

Positivity Resonance in Japanese Adults' Interactions with Familiar Others: Cultural Adaptation and Links to Happiness, Loneliness, and Depression

Rae Na Kang^{1,2,*}, Keiko Otake¹, Hidefumi Hitokoto¹

¹Department of Integrated Psychological Sciences, Kwansei Gakuin University, Nishinomiya, Japan

²Comprehensive Research Center of Human Sciences, Waseda University, Tokorozawa, Japan

*Corresponding author: kangraena@gmail.com

Received November 22, 2025; Revised December 24, 2025; Accepted December 30, 2025

Abstract Positivity resonance (PR), the shared experience of positive affect, mutual care, and behavioral synchrony, has been associated with well-being in Western contexts, yet its mental health benefits in non-Western cultures remain underexplored. This study developed a Japanese version of the Positivity Resonance Scale (PRS) for interactions with “familiar others” and examined its links to subjective happiness, loneliness, and depression. Data were collected across three survey waves: Time 1 used an independent cross-sectional adult sample ($N = 934$), while Time 2 ($N = 318$) and Time 3 ($N = 254$) followed the same Japanese university students longitudinally. Factor analyses supported a one-factor structure consistent with the original PRS, showing excellent internal consistency ($\alpha = .93-.94$) and good test-retest reliability ($ICC = .63$). PR correlated positively with happiness and negatively with loneliness and depression, and these associations remained significant after controlling for positive affect. These findings suggest that PR is a crucial interpersonal emotional process supporting well-being, even in a collectivistic cultural context.

Keywords: positivity resonance, familiar others, subjective happiness, loneliness, depression, well-being, Japan

Cite This Article: Rae Na Kang, Keiko Otake, and Hidefumi Hitokoto, “Positivity Resonance in Japanese Adults' Interactions with Familiar Others: Cultural Adaptation and Links to Happiness, Loneliness, and Depression.” *Research in Psychology and Behavioral Sciences*, vol. 13, no. 1 (2025): 16-22. doi: 10.12691/rpbs-13-1-3.

1. Introduction

The formation and maintenance of meaningful social connections is a fundamental aspect of human life and a central determinant of psychological health and well-being [1,2]. Among various forms of interpersonal experiences, sharing positive emotions with others transcends individual affective states to foster trust, deepen social bonds, and facilitate the acquisition of valuable social resources [3,4]. Consistent with this view, recent research conducted in East Asia has shown that harmony in interpersonal relationships represents a central source of subjective well-being, highlighting the culturally embedded nature of social connectedness in collectivistic societies [5]. This socially shared emotional experience, characterized by the co-occurring of positive affect, mutual care and concern, and behavioral as well as physiological synchrony, is conceptualized as positivity resonance (PR) [6].

PR extends Fredrickson's broaden-and-build theory of positive emotions to the social domain, suggesting that shared positive affect broadens individuals' thought-action repertoires and builds durable psychological and social resources [7].

PR is characterized by three elements—shared positive emotions, caring and coordinated behaviors, and physiological synchrony such as mutual alignment in heart rate [6]. These components together describe the interpersonal emotional process known as positivity resonance.

Previous studies in the United States have developed and validated the Positivity Resonance Scale (PRS), demonstrating its high reliability and structural validity [4]. PRS scores are positively linked to well-being, life satisfaction, social connectedness, and health indicators, and negatively linked to loneliness and depressive symptoms [4]. Similarly, research with Filipino early adults showed that positivity resonance was positively associated with both relatedness needs satisfaction and psychological flourishing [8]. Mediation analyses further indicated that this association was partially mediated by higher relatedness needs satisfaction, even after controlling for demographic covariates. Building on this line of research, [9] demonstrated convergent validity of positivity resonance across three distinct methodologies—self-reports, behavioral coding, and conversational synchrony—providing compelling evidence that PR reflects a robust interpersonal emotional process. However, despite these advances, the role and functions of PR in collectivistic cultural contexts such as Japan remain

largely unexplored.

From a cultural psychological perspective, Japanese culture emphasizes interdependent self-construal [10] as a shared model of agency. Emotions experienced in interpersonal contexts (e.g., respect) are shown to be strongly associated with Japanese well-being [11]. Moreover, context-sensitive behavior is socially sanctioned, and harmony is prioritized over individual emotional expression if it disregards others' feelings, to avoid disrupting social cohesion. Consequently, overt displays of positive emotion for self-expression are often restrained in daily interactions. Within this context, perhaps even more than in Western societies, PR is crucial in fostering intimacy and mutual connection with in-group members or familiar others. Yet empirical research on PR's functions with familiar others and its psychological effects in Japanese culture remains scarce.

Recent studies highlight that the quality of close interpersonal relationships protects against loneliness and depressive symptoms [12,13] and relates closely to adaptive traits such as emotion regulation ability and rejection sensitivity [14,15]. Loneliness, as a maladaptive outcome of deficient close relationships, reflects a subjective state arising from insufficient bonds [16] and intensifies when feelings of connection and care with familiar others are lacking [17]. Conversely, emotionally intimate and deeply connected relationships predict subjective happiness and well-being [18,19,20]. Together, these findings suggest that PR with familiar others is likely to be positively associated with happiness and negatively associated with loneliness and depressive symptoms.

With these considerations, the present study pursued three primary objectives: (1) to develop and validate a Japanese version of the Positivity Resonance Scale (PRS) focused on interactions with familiar others, accounting for cultural patterns of emotional expression; (2) to examine the associations between PR and subjective happiness, loneliness, and depressive symptoms; and (3) to test whether these associations remained significant after controlling for positive affect (PA). The third objective reflects the recognition that PA is implicated in the constructs under study. Prior research indicates that simple correlations between PR and well-being may be confounded by PA [4]. To establish that PR contributes uniquely to well-being beyond PA, the present study measured PA and included it as a control variable. In addressing these aims, this study sought to clarify PR's role in Japanese culture and contribute theoretically to cross-cultural understandings of PR.

Based on previous empirical and theoretical work, we formulated the following hypotheses:

Hypothesis 1. Positivity resonance (PR) with familiar others will be positively associated with subjective happiness and negatively associated with loneliness and depressive symptoms.

Hypothesis 2. These associations between PR and subjective happiness, loneliness, and depressive symptoms will remain significant even after controlling for positive affect.

2. Methods

2.1. Participants and Procedures

Data were collected at three time points. Time 1 consisted of an online survey with a nationwide adult sample, while Times 2 and Time 3 involved paper-based surveys with undergraduates in psychology-related courses at a private university. Time 1 data were used for the exploratory factor analysis (EFA); Time 2 for the confirmatory factor analysis (CFA), convergent validity, and hierarchical regression; and Time 3 for the test-retest reliability analysis.

2.1.1. Time 1 (Adult sample)

In December 2023, an online survey was conducted through Neo Marketing Inc. Adults across Japan were randomly selected and invited via email, and participation began after providing informed consent. Respondents received survey company reward points.

A total of 1,000 respondents (500 women, 500 men; $M_{age} = 46.08$, $SD = 8.27$) completed the survey. As online surveys are susceptible to satisficing—minimal effort responding [21,22]—we applied screening criteria based on [23]. The survey contained 120 items, including demographic questions; therefore, no cases fell below the predetermined threshold of 10 minutes for completion. For identical responses, participants who selected the same option for more than half of the items in at least two of the four main scales were flagged and excluded, leading to exclusion of 66 respondents and a final sample of 934 participants (464 men, 470 women; $M_{age} = 46.05$, $SD = 8.24$). Sample adequacy of the sample size in the present study was evaluated from multiple perspectives. Compared with prior studies [4,24], the present sample was sufficiently large. The adopted one-factor, seven-item structure, contained an adequate number of items per factor, and high communalities suggested strong structural stability [24]. As [25] noted, sample adequacy depends on factors, communalities, and item numbers—the “strength of the data.” From this perspective, the sample was appropriate. Although EFA does not require extremely large samples when communalities and factor clarity are high [25], we collected the largest feasible sample ($N = 934$) to maximize generalizability.

2.1.2. Time 2 and Time 3 (Undergraduate sample).

Two paper-based surveys were conducted about four weeks apart. At Time 2 (mid-November 2024), 254 students participated (182 women, 72 men; $M_{age} = 19.32$, $SD = 2.58$) at Time 3 (mid-December 2024), 318 students participated (218 women, 100 men; $M_{age} = 19.33$, $SD = 2.36$). Test-retest reliability was assessed with data from the 254 students who participated in both waves. Sample adequacy was further assessed for CFA and regression. Using RMSEA-based power analysis [26] with $df = 14$, $\alpha = .05$, power = .80, null RMSEA = .05, and alternative RMSEA = .08, the minimum required CFA sample was estimated at 277. The actual sample ($N = 318$)

exceeded this, indicating sufficient power. For hierarchical multiple regression with the Time 2 sample, an a priori power analysis in G*Power 3.1 [27] assumed a medium effect ($f^2 = .15$), $\alpha = .05$, power = .80, and two predictors. The required sample size was 55; the actual sample ($N = 254$) exceeded this, ensuring adequate power.

The surveys were administered during class sessions with permission from course instructors. Questionnaires were distributed and collected before or after lectures. Participation was voluntary, anonymity was assured, and students were informed that a small grade incentive would be given. The study's purpose, confidentiality, and privacy protection were explained beforehand, and written informed consent was obtained. The research was approved by the Ethics Committee of the authors' institution (Approval No. 2021-04).

2.2. Measures

2.2.1. Positivity Resonance

The Japanese version of the PRS was adapted from [4] with permission from the original authors. Seven items from Study 3 of [4], recommended for trait or episodic assessment, were translated into Japanese by two psychology experts. A bilingual expert back-translated the items into English, and the original authors confirmed semantic equivalence and content validity. The scale consists of seven items assessing positivity resonance specifically within interactions with familiar others. Sample items include: "During your interaction with familiar others, to what extent did you and the familiar other(s) feel warm and caring feelings toward each other?" and "During your interaction with familiar others, to what extent did you and the familiar other(s) feel in sync and attuned to each other?" Participants were instructed to recall and mentally recreate interactions with familiar others, then rate the proportion of time they experienced each item on a scale from 0 (never) to 100 (all of the time). Higher scores indicate higher PR.

2.2.2. Subjective Happiness

Global subjective happiness was measured using the Japanese version of the Subjective Happiness Scale [28, 29]. The SHS consists of four items rated on a 7-point Likert scale (1 = not at all, 7 = very much). A sample item is, "I consider myself a very happy person." Higher scores indicate greater subjective happiness.

2.2.3. Loneliness

Perceived loneliness was assessed using the Japanese version of the UCLA Loneliness Scale [30]. The scale contains 20 items rated on a 4-point Likert scale (1 = never, 4 = always). A sample item is, "I feel that I lack companionship." Higher scores indicate greater loneliness.

2.2.4. Depressive Symptoms

Depression was measured with the Japanese version of the Center for Epidemiologic Studies Depression Scale (CES-D) [31]. The 20 items assess the frequency of symptoms experienced during the past week on a 4-point scale (0 = rarely or none of the time, 1 = 1–2 days, 2 = 3–4

days, 3 = 5–7 days). A sample item is, "I felt depressed." Higher scores indicate more severe symptoms.

2.2.5. Positive and Negative affect

Affect was assessed using the Japanese version of the Positive and Negative Affect Schedule (PANAS) [32]. The scale includes 16 items (8 PA, 8 NA) rated on a 6-point scale (1 = very slightly or not at all, 6 = extremely). A sample PA item is "excited," and a sample NA item is "nervous." Mean scores were computed separately for PA and NA, with higher scores reflecting higher levels of each affect.

2.3. Data Analyses

An exploratory factor analysis (EFA) using maximum likelihood estimation was first conducted on the Time 1 adult sample ($N = 934$) to examine the factor structure of the Japanese PRS. The number of factors was determined using the Kaiser criterion (eigenvalues > 1), parallel analysis, and the minimum average partial (MAP) test. Model fit was evaluated with RMSEA, SRMR, CFI, and TLI. Following conventional guidelines, RMSEA $< .08$ indicates acceptable fit [33], SRMR $< .08$ is acceptable [34], and CFI/TLI $> .95$ reflect good fit [35].

Next, Pearson's correlations were calculated using Time 2 data to examine associations among variables. Hierarchical multiple regression analyses were conducted with subjective happiness (SHS), loneliness (UCLA Loneliness Scale), and depressive symptoms (CES-D) as dependent variables. In each case, Model 1 included PR as the predictor, and Model 2 added PA (PANAS) as a control. Correlations were interpreted following [36] guidelines: $|r| < .30$ = small, $.30 \leq |r| \leq .50$ = moderate, $|r| > .50$ = large.

Test-retest reliability was assessed using the intraclass correlation coefficient (ICC) with Time 3 data. All analyses were conducted in R (version 4.4.2) [37] and HAD [38].

3. Results

3.1. Factor Structure and Reliability

An exploratory factor analysis (EFA) using maximum likelihood estimation was conducted on the Time 1 data ($N = 934$) for the Japanese version of the PRS (Table 1). The number of factors was determined based on the Kaiser criterion, parallel analysis, and the minimum average partial (MAP) test, all of which supported a one-factor solution consistent with the original scale. All factor loadings exceeded .70.

A confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) on the Time 2 data ($N = 318$) yielded the following fit indices: $\chi^2(14) = 37.30$, $p < .01$, CFI = .97, GFI = .93, AGFI = .87, SRMR = .03, RMSEA = .11 (90% CI [.07, .15]), and TLI = .95. Although RMSEA exceeded the conventional .08 cutoff, such inflation is frequently observed in models with few degrees of freedom, particularly in one-factor structures with high communalities [39]. In the present model, all factor loadings were uniformly high ($> .70$), and other fit

indices (CFI, SRMR, and TLI) met recommended criteria. Accordingly, the model fit was evaluated based on multiple indices rather than a single cutoff, and the factor structure was considered acceptable.

Internal consistency was high (Cronbach's $\alpha = .93$ at Time 1; $\alpha = .94$ at Time 2). Test-retest reliability, calculated for participants completing both Time 2 and Time 3 ($N = 254$), yielded $ICC(2,1) = .63$ (95% CI [.54, .70]), which [40] classifies as "good." These results support the Japanese PRS as demonstrating satisfactory construct validity and temporal stability.

3.2. Descriptive Statistics and Correlations

To test Hypothesis 1, descriptive statistics and Pearson's correlations were computed among PRS, subjective happiness (SHS), loneliness (UCLA), depression (CES-D), and positive affect (PANAS PA) using the Time 2 dataset (Table 2). As expected, PRS correlated positively with SHS ($r = .44, p < .01$) and negatively with loneliness ($r = -.46, p < .01$) and depression ($r = -.29, p < .01$). PRS also showed a small positive correlation with PA ($r = .26, p < .01$). These results demonstrate satisfactory criterion-related validity for the Japanese PRS.

3.3. Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analyses

To test Hypothesis 2, hierarchical multiple regression analyses were conducted with SHS, UCLA, and CES-D as dependent variables (Table 3). In Model 1, PRS scores

were entered as the sole predictor. In Model 2, positive affect (PANAS PA) was added as a control variable. Even after controlling for positive affect, PRS remained a significant predictor across outcomes: it positively predicted SHS ($\beta = .26, p < .01$) and negatively predicted both loneliness ($\beta = -.42, p < .01$) and depression ($\beta = -.24, p < .01$). These results indicate that PRS contributes uniquely to well-being beyond the effects of positive affect, supporting Hypothesis 2.

Table 1. Results of Exploratory Factor Analysis (Maximum Likelihood Method) for the Japanese Version of the Positivity Resonance Scale ($N = 934$)

Item No.	Item	Factor loading	Communality
Q1	In your interactions with "familiar other (s)", did you feel mutual warmth and concern?	.90	.80
Q2	In interactions with "familiar other (s)," were you able to attune to and connect with their experiences?	.94	.88
Q3	In interactions with "familiar other (s)," did thoughts and feelings flow with ease between you and the other(s)?	.93	.86
Q4	In interactions with "familiar other (s)," did you feel energized and uplifted by the company of the other(s)?	.93	.86
Q5	In interactions with "familiar other (s)," were you and the other(s) mutually responsive to one another's needs?	.94	.89
Q6	In interactions with "familiar other (s)," did you feel a sense of mutual trust with the other(s)?	.94	.88
Q7	In interactions with "familiar other (s)," did you feel in "in sync" with the other(s)?	.93	.86

Note. English translations are shown; original items are in Appendix A.

Table 2. Descriptive Statistics and Intercorrelations among Scales at Time 2 ($N = 318$)

	1	2	3	4	5	6	<i>t</i>	<i>d</i>	<i>p</i>
1 PRS	—	.44**	.26**	-.12*	-.46**	-.29**	-1.19	-.17	.21
2 SHS		—	.38**	-.35**	-.56**	-.57**	1.20	.17	.23
3 PA			—	.17*	-.26**	-.24**	3.63**	.52	.00
4 NA				—	.41**	.56**	1.70	.25	.09
5 UCLA					—	.57**	1.63	.22	.11
6 CES-D						—	0.21	.03	.84
Total <i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>) ($N = 318$)	79.78 (13.96)	4.81 (1.10)	3.00 (1.03)	2.32 (0.95)	1.85 (0.46)	17.06 (8.67)			
Men <i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>) ($n = 100$)	78.24 (12.38)	4.95 (1.17)	3.38 (1.08)	2.50 (0.91)	1.93 (0.46)	17.21 (9.11)			
Women <i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>) ($n = 218$)	80.60 (14.29)	4.76 (1.07)	2.86 (0.98)	2.26 (0.96)	1.82 (0.46)	16.96 (8.53)			
α	.94	.80	.90	.88	.87	.84			

Mean and Standard Deviation of PRS Scores by Age Group and Gender at Time 1 ($N = 934$) and Time 3 ($N = 254$)

Time Point	Age Group	Men <i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)	Women <i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)	Total <i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)
Time 1	Young (18–34)	56.25 (23.17) ($n = 16$)	60.43 (24.92) ($n = 446$)	59.74 (24.57) ($n = 462$)
	Middle-aged (35–59)	56.74 (25.49) ($n = 82$)	60.92 (27.63) ($n = 390$)	58.69 (26.57) ($n = 472$)
Time 3	Young (18–34)	80.78 (14.80) ($n = 72$)	80.75 (11.95) ($n = 182$)	80.76 (12.80) ($n = 254$)

Note. *M* = mean; *SD* = standard deviation; α = Cronbach's alpha coefficient; PRS = Japanese version of the Positivity Resonance Scale; SHS = Subjective Happiness Scale; PA = Positive Affect subscale of the Positive and Negative Affect Schedule; NA = Negative Affect subscale of the Positive and Negative Affect Schedule; UCLA = UCLA Loneliness Scale; CES-D = Center for Epidemiologic Studies Depression Scale (Japanese version). *t* and *p* values test the mean differences between men and women. All participants at Time 2 were the young age group (18–34).

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

Table 3. Standardized and Unstandardized Coefficients from Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analyses Predicting Well-being Indicators from Positivity Resonance and Positive Affect at Time 2

	SHS					UCLA					CES-D				
	<i>B</i>	<i>SE_B</i>	<i>LB</i>	<i>UB</i>	β	<i>B</i>	<i>SE_B</i>	<i>LB</i>	<i>UB</i>	β	<i>B</i>	<i>SE_B</i>	<i>LB</i>	<i>UB</i>	β
Model 1															
PRS	.03	.01	.02	.04	.34**	-.02	.00	-.02	-.01	-.46**	-.18	.04	-.25	-.10	-.29**
Model 2															
PRS	-.15	.04	-.23	-.07	.26**	-.01	.00	-.02	-.01	-.42**	.02	.01	.01	.03	-.24**
PA	-1.49	.52	-2.52	-.46	.32**	-.07	.03	-.12	-.02	-.15*	.34	.06	.21	.46	-.18**
<i>R</i> ² (Model 1)	.12					.21					.08				
<i>R</i> ² (Model 2)	.21					.23					.11				
ΔR^2	.09					.02					.03				

Note. *B* = unstandardized regression coefficient; *SE_B* = standard error of *B*; *LB/UB* = lower/upper bound of the 95% confidence interval for *B*; β = standardized regression coefficient. PRS = Japanese version of the Positivity Resonance Scale; SHS = Subjective Happiness Scale; PA = Positive Affect subscale of the Positive and Negative Affect Schedule; UCLA = UCLA Loneliness Scale; CES-D = Center for Epidemiologic Studies Depression Scale (Japanese version).

p* < .05, *p* < .01

4. Discussion and Conclusions

Previous studies have shown that positivity resonance (PR) is positively associated with well-being in Western cultural contexts, but its role in Japanese culture has remained unclear. The present study developed a Japanese version of the Positivity Resonance Scale (PRS), focusing on interactions with “familiar others” using recommended seven items with high versatility, and examined its associations with happiness, loneliness, and depression among Japanese university students.

Consistent with our hypotheses and previous studies [4,8], PR was positively associated with happiness and negatively associated with loneliness and depression. These findings suggest that in the interdependent culture of Japan, where emotional expression is restrained as a norm [10], shared positive emotions, mutual care, and behavioral synchrony within close and trusting relationships reasonably contribute to enhancing psychological well-being. Notably, in the present study, PR showed a stronger negative association with loneliness than with depressive symptoms. This pattern suggests that the interpersonal functions of PR may be more closely related to social disconnectedness than to affective distress in Japan. In Japan, emotional restraint serves social harmony by prioritizing sensitivity to others’ needs over overt positive expression [10,41]. Accordingly, PR may support well-being through subtle interpersonal attunement and warmth that maintain in-group relationships. Moreover, because social belonging is deemed crucial for one’s survival in interdependent cultures [42], PR may exert a stronger protective effect against loneliness than against depressive symptoms. Taken together, this culturally flexible function of PR highlights its role as a relational adaptation that reflects local norms of maintaining collective harmony.

Alongside evidence from other non-Western settings [8] and cross-cultural comparative research [24], our results indicate that the benefits of PR extend beyond Western contexts. Our findings complement recent evidence by [9], who demonstrated convergent validity of PR across self-reports, behavioral coding, and conversational synchrony. While Zhou and colleagues established the

methodological robustness of PR, the present study extends this line of inquiry to the cultural domain, showing that PR maintains its beneficial associations with well-being even in a collectivistic society characterized by restrained emotional expression. Taken together, these studies suggest that PR reflects relevant interpersonal process across East and West that can be reliably assessed across both methodological and cultural boundaries.

Notably, the associations between PR and well-being remained significant after controlling for PA, suggesting that PR captures unique interpersonal processes beyond general mood [6,43]. Shared positive emotions may deepen social connections, promoting mental health.

A further strength of this study is its inclusion of a broad adult sample spanning young, middle-aged, and older adults, enabling the investigation of PR within diverse and realistic interpersonal contexts. Such heterogeneity also offers developmental insights. Socioemotional selectivity theory [44] and the broaden-and-build theory [6,45] suggest that aging is accompanied by a motivational shift toward emotionally meaningful relationships, potentially influencing PR’s frequency and quality. Cross-cultural research [24] has shown that PR’s link to well-being can be stronger in older than younger adults, and conceptual work emphasizes its heightened value in later life [43]. By including diverse age groups, the present study enhances generalizability and lays groundwork for future cross-cultural and lifespan research on PR.

Despite these strengths, several limitations should be noted. First, the cross-sectional design limits causal inferences about PR’s effects on well-being. Second, reliance on self-reports may have introduced common method bias. Previous research highlights the importance of multimodal assessments, including nonverbal behavioral and physiological indices, alongside self-reports [6,46]. Self-report measures of PR rely on conscious awareness of interpersonal experiences and may therefore fail to capture implicit or nonverbal processes that occur outside one’s awareness. As PR is theorized to involve behavioral and physiological synchrony, relying solely on self-reports could underestimate crucial relational mechanisms such as subtle affective matching, coordinated gestures, or dyadic physiological linkage. For instance, [46] operationalized PR in couples using

coordinated facial expressions, movement, and speech patterns, as well as heart rate synchrony, finding links with long-term health and longevity. Future research should incorporate longitudinal or experimental designs with behavioral and physiological measures of PR. Third, the sample was limited to Japanese adults, restricting the generalizability of findings to other cultures. Broader cross-cultural samples would strengthen external validity. Fourth, differences in PRS scores between Time 1 and Time 3 among young adults may partly reflect broader social contexts. Time 1 data were collected while COVID-19 restrictions still limited face-to-face interactions, potentially reducing opportunities for shared positive emotions. In contrast, Time 3 occurred after restrictions eased, which may explain relatively higher PR scores. Future research should consider macro-level contexts, such as public health crises, when interpreting temporal changes.

In summary, this study demonstrated that PR is positively associated with well-being in Japan, a cultural context where emotional expression is often restrained. The Japanese PRS focusing on familiar others provides a culturally sensitive tool for assessing PR and offers valuable implications for cross-cultural research and practical applications aimed at fostering positive social emotions.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

In translating the Japanese version of the Positivity Resonance Scale for this study, we gratefully acknowledge the permission and cooperation granted by Barbara L. Fredrickson, Ph.D. (University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill), as well as the invaluable advice provided by Professor Miki Akiyama (Musashino University). We express our deepest gratitude to them.

References

- [1] Baumeister, R.F., and Leary, M.R., "The need to belong: Desire for interpersonal attachments as a fundamental human motivation," *Psychological Bulletin*, 117(3), 497–529, 1995.
- [2] Ryan, R.M., and Deci, E.L., "Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development, and well-being," *American Psychologist*, 55(1), 68–78, 2000.
- [3] Gable, S.L., Reis, H.T., Impett, E.A., and Asher, E.R., "What do you do when things go right? The intrapersonal and interpersonal benefits of sharing positive events," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 87(2), 228–245, 2004.
- [4] Major, B.C., Le Nguyen, K.D., Lundberg, K.B., and Fredrickson, B.L., "Well-being correlates of perceived positivity resonance: Evidence from trait and episode-level assessments," *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 44(12), 1631–1647, 2018.
- [5] Kerstetter, D., Shen, X., Yi, X., Pan, B., Zhang, G., Li, R., and Gao, J., "Sources of happiness: A mixed methods phenomenological study of factors affecting residents' subjective well-being in Shenzhen, China," *Psychological Reports*, 125(1), 167–199, 2022.
- [6] Fredrickson, B.L., "Love: Positivity resonance as a fresh, evidence-based perspective on an age-old topic," in *Handbook of Emotions* (4th ed.), L.F. Barrett, M. Lewis, and J.M. Haviland-Jones, Eds., Guilford Press, New York, 847–858, 2016.
- [7] Fredrickson, B.L., and Cohn, M.A., "Positive emotions," in *Handbook of Emotions* (3rd ed.), M. Lewis, J.M. Haviland-Jones, and L.F. Barrett, Eds., Guilford Press, New York, 777–796, 2008.
- [8] Datu, J.A.D., and Tang, R.L., "The rewards of spreading positivity: Positivity resonance relates to greater relatedness and flourishing in Filipino early adults," *Personality and Individual Differences*, 217, 1–4, 2024.
- [9] Zhou, J., West, T.N., Berman, C.J., and Fredrickson, B.L., "Positively in-sync: Convergent validity across three distinct assessments of the affective quality of social interaction," *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 0(0), 1–19, 2025.
- [10] Markus, H.R., and Kitayama, S., "Culture and the self: Implications for cognition, emotion, and motivation," *Psychological Review*, 98(2), 224–253, 1991.
- [11] Kitayama, S., Markus, H.R., and Kurokawa, M., "Culture, emotion, and well-being: Good feelings in Japan and the United States," *Cognition and Emotion*, 14(1), 93–124, 2000.
- [12] Majd Ara, E., Makvand Hoseini, S., Arab Ghaeni, M., and Asbaghi, E., "Mediating role of rumination in the relationship between social anxiety and depression and early maladaptive schemas," *Journal of Modern Psychological Researches*, 12(47), 181–203, 2017.
- [13] Schwartz-Mette, R.A., Rose, A.J., Smith, R.L., and O'Connor, E.E., "Friendship and internalizing symptoms: A meta-analytic review and directions for future research," *Psychological Bulletin*, 146(8), 703–728, 2020.
- [14] Segrin, C., "The relationship between social skills deficits and psychosocial problems: A test of a vulnerability model," *Communication Research*, 23(4), 425–450, 1996.
- [15] Ghiggia, A., Castelli, L., Adenzato, M., and Di Tella, M., "Emotional competencies and psychological distress: Is loneliness a mediating factor?" *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology*, 65(2), 359–368, 2024.
- [16] Mijuskovic, B., "Intimacy and loneliness," *Journal of Couples Therapy*, 1(3–4), 39–48, 1991.
- [17] Lemay, E.P., Cutri, J., and Teneva, N., "How loneliness undermines close relationships and persists over time: The role of perceived regard and care," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 127(3), 609–637, 2024.
- [18] Di Malta, G., Bond, J., Raymond-Barker, B., Moller, N., and Cooper, M., "The impact of relational depth on subjective well-being in close relationships in the community," *Journal of Humanistic Psychology*, advance online publication, 2024.
- [19] Hudson, N.W., Lucas, R.E., and Donnellan, M.B., "Are we happier with others? An investigation of the links between spending time with others and subjective well-being," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 119(3), 672–694, 2020.
- [20] Oishi, S., Kesebir, S., and Snyder, B.H., "Felt understanding as a bridge between close relationships and subjective well-being: The moderating role of gender," *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 4(6), 403–416, 2010.
- [21] Masuda, S., Sakagami, T., Kitaoka, K., and Sasaki, M., "Relationship between noncompliance with response instructions and response bias," *Japanese Journal of Psychology*, 87(4), 354–363, 2016.
- [22] Miura, A., and Kobayashi, T., "An experimental study on satisficing among online survey panelists," *Japanese Journal of Social Psychology*, 31(1), 1–12, 2015.
- [23] Hanibuchi, T., Muranaka, A., and Ando, M., "Issues in data collection through Internet surveys: Analyses focusing on invalid responses, response time, and geographic characteristics," *E-Journal GEO*, 10(1), 81–98, 2015.
- [24] Zhou, J., West, T.N., Lee, S.H., Choi, I., Hitokoto, H., Otake, K., Fredrickson, B.L. and Salvador, C.E., "Do people from different cultures vary in how much positive emotions resonate in day-to-day social interactions? Examining the role of relational mobility," *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 55(4), 347–367, 2024.
- [25] Kyriazos, T.A., "Applied psychometrics: Sample size and sample power considerations in factor analysis (EFA, CFA) and SEM in general," *Psychology*, 9, 2207–2230, 2018.
- [26] Preacher, K.J., and Coffman, D.L., "Computing power and minimum sample size for RMSEA," [Online]. Available: <http://www.quantpsy.org/rmsear/rmsear.htm>, 2006.
- [27] Faul, F., Erdfelder, E., Lang, A.-G., and Buchner, A., "G*Power 3: A flexible statistical power analysis program for the social, behavioral, and biomedical sciences," *Behavior Research Methods*, 39(2), 175–191, 2007.
- [28] Lyubomirsky, S. and Lepper, H.S., "A measure of subjective happiness: Preliminary reliability and construct validation," *Social Indicators Research*, 46(2), 137–155, 1999.
- [29] Shimai, S., Otake, K., Utsuki, N., Ikemi, A. and Lyubomirsky, S., "Reliability and validity of the Japanese version of the Subjective

- Happiness Scale (SHS)," *Japanese Journal of Public Health*, 51(10), 845–853, 2004.
- [30] Masuda, Y., Tadaka, E. and Dai, A., "Development and reliability and validity of the Japanese version of the UCLA Loneliness Scale Version 3 for older adults," *Journal of Japan Academy of Community Health Nursing*, 15(1), 25–32, 2012.
- [31] Shima, S., Kano, T., Kitamura, T., and Asai, M., "A new self-rating depression scale," *Psychiatry*, 27(6), 717–723, 1985.
- [32] Sato, T., and Yamada, A., "Development of the Japanese version of the Positive and Negative Affect Schedule (PANAS)," *Japanese Journal of Personality*, 9(2), 138–139, 2001.
- [33] Schermelleh-Engel, K., Moosbrugger, H., and Müller, H., "Evaluating the fit of structural equation models: Tests of significance and descriptive goodness-of-fit measures," *Methods of Psychological Research Online*, 8(2), 23–74, 2003.
- [34] Hu, L., and Bentler, P.M., "Fit indices in covariance structure modeling: Sensitivity to underparameterized model misspecification," *Psychological Methods*, 3(4), 424–453, 1998.
- [35] Hu, L., and Bentler, P.M., "Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis: Conventional criteria versus new alternatives," *Structural Equation Modeling*, 6(1), 1–55, 1999.
- [36] Cohen, J., *Statistical Power Analysis for the Behavioral Sciences* (2nd ed.), Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Hillsdale, NJ, 1988.
- [37] R Core Team, *R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing*, R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, 2024. <https://www.R-project.org/>
- [38] Shimizu, H., "Free statistical analysis software HAD: Functions and suggestions for use in statistical learning, education, and research practice," *Media, Information and Communication Studies*, 1, 59–73, 2016.
- [39] Kenny, D.A., Kaniskan, B., and McCoach, B., "The performance of RMSEA in models with small degrees of freedom," *Sociological Methods & Research*, 44(3), 486–507, 2015.
- [40] Cicchetti, D.V., "Guidelines, criteria, and rules of thumb for evaluating normed and standardized assessment instruments in psychology," *Psychological Assessment*, 6(4), 284–290, 1994.
- [41] Matsumoto, D., "Cultural similarities and differences in display rules," *Motivation and Emotion*, 14(3), 195–214, 1990.
- [42] Hashimoto, H., and Yamagishi, T., "Duality of independence and interdependence: An adaptationist perspective," *Asian Journal of Social Psychology*, 19(4), 286–297, 2016.
- [43] Prinzing, M., Nguyen, K.L., and Fredrickson, B.L., "Does shared positivity make life more meaningful? Perceived positivity resonance is uniquely associated with perceived meaning in life," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 125(2), 345–366, 2023.
- [44] Carstensen, L.L., "The influence of a sense of time on human development," *Science*, 312(5782), 1913–1915, 2006.
- [45] Fredrickson, B.L., "Positive emotions broaden and build," in *Positive Psychological Science: Improving Everyday Life, Wellbeing, Work, Education, and Societies Across the Globe*, M.W. Gallagher and S.J. Lopez, Eds., Routledge, New York, 7–19, 2019.
- [46] Wells, J.L., Haase, C.M., Rothwell, E.S., Naugle, K.G., Otero, M.C., Brown, C.L., Lai, J., Chen, K.-H., Connelly, D.E., Grimm, K.J., Levenson, R.W., and Fredrickson, B.L., "Positivity resonance in long-term married couples: Multimodal characteristics and consequences for health and longevity," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 123(5), 983–1003, 2022.



© The Author(s) 2025. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

Appendix A. Japanese Version of the Resonance Scale Items

The following are the original Japanese versions of the seven items used to assess resonance, corresponding to Q1–Q7 presented in Table 1.

Q1.あなたと「親しい人(たち)」との交流において、あなたは、お互いに、温かい気持ちや気遣いの思いを感じていましたか。

Q2.あなたと「親しい人(たち)」との交流において、あなたは、その「親しい人(たち)」と調和し、気持ちを通じ合わせることができましたか。

Q3.あなたと「親しい人(たち)」との交流において、あなたは、その「親しい人(たち)」との間で、考えや気持ちを容易に伝え合うことができましたか。

Q4.あなたと「親しい人(たち)」との交流において、あなたは、お互いに一緒にいることで元気が出たり、気持ちを高め合ったという感覚を感じましたか。

Q5.あなたと「親しい人(たち)」との交流において、あなたとその「親しい人(たち)」は、お互いに望むことに対して、たたえ合っていましたか。

Q6.あなたと「親しい人(たち)」との交流において、あなたは、お互いに、信頼し、尊重し合う気持ちを感じていましたか。

Q7.あなたと「親しい人(たち)」との交流において、あなたは、その「親しい人(たち)」と、波長が合うと感じましたか。

Note. When responding to each item, participants were instructed to think comprehensively about their interactions with close others and to briefly recall and mentally re-experience those interactions. They were then asked to indicate how much of the time they experienced the content described in each item, using a scale ranging from 0 (*not at all*) to 100 (*all of the time*).