011
Participant Interest		.17 (.10)	[-.02, .36]	.16	1.75	.081
Affective Experience		-.02 (.06)	[-.15, .10]	-.03	-.35	.724
Negative Affect (Last 7 days)	.13					
Shared Reality		.01 (.10)	[-.20, .22]	.01	.09	.925
Partner Responsiveness		.15 (.12)	[-.09, .39]	.13	1.24	.215
Participant Interest		-.15 (.10)	[-.35, .05]	-.14	-1.46	.146
Affective Experience		-.30 (.07)	[-.43, -.17]	-.35	-4.59	< .001
Relatedness (BMPN)	.35					
Shared Reality		.06 (.06)	[-.06, .17]	.08	.97	.332
Partner Responsiveness		.17 (.07)	[.03, .30]	.22	2.49	.014
Participant Interest		.09 (.06)	[-.02, .20]	.13	1.55	.212
Affective Experience		.16 (.04)	[.09, .23]	.29	4.49	< .001
Autonomy (BMPN)	.12					
Shared Reality		-.07 (.05)	[-.18, .03]	-.13	-1.37	.172
Partner Responsiveness		.24 (.06)	[.12, .37]	.40	3.93	<.001
Participant Interest		.00 (.05)	[-.11, .10]	-.01	-.08	.935
Affective Experience		.09 (.03)	[.02, .15]	.19	2.51	.012
Competence (BMPN)	.07					
Shared Reality		.06 (.07)	[-.07, .20]	.10	.97	.336
Partner Responsiveness		.05 (.08)	[-.11, .20]	.06	.60	.550
Participant Interest		.03 (.07)	[-.10, .16]	.04	.42	.676
Affective Experience		.08 (.04)	[-.01, .16]	.14	1.79	.074
Loneliness	.38					
Shared Reality		-.08 (.04)	[-.16, .00]	-.16	-1.86	.064
Partner Responsiveness		-.16 (.05)	[-.26, .04]	-.30	-3.40	< .001
Participant Interest		-.04 (.04)	[-.12, .04]	-.07	-.94	.346
Affective Experience		-.09 (.03)	[-.14, -.03]	-.21	-3.27	.001
	.14					

Extraversion						
	Shared Reality	.12 (.07)	[-.02, .26]	.20	1.67	.096
	Partner Responsiveness	.10 (.08)	[-.06, .27]	.16	1.21	.227
	Participant Interest	-.11 (.07)	[-.25, .04]	-.17	-1.49	.139
	Affective Experience	.13 (.04)	 [.05, .21]	.27	3.04	.003
Neuroticism .09						
	Shared Reality	.08 (.08)	[-.07, .24]	.13	1.06	.290
	Partner Responsiveness	-.01 (.09)	[-.19, .17]	-.02	-.11	.910
	Participant Interest	-.22 (.08)	 [-.38, -.06]	-.33	2.75	.007
	Affective Experience	-.05 (.05)	[-.14, .04]	.10	-1.15	.254
Agreeable .15						
	Shared Reality	-.01 (.06)	[-.07, .24]	-.02	-.21	.837
	Partner Responsiveness	.06 (.06)	[.19, .17]	.12	.95	.343
	Participant Interest	.09 (.06)	[-.38, -.06]	.18	1.59	.114
	Affective Experience	.08 (.03)	 [-.14, .04]	.20	2.33	.021
Openness .04						
	Shared Reality	.08 (.07)	[-.06, .21]	.14	1.09	.278
	Partner Responsiveness	.07 (.08)	[-.09, .23]	.12	.90	.369
	Participant Interest	.00 (.07)	[-.14, .13]	-.01	-.06	.949
	Affective Experience	.01 (.04)	[-.07, .10]	.03	.36	.717
Conscientious .07						
	Shared Reality	-.14 (.07)	 [-.28, -.01]	-.27	-2.14	.034
	Partner Responsiveness	.10 (.08)	[-.06, .25]	.16	1.24	.212
	Participant Interest	.12 (.07)	[-.02, .25]	.20	1.72	.087
	Affective Experience	.07 (.04)	[-.01, .15]	.15	1.68	.095

Note. One item in the Participant Interest subscale and all items in the Affective Experience subscale have been reverse coded. As such, positive values in Affective Experience indicate a positive experience. Variance inflation factors (VIFs) for each independent variable were as follows: Shared Reality VIF = 2.65; Partner Responsiveness VIF = 2.85, Participant Interest VIF = 2.13; Negative Experience VIF = 1.62.

Table 7. Connection During Conversations Scale.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly disagree	Disagree	Somewhat disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat agree	Agree	Strongly agree

Please answer the following questions about your recent interaction and interaction partner.

Shared Reality Subscale

1. I felt “in sync” with them
2. I felt like we shared a lot in common
3. I felt that we saw the world in the same way
4. They were able to relate to my experiences

Partner Responsiveness Subscale

5. They were interested in my thoughts and feelings
6. They respected my beliefs and opinions
7. I felt that they cared about me
8. They really understood who I am

Participant Interest Subscale

9. I was truly attentive during the interaction
10. I was interested in their thoughts and feelings
11. I thought that they were boring

Affective Experience Subscale

12. I felt that my energy was drained by the interaction
13. I couldn’t wait for the interaction to end
14. I felt that it was hard to communicate with them

Supplemental Materials

Measuring the Experience of Social Connection Within Specific Social Interactions:
The Connection During Conversations Scale (CDCS)

Table S1. List of Connection-Relevant Scales Used in Scale Creation and Other Recent Scales.

Name of Scale	Type of Scale	Example Item	Scaling	Citation	Subscales
<i>Scales Used in Scale Creation</i>					
Inventory of Socially Supportive Behaviors	Global	Looked after a family member when you were away	1 (not at all) - 5 (about every day)	Barrera, Sandler, & Ramsay (1981)	
Buckner Neighborhood Cohesion Index	Global	I feel like I belong to this neighborhood	1 (strongly disagree) - 5 (strongly agree)	Buckner (1988)	
Communal Orientation Scale	Global	It bothers me when other people neglect my needs	1 (extremely uncharacteristic of them) - 5 (extremely characteristic of them)	Clark, Oullette, Powell, & Milberg (1987)	3 Subscales: General communal, a desire for other's help, locus of initiation
Relational Interdependent Self-Construal	Global	My close relationships are an important reflection of who I am	1 (very strongly disagree) - 7 (very strongly agree)	Cross, Bacon, & Morris (2000)	
Social Provisions Scale	Global	There are people that I can depend on to help me if I really need it	1 (Strongly disagree) - 4 (Strongly agree)	Cutrona & Russell (1987)	6 Subscales: Attachment, social integration, reassurance of worth, reliable alliance, guidance, opportunity for nurturance

Interpersonal Reactivity Index	Global	After seeing a play or movie, I have felt as though I were one of the characters	0 (does not describe me well) - 4 (describes me very well)	Davis (1980)	4 Subscales: Fantasy items, perspective-taking items, empathic concern items, personal distress items
Measurement of Social Disconnection	Global	Today, I generally felt connected to others	1 (strongly disagree) - 7 (strongly agree)	Eisenberger, Gable, & Lieberman (2007) but adapted from Williams, Cheung, & Choi (2000)	
Facebook Social Connectedness	Global	I feel close to people on Facebook	1 (strongly agree) - 6 (strongly disagree)	Grieve, Indian, Witteveen, Anne Tolan, & Marrington (2013)	
Sense of Belonging Index	Global	Not sure if I fit with friends	1 (not relevant) - 4 (very relevant)	Hagerty & Patusky (1995)	2 Subscales: Psychological state of belonging and antecedents of belonging
Four-Dimensional Connectedness Scale	Global	I am appreciated by the people I work with	1 (strongly disagree) - 7 (strongly agree)	Huynh, Metzger, & Winefield (2012)	
The Social Orientation Scale	Global	It's easy for me to get so caught up in a conversation with my partner that I lose all track of time	1 (very uncharacteristic of me) - 4 (very characteristic of me)	Ickes, Hutchinson, & Mashek (2004)	2 Subscales: Social absorption, social individuation
The Flow State Scale	Global	I was challenged, but I believed my skills would allow me to meet the challenge	1 (strongly disagree) - 5 (strongly agree)	Jackson & Marsh (1996)	9 Subscales: Challenge-skill, action-awareness, clear goals, unambiguous feedback, concentration, sense of control, loss of self-consciousness, Transformation of time, autotelic experience

Hemingway Measure of Adolescent Connectedness	Global	Spending time with my friends is the best part of my day	1 (not at all) - 5 (very true)	Karcher [unpublished]	
Conflict Over Emotional Expression	Global	It is hard to find the right words to indicate to others what I am really feeling	1 (strongly disagree) - 7 (strongly agree)	King & Emmons (1990)	
Family Allocentricism Scale	Global	I think it is important to get along with my family at all costs	1 (strongly disagree) - 5 (strongly agree)	Lay, Fairlie, Jackson, Ricci, Eisenberg, Sato, Teeäär, & Melamud (1998)	
Social Connectedness Scale/Social Assurance Scale	Global	I have no sense of togetherness with my peers	1 (agree) - 6 (disagree)	Lee & Robbins (1995)	2 Subscales: Social connectedness & social assurance
Social Connectedness Scale-Revised	Global	I feel understood by the people I know	1 (strongly agree) - 6 (strongly disagree)	Lee, Draper, & Lee (2001)	Revising the Social connectedness Scale with 1 subscale
Psychological Sense of Community	Global	There is a strong feeling of togetherness on campus	1 (strongly disagree) - 5 (strongly agree)	Lounsbury & DeNeui (1996)	
Collective Self-Esteem Scale	Global	I am a worthy member of the social groups I belong to	1 (strongly disagree) - 7 (strongly agree)	Luhtanen & Crocker (1992)	4 Subscales: Membership, private, public, identity
Connectedness With Nature	Global	I think of the natural world as a community to which I belong	1 (strongly disagree) - 5 (strongly agree)	Mayer & Frantz (2004)	

Self-Disclosure Index	Global	My personal habits	0 (discuss not at all) - 4 (discuss fully and completely)	Miller, Berg, & Archer (1983)	
Psychological Sense of Community	Global	I have friends in my local neighborhood, who are part of my everyday activities	1 (very strongly disagree) - 7 (very strongly agree)	Obst, Smith, & Zinkiewicz (2002)	5 Subscales: Ties and friendship, influence, support, belonging, conscious identification
Perceived Social Support from Friends and Family (PSS-Fr and PSS-Fa scales)	Global	My friends/family give me the moral support I need	Yes, No, Don't know	Procidano & Heller (1983)	2 Subscales: Family, friends
ESTCOL Scale	Global	In life, family interests are most important	1 (Strongly disagree) - 5 (Strongly agree)	Realo, Allik, & Vadi (1997)	3 Subscales (subtypes of collectivism): Relations with family (familism), friends (companionship), and society (patriotism)
Register-Connectedness Scale for Older Adults	Global	Wanted to be with my family	1 (not important) - 4 (very important)	Register, Herman, & Tavakoli (2011)	5 Subscales: Self-regulating, facing aging, being part of a family, having friends, being spiritual
UCLA Loneliness Scale	Global	I have a lot in common with the people around me	1 (never) - 4 (often)	Russell, Peplau, & Cutrona (1980)	

Social Support Questionnaire	Global	Who accepts you totally, including both your worst and best points?	Two Parts: (1) Number of available others the individual feels they can turn to; (2) 1 (very dissatisfied) - 6 (very satisfied)	Sarason, Levine, Basham, & Sarason (1983)	2 Subscales: Perceived availability, satisfaction
Emotional Intelligence Scale	Global	I know when to speak about my personal problems to others	1 (strongly disagree) - 5 (strongly agree)	Schutte, Malouff, Hall, Haggerty, Cooper, Golden & Dornheim (1998)	
Steen Happiness Index - Connection Subscale	Global	I feel disconnected from other people	1 (Extremely negative) - 5 (Extremely positive)	Seligman, Steen, Park, & Peterson (2005)	
Two-Way Social Support Scale	Global	There is someone I can talk to about the pressures in my life	0 (not at all) - 5 (always)	Shakespeare-Finch & Obst (2011)	4 Subscales: Receiving emotional support, giving emotional support, receiving instrumental support, giving instrumental support
Balanced Measure of Psychological Needs Scale	Global	I felt close and connected with other people who are important to me	1 (strongly disagree) - 5 (strongly agree)	Sheldon & Hilpert (2012)	
Self-Construal Scale	Global	My happiness depends on the happiness of those around me	1 (strongly disagree) - 7 (strongly agree)	Singelis (1994)	2 Subscales: Interdependent, independent

Big Five Inventory (BFI-2) - Extraversion subscale	Global	I am someone who is outgoing, sociable	1 (disagree strongly) - 5 (agree strongly)	Soto & John (2017)	5 Subscales: Extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, negative emotionality, open-mindedness
Comprehensive Inventory of Thriving - Support, Belonging, Loneliness subscales	Global	Support: There are people that I can depend on to help me Belonging: I feel a sense of belonging in my community. Loneliness: I feel lonely	1 (strongly disagree) - 5 (strongly agree)	Su, Tay, & Diener (2014)	
Interpersonal Relationship Index	Global	I can count on a friend	1 (strongly disagree) - 5 (strongly agree) and 1 (never) - 5 (very often)	Tilden, Nelson, & May (1990)	3 Subscales: Social support, reciprocity, and conflict
Separateness - Connectedness Scale	Global	I often find that I can remain cool in spite of people around me being excited	1 (does not describe me at all) - 5 (describes me very well)	Wang & Mowen (1997)	2 Subscales: Independence/Individuality, self-other boundary
Social Avoidance and Distress Scale	Global	I try to avoid situations which force me to be very sociable	1 (not at all) - 5 (very much)	Watson & Friend (1969)	
Fear of Negative Evaluation Scale	Global	The opinions that important people have of me cause me little concern	1 (not at all) - 5 (very much)	Watson & Friend (1969)	

Multi-Dimensional Support Scale	Global	How often did they really listen to you when you talked about your concerns or problems?	1 (never) - 4 (often); Would have liked: more, less, right	Winefield, Winefield, & Tiggemann (1992)	
Multi-Dimensional Scale of Perceived Social Support	Global	I get the emotional help and support I need from my family	1 (very strongly disagree) - 7 (very strongly agree)	Zimet, Dahlem, Zimet, & Farley (1988)	
Inclusion of Others in Self Scale	Partner-Specific	Increasingly overlapping circles		Aron, Aron, & Smollan (1992)	
Individuality and Connectedness Q-Sort	Partner-Specific	Speaks first; Initiate's compromise; Asks for partner's opinion	Q-Sort	Bengtson & Grotevant (1999)	
Relationship Closeness Inventory	Partner-Specific	_____ influences important things in my life	1 (very strongly disagree) - 7 (very strongly agree)	Berscheid, Snyder, & Omoto (1989)	
Fear of Intimacy Scale	Partner-Specific	I would feel uneasy about talking with _____ about something that has hurt me deeply	1 (not at all characteristic of me) - 5 (extremely characteristic of me)	Descutner & Thelen (1991)	
The Group Attitude Scale	Partner-Specific	I feel included in the group	1 (disagree) - 9 (agree)	Evans & Jarvis (1986)	
Relationship Attributions Scale	Partner-Specific	Your partner criticizes something you say	1 (strongly disagree) - 7 (strongly agree)	Fincham & Bradbury (1992)	2 Subscales: Causal-attribution, responsibility-attribution

The Experiences in Close Relationships-Relationship Structures Questionnaire	Partner-Specific	I usually discuss my problems and concerns with this person	1 (strongly disagree) - 7 (strongly agree)	Fraley, Heffernan, Vicary, & Brumbaugh (2011)	4 Subscales: Mother, father, romantic partners, best friends
Couples Satisfaction Index	Partner-Specific	I have a warm and comfortable relationship with my partner	1 (strongly disagree) - 6 (strongly agree)	Funk & Rogge (2007)	
Passionate Love Scale	Partner-Specific	Since I've been involved with _____, my emotions have been on a roller coaster	1 (Not at all true) - 9 (Definitely true)	Hatfield & Sprecher (1986)	
Relationship Assessment Scale	Partner-Specific	How well does your partner meet your needs?	1 (low satisfaction) - 5 (high satisfaction)	Hendrick, Dicke, & Hendrick (1998)	
Commitment Scale	Partner-Specific	How likely is it that your relationship will be permanent?	7-pt scale	Lund (1985)	
Investment Scale	Partner-Specific	Spending your free time with your partner rather than doing other things or seeing other people.	How large an investment on 7-pt scale	Lund (1985)	
Inclusion of Community in Self Scale	Partner-Specific	Increasingly overlapping circles		Mashek, Cannaday, & Tangney (2007)	
Miller Social Intimacy Scale	Partner-Specific	How much do you like to spend time alone with him/her?	1 (very rarely) - 10 (almost always)	Miller & Lefcourt (1982)	

Measurement of Communal Strength	Partner-Specific	How happy do you feel when doing something that helps ___?	0 (not at all) - 10 (extremely)	Mills, Clark, Ford, & Johnson (2004)	
Partner Responsiveness Scale	Partner-Specific	...sees the "real" me	1 (strongly disagree) - 7 (strongly agree)	Reis, Maniaci, Caprariello, Eastwick, & Finkel (2011); Reis et al. (2017)	
Rubin's Loving and Liking Scale	Partner-Specific	Love: I feel that I can confide in ___ about virtually everything Like: When I am with ___, we are almost always in the same mood	1 (not at all true; disagree completely) - 9 (definitely true; agree completely)	Rubin (1970)	
Personal Assessment of Intimacy in Relationships Inventory	Partner-Specific	I think that we share some of the same interests	1 (strongly disagree) - 5 (strongly agree)	Schaefer & Olson (1981)	6 Subscales: Emotional intimacy, social intimacy, sexual intimacy, intellectual intimacy, recreational intimacy, conventionality
Revised Experiences in Close Relationships Questionnaire	Partner-Specific	I often worry that my partner will not want to stay with me	1 (strongly disagree) - 6 (strongly agree)	Sibley, Fischer, & Liu (2005)	2 Subscales: Romantic attachment anxiety and romantic attachment avoidance
Dyadic Adjustment Scale	Partner-Specific	Amount of time spent together	0 (always disagree) - 5 (always agree)	Spanier (1976)	4 Subscales: Dyadic consensus, dyadic satisfaction, dyadic cohesion, affectional expression

Sternberg Intimacy Scale	Partner-Specific	I am able to count on _____ in times of need	1 (not at all) - 9 (extremely)	Sternberg (1997)	3 Subscales: Intimacy, passion, commitment
Positivity Resonance Scale	Interaction-Specific	Did you experience a mutual sense of warmth and concern toward the other(s)?	0 - 100%	Major, Nguyen, Lundberg, & Fredrickson (2018)	
Name of Scale	Type of Scale	Example Item	Scaling	Citation	Subscales
<i>Recent Scales Not Used in Scale Creation</i>					
Friendship Network Satisfaction	Global	My friends understand me	0 (Not all agree) - 5 (Completely Agree)	Kaufman, Perez, Reise, Bradbury, & Karney (2021)	2 Subscales: Closeness and socializing
Generalized Shared Reality Measure - Cross Situational	Partner-Specific	We frequently think of things at the exact same time	1 (strongly disagree) - 7 (strongly agree)	Rossignac-Milon, Bolger, Zee, Boothby, & Higgins (2021)	
Generalized Shared Reality Measure - Interaction-Specific	Interaction-Specific	During our interaction... we thought of things at the exact same time	1 (strongly disagree) - 7 (strongly agree)	Rossignac-Milon, Bolger, Zee, Boothby, & Higgins (2021)	

Table S2. Correlations among the Connection During Conversations Scale (CDCS) Items across three occasions (Times 1, 2, and 3) in Study 2

Sub-scale	Item	Correlations between Time 1 and Time 2	Correlations between Time 2 and Time 3	Correlations between Time 1 and Time 3
SR	1. I felt “in sync” with them	.16**	.27***	.17**
SR	2. I felt like we shared a lot in common	.20***	.27***	.18**
SR	3. I felt that we saw the world in the same way	.15**	.25***	.06
SR	4. They were able to relate to my experiences	.14*	.14*	.13*
PR	5. They were interested in my thoughts and feelings	.27***	.30***	.23***
PR	6. They respected my beliefs and opinions	.28***	.21***	.13*
PR	7. I felt that they cared about me	.23***	.20***	.13*
PR	8. They really understood who I am	.23***	.28***	.20***
PI	9. I was truly attentive during the interaction	.23***	.29***	.21***
PI	10. I was interested in their thoughts and feelings	.24***	.27***	.23***
PI	11. I thought that they were boring	.23***	.24***	.26***
PI	12. I was distracted during the conversation (R)	.21***	.36***	.28***
AE	13. I was nervous during the interaction (R)	.12*	.30***	.29***
AE	14. I felt that my energy was drained by the interaction (R)	.32***	.20***	.17**
AE	15. I couldn’t wait for the interaction to end (R)	.27***	.20***	.25***
AE	16. I felt that it was hard to communicate with them (R)	.23***	.24***	.26***

Note. SR = Shared Reality subscale. PR = Partner Responsiveness subscale. PI = Participant Interest subscale. AE = Affective Experience subscale. * $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.