



HAL
open science

Ninety Years after Lewin: the Role of Familism and Attachment Style in Social Networks Characteristics across 21 Nations

Xian Zhao, Omri Gillath, Itziar Alonso-Arbiol, Amina Abubakar, Byron Adams, Frédérique Autin, Audrey Brassard, Rodrigo Carcedo, Or Catz, Cecilia Cheng, et al.

► To cite this version:

Xian Zhao, Omri Gillath, Itziar Alonso-Arbiol, Amina Abubakar, Byron Adams, et al.. Ninety Years after Lewin: the Role of Familism and Attachment Style in Social Networks Characteristics across 21 Nations. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 2024, 10.1177/02654075241237939 . hal-04520898

HAL Id: hal-04520898

<https://hal.science/hal-04520898>

Submitted on 25 Mar 2024

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Ninety Years after Lewin: The Role of Familism and Attachment Style in Social
Networks Characteristics across 21 Nations/Areas

[Please see authorship on the next page.]

Word Count: 8985

Note: This project was funded by a grant from the Basque Government to Research Groups (IT1598-22). João M. Moreira holds a position at the Faculty of Psychology and Research Center for Psychological Science (CICPSI), University of Lisbon, Portugal. The first author wants to thank Tianyi Li, Zhiying Irene Zhen, Xue Sunny Xiang, and Man Mandy Luo for their support while this study was conducted. Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Xian Zhao, who is now at the Kellogg School of Management, Northwestern University, 2211 Campus Drive, Evanston, IL, 60208, USA. Email: xian.zhao@kellogg.northwestern.edu or zhaoxianpsych@gmail.com

Corresponding author's contact information:

Xian Zhao

Kellogg School of Management

Northwestern University, 2211 Campus Drive, Evanston, IL. 60208.

E-mail: xian.zhao@kellogg.northwestern.edu

Xian Zhao¹

Northwestern University, USA

Omri Gillath

University of Kansas, USA

Itziar Alonso-Arbiol

University of the Basque Country UPV/EHU, Spain

Amina Abubakar

Aga Khan University, Kenya

Byron G. Adams

University of Amsterdam, the Netherlands

University of Johannesburg, South Africa

Ghent University, Belgium

Frédérique Autin

CeRCA; Université de Poitiers; CNRS, France

Audrey Brassard

Université de Sherbrooke, Canada

Rodrigo J. Carcedo

University of Salamanca, Spain

¹ Except Xian Zhao, Omri Gillath, and Itziar Alonso-Arbiol, the names of the other authors are in an alphabetical order. We thank Fons J. R. van de Vijver (Tilburg University, Netherlands) for his contribution on an early version of the manuscript.

Or Catz

Ashkelon Academic College, Israel

Cecilia Cheng

University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong

Tamlin S. Conner

University of Otago, New Zealand

Tasuku Igarashi

Nagoya University, Japan

Konstantinos Kafetsios

Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, Greece

Palacký University Olomouc, Czech Republic

Shanmukh Kamble

Karnatak University, India

Gery Karantzas

Deakin University, Australia

Rafael Emilio Mendía-Monterroso

Private Researcher of Social Innovation Projects of Guatemala Municipality

Research Institute of Science and Technology for Development, Universidad Rafael Landívar, Guatemala

João M. Moreira

University of Lisbon, Portugal

Tobias Nolte

University College London, UK

Willibald Ruch

University of Zurich, Switzerland

Sandra Sebre

University of Latvia, Latvia

Angela Suryani

Atma Jaya Catholic University of Indonesia, Indonesia

Semira Tagliabue

Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore, Italy

Qi Xu

New York University, USA

Fang Zhang

Assumption University, USA

1 Abstract

2 Drawing on the literature on person-culture fit, we investigated how culture (assessed as
3 national-level familism), personality (tapped by attachment styles) and their interactions
4 predicted social network characteristics in 21 nations/areas ($N = 2977$). Multilevel mixed
5 modeling showed that familism predicted smaller network size but greater density, tie
6 strength, and multiplexity. Attachment avoidance predicted smaller network size, and
7 lower density, tie strength, and multiplexity. Attachment anxiety was related to lower
8 density and tie strength. Familism enhanced avoidance's association with network size
9 and reduced its association with density, tie strength, and multiplexity. Familism also
10 enhanced anxiety's association with network size, tie strength, and multiplexity. These
11 findings contribute to theory building on attachment and culture, highlight the
12 significance of culture by personality interaction for the understanding of social
13 networks, and call attention to the importance of sampling multiple countries.

14

15 Keywords: social network, attachment, familism, person-culture fit

16

17 **Ninety Years after Lewin: The Role of Familism and Attachment Style in Social**
18 **Networks Characteristics across 21 Nations/Areas¹**

19 When comparing people's networks and the formation and maintenance of social
20 ties between Germany and the U.S., Kurt Lewin (1936) argued that Americans engage in
21 more distal "peripheral" relationships—being more willing to form new ties but not
22 allowing them to evolve into deeper relationships. Conversely, Germans who value close
23 "private" relationships—are less willing to form new ties. Once ties are formed, they are
24 more likely to evolve into close meaningful relationships. Lewin (1936) theorized that the
25 differences in people's social networking are due, like many other behaviors, to the
26 interaction between people's personality and the environment they are embedded in.
27 Despite almost 90 years passing since Lewin (1936), no research to our knowledge has
28 systematically tested Lewin's proposition. Guided by recent cultural perspectives, to fill
29 this gap, we conducted a large-scale international collaborative investigation across 21
30 different nations/areas. Specifically, we examined how familism—a cultural construct
31 related to relationships (Campos et al., 2016) and attachment style—a personality trait
32 central to close relationships (Bowlby, 1969) relate to one's social networks.

33 **Social Networks**

34 Social networks are social structures depicting people and their interpersonal
35 connections. A main characteristic of social networks is the number of others or *alters*
36 one has — termed *network size* (Walker et al., 2000). Alters can reside either in the
37 periphery of the network (usually with more superficial and distal relationships) or in the
38 private region of the network (with deeper and closer relationships). Using these regions,

¹ The inclusion of "nations/areas" in our references was driven by the fact that certain regions in this research, such as Hong Kong, can be politically contentious when categorized as independent nations.

39 ties can be described across a dimension termed *depth* ranging from superficial to deep
40 (less to more intimate). Depth can be directly assessed via network *density*, the structural
41 closeness among members within a network, or *tie strength*, the intensity of bondedness
42 between network members (Gillath et al., 2019). Both indexes represent the degree of
43 relationship closeness and are based on people's self-report of felt closeness or how
44 frequently they interact with Alters (Marsden & Campbell, 1984).
45 Alters can also play different roles for people, share different situations with them, and
46 satisfy different needs. The more roles alters play (e.g., classmate, roommate; Ferriani et
47 al., 2013), the more situations they share, and the more needs/functions they fulfill (e.g.,
48 secure base, safe haven; Gillath et al., 2017) the higher the network's *multiplexity* is.

49 **Cultural Differences in Social Networks**

50 Previous studies have investigated the dynamics of culture and social networks.
51 Americans have more friends than Ghanaians (Adams & Plaut, 2003) and people in Hong
52 Kong (Wheeler et al., 1989). Potentially, because Americans' friendships are less
53 strongly tied (Li et al., 2015), Americans invest less in each friendship and thus can have
54 more. Work on relational mobility—the ease of establishing new relationships (Yuki &
55 Schug, 2012) demonstrates that Americans tend to be higher on relational mobility than
56 Japanese. Potentially because ties in the U.S. are often weaker or more superficial,
57 relationships are easier to establish and maintain than in Japan (Schug et al., 2010) and
58 are easier to dissolve in the U.S. (Gillath & Keefer, 2016).

59 Related to multiplexity, when people fulfill fewer functions and roles for each
60 other, there is a smaller chance or opportunity for friction to happen. Indeed, Americans
61 tend to report less relational animosity than Ghanaians (Adams, 2005), and fewer

62 concerns about negative relational consequences when asking for social support than
63 Asians (Kim et al., 2008).

64 Most existing studies on the associations between culture and relationships, suffer
65 from a major limitation: they compare only two nations or cultures, and thus cannot
66 discern which of all possible differences between the two cultures contributes to their
67 findings (van de Vijver & Leung, 2000). Furthermore, often the U.S. serves as a
68 comparison target, rather than the hypotheses being directly and systematically tested
69 across multiple cultures. As a result, people may overgeneralize findings based on
70 American samples, and the U.S. patterns of relationships might be treated as the standard
71 (Hegarty & Pratto, 2001). In the present study, we overcame these limitations by
72 assessing relationship patterns in multiple cultures. Specifically, we delved into the
73 impact of familism within diverse cultural contexts.

74 **Familism and Social Networks**

75 Familism is the extent to which family is prioritized among one's social
76 relationships. People who endorse familism are more likely to prioritize family members
77 and their welfare over other relationships and interests (Valenzuela & Dornbusch, 1994).
78 This preference may manifest as strong identifications with family members, and strong
79 interdependence, reciprocity, obligation, loyalty, and solidarity among family members
80 (Triandis et al., 1982). Familism (Villarreal et al., 2003) is viewed as a subtype of
81 collectivism (Realo et al., 1997). Global inequality in technology development and
82 differences in sociodemographic factors determine cultural variations in familism across
83 nations/areas (Greenfield, 2016). Nations that are more technologically developed, with
84 higher income, and more urbanization, tend to be less family-oriented or low on

85 familism. Researchers have shown that familism is associated with greater psychological
86 health among European Americans, Asian Americans, and Hispanic Americans (Campos
87 et al., 2014; Keeler et al., 2014), and greater self-esteem and life satisfaction among
88 Hispanic Americans (Piña-Watson et al., 2013). Although familism is often assessed as
89 an individual-difference measure, nations and cultures tend to differ on familism (e.g.,
90 Mair, 2022), and these nation-level differences are the focus of the present manuscript.

91 A cultural psychological approach positions familism in broader cultural
92 ecologies of interdependence in which relationality is constructed in overlapping
93 networks of thick connections. Adaptation to such cultural ecology in which relationships
94 are closely intertwined and stable, includes maintaining more social bonding (Greenfield,
95 2016), maintaining sensitivity to obligations (Steidel & Contreras, 2003), and
96 emphasizing caution in relationships to avoid making enemies and conflicts (Adams,
97 2005). Although familism emphasizes the nuclear family—kinship as the center of one’s
98 social network, the relational mode that familism affords may extend to others beyond the
99 boundaries of one’s family (e.g., friends, acquaintances, and colleagues; Restubog &
100 Bordia, 2006), as familism is a culturally shared belief. Indeed, some friends can be
101 called “family friends” due to their strong ties to the whole family.

102 Social network in familism culture may thus be constructed in a way that reflects
103 embedded relationality—a network including a small number of friends who are very
104 close to each other. The network can help to manage obligations towards close others in
105 overlapping networks of embedded connection. Supporting this, outside the family,
106 familism is associated with less interpersonal trust and civic engagement (Realo et al.,
107 2008), which leads to forming fewer social connections and implies a smaller network

108 size. Familism prioritizes ingroup needs over one's own and emphasizes group harmony
109 when facing conflicts in close friendships. Familism is positively associated with
110 solution-oriented resolution rather than self-oriented resolution (Thayer et al., 2008), as a
111 means to maintain closeness and bondedness between friends, indicating a deeper level of
112 involvement among connections. Based on these findings, we predicted that national-
113 level familism would be negatively associated with network size, but positively
114 associated with network density, tie strength, and multiplexity.

115 Although there is little empirical evidence to support the associations between
116 familism and these network characteristics, one may point out that cross-cultural studies
117 assessing closeness and intimacy allude to the possibility that familism will be negatively
118 correlated with relationship depth and multiplexity. For example, Marshall (2008)
119 showed that Chinese Canadians who are likely to be higher on familism than European
120 Canadians, reported lower intimacy in their dating relationships than European
121 Canadians. The current study provides an opportunity to delve deeper into these proposed
122 associations and explore both the individual influence of attachment style and the
123 dynamic interaction between attachment style and familism.

124 **Attachment Theory and Social Networks**

125 Attachment theory (Bowlby, 1969) is a leading theoretical framework often used
126 to study close relationships and affect regulation processes. Attachment style delineates
127 people's cognitive, affective, and behavioral patterns, capturing the way individuals
128 think, feel, and behave in their relationships. Attachment style has been found to be a
129 reliable predictor of relational variables (Wilkinson, 2010), such as relationship
130 satisfaction (Gillath et al., 2016) and network characteristics (Gillath et al., 2019).

131 Attachment is assessed as two dimensions: anxiety and avoidance. Individuals high on
132 attachment anxiety tend to worry about being abandoned and rejected by close others,
133 whereas individuals high on avoidance are less likely to trust or depend on others or let
134 others depend on them. Individuals low on both attachment anxiety and avoidance are
135 thought to be secure—they find it easy to get close to, trust, and depend on others and let
136 others depend on them.

137 Existing research shows a negative correlation between attachment avoidance and
138 network size in Americans (Fiori et al., 2011), but there is a lack of evidence on the
139 association between attachment anxiety and network size. Considering the apprehension
140 of losing connections, it is reasonable to predict that individuals high on attachment
141 anxiety are more likely to form larger networks to ease the anxiety associated with losing
142 ties. We predicted that attachment avoidance would be negatively associated, whereas
143 attachment anxiety would be positively associated with network size.

144 Both attachment styles are negatively associated with the tendency to maintain
145 social ties (Gillath et al., 2011) and with density (Gillath et al., 2017). Attachment
146 avoidance and anxiety also predict a stronger tendency to use exchange norms rather than
147 communal norms (Clark et al., 2010). These findings suggest that attachment avoidance
148 and anxiety would predict lower levels of density and tie strength. With regard to
149 multiplexity, only attachment avoidance was found to be negatively associated with
150 multiplexity online (Karantzas et al., 2012) and offline (Gillath et al., 2017). Based on
151 this literature, we predicted that attachment insecurity, and especially avoidance, would
152 predict lower multiplexity.

153 **Social Networks Characteristics as a Function of the Interaction between Familism**
154 **and Attachment Style**

155 Environment-level and individual-level factors are seen as mutually contingent
156 and jointly affecting behaviors (Anderson et al., 2008; Erez & Gati, 2004). As Strand
157 (2020) proposed, cultures are group-level reflections of individuals' security-seeking and
158 autonomy-seeking tendencies. Therefore, individuals may reside in a cultural
159 environment characterized by varying degrees of familism that is aligned or not aligned
160 with their personality. Our hypotheses were formulated based on the notion of cultural fit
161 and misfit between familism and attachment style. According to the cultural fit
162 hypothesis, culture constructs, such as familism, can amplify or suppress personality's
163 effects on behaviors depending on the fit or misfit between cultural norms and
164 personality (Leung & Cohen, 2011; Yoo & Miyamoto, 2018).

165 Individuals high on attachment avoidance tend to hold more negative working
166 models of others (Pietromonaco & Barrett, 2000). They are less likely to resort to social
167 network members to fulfill their need for social connectedness. Thus, they are less likely
168 to seek help from others (Vogel & Wei, 2005) and rely less on social bonds to regulate
169 distress (Wildschut et al., 2010). Their tendency to develop a small network size is
170 congruent with the familistic environments' relational mode of being embedded with a
171 few close others (cultural fit). However, the tendency of individuals high on attachment
172 avoidance to maintain a shallow network connection is incongruent with the deeply
173 intertwined relational model of familistic environments (cultural misfit): they may feel
174 pressured living in such an environment, as it may be difficult to form and maintain the
175 kind of relationships with which they feel comfortable. Therefore, familism may promote

176 avoidance's effect on network size but suppress avoidance's effect on density, tie
177 strength, and multiplexity.

178 Individuals high on attachment anxiety have positive working models of others
179 (and negative working models of the self; Pietromonaco & Barrett, 2000). They are
180 hypervigilant to social cues (especially signs of rejection; Fraley et al., 2006), crave
181 intimacy (Mikulincer & Shaver, 2009), and want to merge with close others while
182 simultaneously feeling unloved and rejected. In societies characterized by a higher
183 proportion of attachment anxiety, individuals prioritize security-seeking and engage in
184 strong-tie networks (Yamagishi & Hashimoto, 2016). Therefore, for individuals with
185 high levels of attachment anxiety, their tendency to be anxiously attached to others
186 (although it may inadvertently result in a larger network size and less close relationships),
187 may be more acceptable when they live in an environment that is high on familism that
188 emphasizes closeness among key relationships (cultural fit). Indeed, there is a higher
189 percentage of people with high attachment anxiety in familistic cultures (e.g.,
190 DiTommaso et al., 2005). Therefore, familism may promote anxiety's effect on network
191 size, density, tie strength, and multiplexity.

192 **Current Research**

193 We obtained data at the country level for familism. Attachment style and social
194 network were assessed at the individual level. We focused on two types of social network
195 indexes: measures representing the depth of relationships and measures representing
196 multiplexity. Depth was assessed using network size, network density, and tie strength.
197 Multiplexity was assessed via the number and the degree of fulfilled attachment-related

198 functions (proximity seeking, safe haven, and secure base, which are widely recognized
199 in the literature; e.g., Hazan & Shaver, 1994).

200 We predicted that (1a) familism will be negatively associated with network size
201 and (1b) positively associated with density, tie strength, and multiplexity. (2a) attachment
202 avoidance will be negatively associated and (2b) attachment anxiety will be positively
203 associated with network size. (3) Both attachment avoidance and anxiety will be
204 negatively related to density, tie strength, and multiplexity (especially avoidance). (4a)
205 Familism will enhance avoidance's effect on network size but (4b) suppress its effect on
206 density, tie strength, and multiplexity. Finally, (5) familism will enhance anxiety's effect
207 on network size, density, tie strength, and multiplexity.

208 **Method**

209 **Participants**

210 The final sample size was 2,977 participants from 21 nations/areas (sample sizes
211 ranged from 77 to 273; additional demographic and country details in Table 1). These
212 nations consisted of Australia, Canada, China, France, Greece, Guatemala, Hong Kong,
213 India, Indonesia, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Portugal,
214 South Africa, Spain, Switzerland, the UK, and the US. No participants were excluded.
215 This size allowed us to detect effect sizes as small as $f^2 = 0.003$ with 80% power. The
216 selection of nations/areas was based on the availability of collaborators. The 21
217 nations/areas include about 52.2% of the world's population and are spread
218 geographically across six continents. The nations/areas also vary greatly in terms of
219 economy, politics, and culture. Participants were college students except for the

220 Australian sample in which 44% of participants were recruited online. The mean sample
 221 size for each nation/area was 141 ($SD = 40.0$).

222

223 *Table 1.*

224 Main demographic information by countries.

Nation/Area	<i>N</i>	Female%	Age mean	Language	Married	Heterosexua 1	Years of Education (since elementary school)	Social Class (1 Upper-5 Lower)
1 Australia	85	77.0	30.5	English	17.65%	78.82%	13.02	3.11
2 Canada	273	78.3	22.4	French	2.88%	84.4%	14.24	3.07
3 China	129	58.5	20.3	Chinese	0.78%	94.5%	14.75	3.26
4 France	113	56.6	21.2	French	0.00%	58.41%	11.13	2.81
5 Greece	175	79.7	24.7	Hellenic	4.57%	96.00%	16.19	3.09
6 Guatemala	179	57.5	20.3	Spanish	2.23%	78.77%	13.15	2.58
7 Hong Kong	128	69.6	20.1	English	1.56%	94.53%	14.37	3.37
8 India	149	49.7	22.9	English	4.03%	99.3%	16.47	2.77
9 Indonesia	77	50.6	20.6	Bahasa	0.00%	92.21%	14.29	2.74
10 Israel	115	79.8	25.0	Hebrew	30.43%	93.5%	14.12	3.12
11 Italy	134	54.5	22.5	Italian	1.49%	97.76%	16.30	3.06
12 Japan	127	52.8	19.9	Japanese	0.00%	NA	15.74	3.49
13 Latvia	120	58.3	19.6	Latvian	3.33%	94.17%	12.58	2.97
14 Netherlands	149	75.7	19.8	Dutch	0.67%	97.32%	13.99	3.00
15 New Zealand	110	74.8	21.0	English	2.73%	87.0%	12.58	2.86
16 Portugal	159	56.7	23.6	Portuguese	11.32%	87.3%	13.28	3.14
17 South Africa	141	78.4	21.7	English	2.84%	93.62%	15.43	2.66
18 Spain	137	56.9	20.8	Spanish	0.00%	94.16%	17.00	3.08
19 Switzerland	148	82.6	22.8	English	5.41%	95.27%	14.10	2.87

20 UK	165	77.8	24.5	English	5.45%	81.5%	15.30	3.18
21 US	164	65.0	19.0	English	0.61%	97.0%	13.50	2.56

225

226

227 **Measures and Procedure**228 ***Familism***

229 The familism index was derived from the Gelfand et al. (2004) GLOBE project
230 (House et al., 2004). Familism was assessed at the country level, and subsequently,
231 participants were assigned a familism score based on their country. The original familism
232 items, which formed the basis for our index, evaluate the degree of interdependence
233 within families and the degree to which individuals express pride and loyalty to their
234 families. Familism score includes practice scores, which measure how participants
235 perceive the existing cultural practices in their society, and value scores, which assess
236 societal values. The final familism index for each nation was the average of the two
237 scores. Although Gelfand et al. (2004) labelled these scores as in-group collectivism,
238 other researchers have suggested that these items measure familism rather than
239 collectivism (e.g., Realo & Allik, 2009). Familism is thought to be related but different
240 from collectivism—being an orientation toward one’s family as opposed to one’s larger
241 community (Gaines et al., 1997). Supporting the idea that the scores reflect familism, this
242 measure is highly correlated with the *strength of family ties* scale ($r = .48$; Gelfand et al.,
243 2004), and levels of respect for family and friends ($r = .76$; Gelfand et al., 2004).²

² Out of all the nations, the familism index for Latvia was not reported by Gelfand et al. (2004). To include as many nations as possible in our analyses while acknowledging the relatedness between familism and collectivism, we imputed Latvia’s familism using Suh et al.’s (1998) collectivism score (missing three scores of our targeted nations) and Hofstede and Minkov’s (2010) collectivism score (missing one score of our targeted nations; correlation between the two indexes was, $r = .90$).

244 *Name Generators and Interpreters*

245 We collected egocentric network (networks that depict connections of specific
246 respondents rather than all connections in a bounded network; Clifton & Webster, 2017)
247 information from participants. Participants (egos) were asked to list up to 15 names of the
248 most important people (alters) in their life (Marin & Hampton, 2007). We labelled the
249 number of alters as $n1$. Participants were first asked to indicate how close they felt toward
250 each person and how close they thought each alter felt towards them on a 7-point Likert
251 scale, ranging from 1 (*don't feel close at all*) to 7 (*feel very close*). Then, on a 15×15
252 matrix, participants were asked to list the same 15 alters names and report how close they
253 thought each alter felt toward each of the other alters using the same response scale
254 (21.1% of participants did not list the same number of alters). We, therefore, labelled the
255 number of alters they listed in the second part as $n2$. “ $n1$ ” and “ $n2$ ” were significantly
256 correlated, $r = .87, p < .001$, and both were used as dependent variables in the following
257 analyses.

258 Two dependent variables were calculated from the name generator (and the two
259 n s): network density and tie strength. Both variables represent the depth of one's
260 relationship that is computed based on the number of alters and the closeness between
261 them (Hanneman & Riddle, 2005), but each one focuses on a different aspect. Network
262 density focuses on the extent to which the network as a whole is dense (Granovetter,
263 1973). In the current study, it reflects the network's structural characteristics. Tie strength
264 focuses on the overall closeness between network members (Marsden & Campbell,
265 1984), and in the current study, it emphasizes the network's reciprocal intimacies (see
266 formulas below).

267 **Density.** The two density scores were computed based on two different common
 268 procedures in the literature. The first, which we denote as D1, was calculated based on
 269 the closeness and the number of alters (Zohar & Tenne-Gazit, 2008). In *d1*'s equation, r_{ij}
 270 represents the closeness between alter i and alter j , and n denotes the total number of
 271 alters. Note that only alter-alter relationships are included in the calculation of the density
 272 score. Conceptually r_{ij} is not equal to r_{ji} , because one represents the perception of
 273 closeness from one alter to another (e.g., from i to j) whereas the other represents the
 274 perception of the opposite direction (from j to i). When $i = j$, $r_{ij} = 0$.

$$275 \quad d1 = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n r_{ij}}{7(n2)(n2+1)}$$

276 Density can alternatively be calculated. We denote the second density score as D2,
 277 which reflects the number of connections that exist in the network when they meet a
 278 minimal closeness standard. It is calculated using the ratio between all possible
 279 connections an actor (ego) or network might have, and how many connections are
 280 actually present (Eckles & Stradley, 2012). D2 was based on the number of connections
 281 with at least a minimal closeness in the network. In *d2*'s equation, the function of K is
 282 counting the number of elements that are not equal to 1 (1 = "don't feel close at all") in
 283 the r_{ij} matrix. As we can see from the formula, D2's calculation is focused less on
 284 closeness, and more on the existence of connections.

$$285 \quad d2 = \frac{K(r_{ij} \neq 1)}{(n2)(n2+1)}$$

286 **Tie Strength.** The following formula shows how we computed perceived tie
 287 strength. W_i denotes each ego's perceived closeness to each alter. X_i denotes each ego's
 288 perceptions of each alter's closeness to the ego.

$$t = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n (W_i + X_i)}{n1}$$

289
 290 **Multiplexity.** We used a modified version of the WHOTO scale (Fraley & Davis,
 291 1997) to assess the level of attachment functions that each alter fulfils. The modified
 292 scale includes three attachment functions: proximity seeking (e.g., “I like to spend time
 293 with this person.”), safe heaven (e.g., “I turn to this person when I am feeling down.”),
 294 and secure base (e.g., “I want to share my successes with this person.”). Each function
 295 was measured using two items, and participants were asked to indicate the extent to
 296 which each alter (out of the list of 15) fulfilled each function on a 1 (*strongly disagree*) to
 297 7 (*strongly agree*) Likert scale. Scores on each function are calculated by averaging the
 298 two items.³

299 We calculated the first multiplexity score (m1) by computing the average number
 300 of attachment functions fulfilled by each alter in a participant’s social network (Gerich &
 301 Lehner, 2006). Specifically, if the score for one function was above 4 (the middle point of
 302 the scale), we counted it as “1”, which meant that the alter fulfilled this function. The
 303 resulting possible multiplexity scores for each alter ranged from 0 (fulfilled no functions)
 304 to 3 (fulfilled all three functions); with higher scores indicating a greater number of
 305 functions fulfilled by the alter. This multiplexity index was computed by adding
 306 multiplexity scores for each alter and divided by the network size (see the formula
 307 below). In the equation, H_i represents the number of attachment functions fulfilled by

³ Results related to each function of WHOTO are presented in the Supplementary Materials. To summarize, the interpretation of the results of the WHOTO’s subscales is generally consistent with the aggregated findings. We ran the correlations between the two items of each function under WHOTO based on the ratings on the first alter. Correlations are 0.59 (proximity seeking), 0.81 (safe haven), and 0.72 (secure base).

308 each alter. This dichotomous index has been commonly computed in the literature
 309 (Felsher & Koku, 2018; Gillath, Karantzas, & Selcuk, 2017).

$$310 \quad m1 = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^N (H_i)}{n1}, \quad 0 \leq H_i \leq 3$$

311 In addition to assessing the quantity of multiplexity, we also computed the mean
 312 of the WHOTO scale for each participant to capture the degree of multiplexity. We
 313 labelled this continuous variable as $m2$. Therefore, $m2$ serves as a complementary index
 314 to $m1$.

315 *Attachment Style*

316 Adult attachment style was assessed using the short version of the Experiences in
 317 Close Relationship inventory (ECR-S; Wei et al., 2007). The measure included 12 items;
 318 six assessing attachment-related avoidance (e.g., “I want to get close to others, but I keep
 319 pulling back”), and six assessing attachment-related anxiety (e.g., “I worry that others
 320 won't care about me as much as I care about them”). For the Indonesian participants, five
 321 items of the ECR were missing due to a clerical error. Hence, scores on attachment
 322 avoidance and anxiety for Indonesia were computed by using only seven items.⁴
 323 Participants responded on a 7-point Likert scale, ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 7
 324 (*strongly agree*). Cronbach's α s for both dimensions without the responses from the
 325 Indonesian participants were adequate: $\alpha_{\text{avoidance}} = .71$ and $\alpha_{\text{anxiety}} = .72$.

326

⁴ Cronbach's α s for Indonesian participants' responses on ECR were: $\alpha_{\text{avoidance}} = .68$ and $\alpha_{\text{anxiety}} = .66$. Both of which were close to the Cronbach's α s as reported in the text when the data excluded Indonesian participants' responses. Additionally, the Cronbach's α s for U.S. participant's responses ($\alpha_{\text{avoidance}} = .78$ and $\alpha_{\text{anxiety}} = .76$) were similar to what Wei et al. (2007) reports ($\alpha_{\text{avoidance}}$ ranged from .78 to .88, and α_{anxiety} ranged from .77 to .86).

327 *Demographic Questions*

328 Participants reported their gender, age, and levels of social class. Social class was
329 measured on a 1 (*upper*) to 5 (*lower*) scale.

330 *Data Analytic Plan*

331 Data were initially examined through descriptive and correlational analyses.
332 Subsequently, we employed multilevel modeling for further analysis to test the familism
333 × attachment interactions. As an exploratory analysis, response surface analyses were
334 conducted, which assessed the mismatch between attachment style and familism in a
335 three-dimensional space, and results are present in the supplementary materials (Table
336 3S, Figure 1S, and Figure 2S).

337 **Results**

338 **Descriptive Results**

339 Table 2 shows the means and SDs for key variables across nations/areas. Table 3
340 shows the grand means, standard deviations, and correlations between variables for all
341 participants. Overall consistent with our hypotheses, familism was negatively correlated
342 with network sizes (n1, n2; supporting H1a) and positively correlated with network
343 density (d1, but not d2), tie strength, and multiplexities (m1, m2; supporting H1b).
344 Attachment avoidance was negatively correlated with all dependent variables (supporting
345 H2a & H3), and attachment anxiety was negatively correlated with all dependent
346 variables (supporting H3) except for network size (n1, n2; not supporting H2b) and one
347 measure of multiplexity (m2, but not m1).⁵

348

⁵ Tests of intraclass correlations (Table 1S) and construct equivalence (Table 2S) are present in the supplementary materials.

349 Table 2.

350 *Means (standard deviations) of the key variables in this study across nations/areas.*

Nation/Areas	Familism	Avoidance	Anxiety	n1	n2	d1	d2	t	m1	m2
1 Australia	4.96	2.56(1.18)	3.37(1.10)	12.07(3.58)	10.61(4.76)	0.42(0.10)	0.51(0.23)	11.16(1.36)	2.30(0.79)	5.27(0.72)
2 Canada	5.12	2.67(0.94)	3.54(1.11)	7.27(3.30)	6.80(3.51)	0.36(0.11)	0.48(0.21)	11.47(1.31)	2.58(0.66)	5.53(0.75)
3 China	5.45	3.12(0.96)	3.92(1.02)	10.78(3.68)	10.43(3.92)	0.34(0.09)	0.44(0.17)	10.99(1.32)	2.35(0.65)	5.00(0.86)
4 France	4.90	2.95(0.96)	3.73(1.34)	11.27(3.15)	11.11(3.33)	0.35(0.09)	0.47(0.17)	11.06(1.18)	2.40(0.50)	5.04(0.76)
5 Greece	5.37	2.76(0.99)	3.59(1.13)	9.78(3.54)	8.94(4.24)	0.39(0.12)	0.54(0.42)	11.35(1.45)	2.55(0.54)	5.41(0.73)
6 Guatemala	5.89	3.07(0.92)	3.44(1.09)	8.45(3.68)	7.23(3.94)	0.45(0.12)	0.48(0.23)	12.10(1.27)	2.61(0.56)	5.74(0.79)
7 Hong Kong	5.22	3.05(0.83)	3.97(1.01)	11.11(3.62)	10.92(3.83)	0.31(0.08)	0.42(0.16)	10.61(1.25)	2.60(0.48)	5.27(0.63)
8 India	5.62	3.15(0.98)	3.83(.66)	6.58(3.40)	6.52(3.27)	0.43(0.13)	0.60(0.49)	12.37(1.51)	2.83(0.33)	5.94(0.77)
9 Indonesia	5.68	2.61(1.00)	4.29(1.02)	10.25(4.13)	10.32(4.33)	0.39(0.13)	0.55(0.33)	11.07(1.55)	2.65(0.54)	5.29(0.94)
10 Israel	5.23	2.76(0.94)	3.05(1.13)	10.36(3.47)	9.80(3.88)	0.43(0.12)	0.52(0.21)	11.89(1.21)	2.39(0.59)	5.18(0.83)
11 Italy	5.33	2.52(1.00)	3.41(1.09)	8.24(3.44)	7.78(3.68)	0.42(0.10)	0.55(0.18)	11.99(1.34)	2.59(0.61)	5.47(0.92)
12 Japan	4.95	3.28(0.96)	3.54(1.09)	10.45(3.85)	10.36(4.03)	0.33(0.10)	0.39(0.18)	11.55(1.59)	2.15(0.78)	4.17(0.78)
13 Latvia	5.28	2.94(1.04)	3.81(1.00)	8.17(3.33)	8.09(3.29)	0.39(0.12)	0.55(0.16)	11.16(1.58)	2.52(0.54)	5.21(0.86)
14 Netherlands	4.44	2.38(0.80)	3.61(1.05)	10.40(3.30)	10.35(3.30)	0.42(0.10)	0.59(0.15)	11.55(1.22)	2.47(0.56)	5.18(0.72)
15 New Zealand	4.96	2.78(1.05)	3.34(1.17)	11.19(3.14)	11.09(3.31)	0.40(0.10)	0.54(0.18)	11.22(1.42)	2.52(0.52)	5.30(0.74)
16 Portugal	5.73	2.61(0.91)	3.67(1.16)	9.78(3.76)	9.71(3.75)	0.42(0.12)	0.59(0.17)	11.55(1.39)	2.54(0.49)	5.39(0.80)
17 South Africa	5.21	2.75(1.04)	3.45(1.18)	10.26(3.08)	10.26(3.12)	0.41(0.10)	0.56(0.16)	11.34(1.43)	2.53(0.51)	5.33(0.82)
18 Spain	5.62	3.09(0.84)	3.94(1.00)	9.12(2.91)	9.11(2.91)	0.44(0.10)	0.60(0.12)	11.77(1.05)	2.68(0.43)	5.62(0.75)
19 Switzerland	4.60	2.35(0.91)	3.33(.97)	11.21(3.29)	10.91(3.52)	0.35(0.09)	0.51(0.22)	10.76(1.45)	2.45(0.54)	5.19(0.62)
20 UK	4.82	2.92(1.08)	3.71(1.29)	9.96(3.74)	9.95(3.57)	0.38(0.11)	0.56(0.30)	11.29(1.53)	2.29(0.61)	4.88(0.80)
21 US	5.01	2.63(1.05)	3.18(1.11)	11.15(2.66)	10.89(3.01)	0.43(0.11)	0.55(0.17)	11.37(1.31)	2.53(0.47)	5.40(0.79)

351 Note: n1 and n2 are network size indexes, d1 and d2 are density indexes, t represents tie

352 strength, and m1 and m2 are multiplexity indexes.

353

354

355 Table 3.

356 *Means, standard deviations, and simple correlations of variables.*

357

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Mean	5.20	2.80	3.59	9.69	9.36	0.39	0.52	11.44	2.51	5.30
(SD)	(0.38)	(1.00)	(1.12)	(3.71)	(3.93)	(0.11)	(0.25)	(1.43)	(0.58)	(0.85)
1 Familism	1									
2 Avoidance	.12**	1								
3 Anxiety	.08**	.26**	1							
4 n1	-.18**	-.07**	-.02	1						
5 n2	-.19**	-.08**	-.01	.89**	1					
6 d1	.14**	-.15**	-.09**	-.004	.003	1				
7 d2	.02	-.11**	-.04*	-.07**	.18**	.60**	1			
8 t	.14**	-.21**	-.15**	-.26**	-.24*	.38**	.17**	1		
9 m1	.14**	-.23**	-.01	-.10**	-.04*	.18**	.16**	.35**	1	
10 m2	.22**	-.31**	-.06**	-.19**	-.19**	.29**	.15**	.51**	.84**	1

358 *Note.* * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$. Familism is a level-2 variable while the rest of them are level-1
 359 variables. n1 and n2 are network size indexes, d1 and d2 are density indexes, t represents
 360 tie strength, and m1 and m2 are multiplexity indexes.

361

362 **Results of Multilevel Analyses**

363 Multilevel analyses based on linear mixed modeling were conducted to test the
 364 effects of familism, attachment style, and the interaction between the two factors on
 365 social networks outcomes. Familism, attachment avoidance, and attachment anxiety were
 366 centered using the grand mean. Nation/area was treated as the second level unit. We

367 defined the intercept of the mean as a random effect. The effects of familism, attachment
 368 style, and their interactions were all modeled as fixed effects. As no three-way interaction
 369 was significant we excluded them, and rebuilt the models with only the three two-way
 370 interactions. Table 4 shows the results of the multilevel analyses.⁶

371 Table 4.

372 *The effect of familism, attachment style, and their interaction on network outcomes*

	Intercept	Familism	Avoidance	Anxiety	Familism × Avoidance	Familism × Anxiety	Avoidance × Anxiety	VIFs	Effect Size of the Model (R ²)
n1	9.96*** [9.42, 10.50]	-0.68* [-1.22, -0.13]	-0.23*** [-0.37, -0.10]	0.05 [-0.09, 0.18]	-0.16* [-0.30, -0.01]	0.16* [0.02, 0.30]	0.03 [-0.10, 0.16]	≤1.08	0.16
n2	9.73*** [9.17, 10.29]	-0.77* [-1.33, -0.20]	-0.26*** [-0.41, -0.12]	0.05 [-0.09, 0.19]	-0.19* [-0.34, -0.04]	0.13 [-0.01, 0.28]	-0.01 [-0.14, 0.12]	≤1.08	0.16
d1	0.39*** [0.38, 0.41]	0.02* [0.002, 0.03]	-0.02*** [-0.02, -0.01]	-0.01* [-0.01, -0.001]	0.01* [0.01, 0.011]	-0.001 [-0.01, 0.004]	0.001 [-0.004, 0.01]	≤1.08	0.15
d2	0.53*** [0.50, 0.55]	0.01 [-0.02, 0.04]	-0.02*** [-0.03, -0.01]	-0.01 [-0.02, 0.004]	0.01* [0.0002, 0.02]	-0.01 [-0.02, 0.004]	-0.001 [-0.01, 0.01]	≤1.08	0.06
t	11.41*** [11.24, 11.59]	0.24* [0.06, 0.41]	-0.29*** [-0.34, -0.24]	-0.15*** [-0.20, -0.09]	0.07* [0.01, 0.12]	-0.07** [-0.13, -0.02]	0.03 [-0.02, 0.08]	≤1.08	0.15
m1	2.51*** [2.46, 2.56]	0.10*** [0.05, 0.15]	-0.14*** [-0.16, -0.12]	0.02 [-0.003, 0.04]	0.02 [-0.01, 0.04]	-0.01 [-0.04, 0.01]	-0.01 [-0.03, 0.01]	≤1.08	0.12
m2	5.28*** [5.15, 5.40]	0.22** [0.09, 0.35]	-0.27*** [-0.30, -0.24]	0.01 [-0.02, 0.04]	-0.01 [-0.04, 0.02]	-0.02 [-0.05, 0.01]	0.02 [-0.01, 0.05]	≤1.08	0.27

373 Note. n1 and n2 are network size indexes, d1 and d2 are density indexes, t

374 represents tie strength, and m1 and m2 are multiplexity indexes.

375

376 *Effects of Familism*

377 The effects of familism on network size, density (d1 but not d2), tie strength, and

378 multiplexity were all significant (supporting H1a & H1b). A higher level of familism

⁶ We also considered the geographical relations among nations. However, the p-values of Moran's I on all outcomes were not significant or close to 0.05. Therefore, spatial analysis that takes account of geographical correlations was not conducted.

379 predicted a smaller sized, denser, and more tied network. A higher level of familism also
380 predicted higher multiplexity. This indicates that on average, network members fulfilled
381 more attachment roles for participants when they were embedded in a culture higher on
382 familism.

383 *Effects of Attachment Style*

384 Attachment avoidance significantly predicted all dependent variables (supporting
385 H2a and 3). The higher one's attachment avoidance was, the smaller, less dense, and less
386 mutually tied network people had. Higher avoidance also predicted lower multiplexity.
387 That is, the higher one's scores on avoidance, the fewer attachment roles that network
388 members fulfilled. Attachment anxiety significantly predicted density (d1 but not d2) and
389 tie strength, but not multiplexity (partially supporting H3). Participants with higher
390 attachment anxiety tended to perceive their networks as less dense, and the people in their
391 networks as tied less strongly to each other. Although we did not witness a main effect of
392 anxiety on network size (not supporting H2a), anxiety's predicting effect was moderated
393 by familism as presented below.

394 *The Interaction between Familism and Attachment Style*

395 The analysis revealed five significant two-way interactions between familism and
396 attachment avoidance—two for network size, two for density, and one for tie strength.
397 Simple slope tests (Table 5; Figure 1) revealed that attachment avoidance was negatively
398 associated with network size, which was more pronounced when familism levels were
399 high (one SD above the mean; supporting H4a). Attachment avoidance was also
400 negatively associated with both density and tie strength, with this negative association

401 being more pronounced when familism was lower (one SD below the mean; supporting
402 H4b).

403

404 Table 5.

405 *Coefficients of simple slope tests for the interactions between familism and attachment.*


The effect of attachment	Levels of familism		
	-1	0	+1
avoidance			
n1	-0.08	-0.23***	-0.39***
n2	-0.07	-0.26***	-0.45***
d1	-0.02***	-0.02***	-0.01***
d2	-0.03***	-0.02***	-0.01
t	-0.36***	-0.29***	-0.22***
The effect of attachment	Levels of familism		
anxiety			
n1	-0.12	0.04	0.21*
t	-0.07	-0.15***	-0.22***

406 Note. n1 and n2 are network size indexes, d1 and d2 are density indexes, t represents tie
407 strength, and m1 and m2 are multiplexity indexes.


408

409


410



411




412



413

(A)

414



415

(B)

416 *Figure 1.* Simple slope tests for the interactions between attachment styles and familism
417 on social network outcomes.

418 The analysis also revealed two significant two-way interactions between familism
419 and attachment anxiety. Attachment anxiety was positively associated with network size
420 but only when familism was high (one SD above the mean; supporting H5). Attachment
421 anxiety was also negatively associated with tie strength when familism was at high and
422 intermediate levels (one SD above and at the mean; supporting H5). These results suggest
423 that familism enhanced the role of anxiety on network size and tie strength.

424 **Discussion**

425 In this study, we examined the influence of familism at the national level,
426 attachment anxiety and avoidance at the individual level, and their interactions, on
427 various network outcomes, to understand how culture and personality impact friendship
428 processes.

429 **Familism and Social Network**

430 As predicted, individuals from cultures higher on familism reported a smaller
431 network size and higher levels of tie strength. We found limited evidence that familism is
432 associated with density and multiplexity. This research ruled out the competing
433 hypothesis that familism negatively predicts intimacy/closeness (Marshall, 2008). We
434 had the ability to test these associations by adopting a broader approach and using 21
435 countries/regions simultaneously. When all 21 nations were included, familism was
436 found to positively correlate with intimacy. When focusing on only two nations to draw
437 conclusions regarding a cultural pattern, the conclusions were largely dependent on- and
438 limited by- selection choices (van de Vijver & Leung, 2000). For example, a brief review

439 of the means in Table 2 shows that Dutch participants exhibited more intimacy than
440 Japanese participants on all four dependent measures and similarly American participants
441 displayed more intimacy than Japanese participants on density, tie strength, and
442 multiplexity. These patterns suggest that lower levels of familism may be associated with
443 greater intimacy. However, these results were different when all 21 nations/areas were
444 considered. The multi-site sampling of countries differing in a continuum of familism has
445 helped overcome that limitation. The discrepancy between our findings and previous
446 research also highlights the need to avoid essentializing culture into two presumably
447 extreme poles on cultural dimensions.

448 **Attachment Styles and Social Networks**

449 Regarding personality pertaining to relational propensities, our hypotheses were
450 supported. Attachment avoidance was associated with smaller network size, lower levels
451 of density, tie strength, and multiplexity (seven significant associations; Table 4).
452 Attachment anxiety was related to lower levels of density and tie strength (two significant
453 associations). These results are consistent with the literature showing attachment
454 avoidance is more likely to predict social network-related outcomes than attachment
455 anxiety (e.g., Gillath et al., 2011).

456 **The Interaction between Familism and Attachment Style**

457 The personality-environment fit perspective helped us shed light on the way in
458 which culture (e.g., familism) interacted with personality (e.g., attachment style) in
459 predicting network characteristics. We found that culture (familism) modifies the
460 association between personality traits (attachment style) and social network outcomes.

461 We further found that the effects of avoidance on network size were more salient
462 when familism was high (cultural fit). The effects of avoidance on density and tie
463 strength were more salient when familism was low (cultural misfit). For anxiety,
464 familism promoted its effects on network size and tie strength (cultural fit). These
465 findings indicate that the influence of familism on the connections between attachment
466 style and social network outcomes are contingent upon the particular index of social
467 network under consideration. This insight deepens our comprehension of the complex
468 interplay between personality and environment, highlighting how interaction patterns can
469 vary based on specific outcome nuances.

470 Our findings also help us integrate and bridge the cultural (mis)fit literature.
471 Culture (mis)fit effect posits that the mismatch between personality and environment
472 predicts negative outcomes (e.g., lower levels of performance or satisfaction) in
473 organizations (e.g., withdrawal behaviors; Kristof-Brown et al., 2005), relationships (e.g.,
474 relationship problems; Friedman et al., 2010), and reactions to COVID-19 (e.g., death
475 rate; Kafetsios, 2022). One distinction between the current study and previous studies
476 examining culture fit is that here, we had no a-priori predictions about potential negative
477 outcomes due to misfit. Different networks represent the different ways individuals
478 manage their relationships—and no one way is better than others.

479 In future studies, social networks, which acted as dependent variables here, could
480 serve as mediators in the prediction of other outcomes with pre-defined positivity. For
481 example, the discrepancy between personality and environment may affect one's
482 satisfaction from their social network. The counterforces from the environment may
483 lower one's friendship satisfaction when the inner tendency to build one's preferred type

484 of network is blocked by the culture they are immersed in. If this is indeed the case, this
485 may help explain the inconsistencies in the correlations between individualism and life
486 satisfaction (a null correlation; e.g., Spector et al., 2001; a positive correlation; Yetim,
487 2003). The discrepancy between personality and culture could be a stronger predictor of
488 life satisfaction than either personality or culture.

489 **Limitations**

490 Methodologically, familism and our other variables were not assessed at the same
491 time or using the same samples. Although a limitation, this is also a benefit, as obtaining
492 variables from different sources may help rule out the possibility that the results were
493 inflated by common method variance (Podsakoff et al., 2003). For multiplexity, we only
494 assessed attachment-related functions, but there are numerous other functions and roles
495 that relationships can fulfill. The sample sizes of some nations (e.g., Australia and
496 Indonesia) was relatively small and there are many nations (e.g., Germany) that are not
497 included, both of these issues could be resolved in future studies. Random sampling was
498 not used here, limiting the possibility of generalizing conclusions directly to the general
499 population (but see Straus, 2009, for a defense of this sampling strategy). The study
500 involved university students, who may function psychologically in a more analogous
501 manner worldwide because of their higher exposition to the globalization effect
502 (Fernandez et al., 2014). Nevertheless, it is important to consider that the age of our
503 participants could potentially restrict the generalization of our findings, given that age is
504 inversely related to network size, closeness, and the number of non-primary-group ties.
505 (Cornwell, Laumann, & Schumm, 2008).

506

507 Future Directions

508 Although the current research illuminates the moderating role of familism in the
509 relationship between attachment style and social network outcomes, the broader impact
510 on individuals' daily lives remains a subject of inquiry. For instance, in cases where
511 individuals experience a cultural mismatch (high familism coupled with high attachment
512 avoidance), questions arise regarding the extent to which this might lead to reduced
513 happiness. Furthermore, what coping strategies might individuals employ to adapt to such
514 environments? Could such a situation prompt people to reside in environments high on
515 relational or residential mobility (Oishi, 2010; Yuki & Schug, 2020) where individuals
516 actively seek more culturally compatible socioecology? Future research can delve deeper
517 into the downstream consequences of the social network effects uncovered in the current
518 study. In our research, we concentrated on familism at the national level to align with our
519 focus on cultural fit. However, it is conceivable that an individual's perception of
520 familism embedded in surrounding or immediate environments could interact with their
521 attachment style in a manner akin to our findings. Such interaction might be more
522 pronounced at the individual level, capturing a broader range of personal variance
523 compared to the national level. Further exploration into the potential three-way
524 interactions among national-level familism (macro-level), individual-level familism
525 (micro-level), and attachment style could also be valuable.

526 Conclusion

527 This paper investigated how culture and personality are jointly associated with
528 social networks. Grounded in Lewin's seminal observation and theories of person-culture
529 fit, we broadened those ideas into a more systematic cross-sectional work, merged it with

530 attachment theory, and tested it in different cultural contexts. The results reveal unique
531 predicting effects of familism, attachment, and their interactions on social network
532 characteristics and illuminate the importance and value of endorsing the approach of
533 culture \times personality to studying social processes.

534

535

536

References

- 537 Adams, G. (2005). The cultural grounding of personal relationship: Enemyship in North
538 American and West African worlds. *Journal of Personality and Social
539 Psychology, 88*, 948-968.
- 540 Adams, G., & Plaut, V. C. (2003). The cultural grounding of personal relationship:
541 Friendship in North American and West African worlds. *Personal Relationships,*
542 *10*, 333-347.
- 543 Alonso-Arbiol, I., Balluerka, N., Shaver, P. R., & Gillath, O. (2008). Psychometric
544 properties of Spanish and American versions of the ECR adult attachment
545 questionnaire: A comparative study. *European Journal of Psychological
546 Assessment, 24*(1), 9-13.
- 547 Antal, T., Krapivsky, P. L., & Redner, S. (2005). Dynamics of social balance on
548 networks. *Physical Review E, 72*, 036121.
- 549 Bowlby, J. (1969). *Attachment and loss: Attachment* (Vol. 1). London: Hogarth
- 550 Campos, B., Perez, O. F. R., & Guardino, C. (2016). Familism: A cultural value with
551 implications for romantic relationship quality in US Latinos. *Journal of Social
552 and Personal Relationships, 33*(1), 81-100.
- 553 Campos, B., Ullman, J. B., Aguilera, A., & Dunkel Schetter, C. (2014). Familism and
554 psychological health: The intervening role of closeness and social
555 support. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology, 20*(2), 191–201.
- 556 Chiu, C. Y., Gelfand, M. J., Yamagishi, T., Shteynberg, G., & Wan, C. (2010).
557 Intersubjective culture: The role of intersubjective perceptions in cross-cultural
558 research. *Perspectives on Psychological Science, 5*(4), 482-493.

- 559 Clark, M. S., Lemay Jr, E. P., Graham, S. M., Pataki, S. P., & Finkel, E. J. (2010). Ways
560 of giving benefits in marriage: Norm use, relationship satisfaction, and
561 attachment-related variability. *Psychological Science*, 21(7), 944-951.
- 562 Clifton, A., & Webster, G. D. (2017). An introduction to social network analysis for
563 personality and social psychologists. *Social Psychological and Personality
564 Science*, 8(4), 442-453.
- 565 Cornwell, B., Laumann, E. O., & Schumm, L. P. (2008). The social connectedness of
566 older adults: A national profile. *American Sociological Review*, 73(2), 185-203.
- 567 DiTommaso, E., Brannen, C., & Burgess, M. (2005). The universality of relationship
568 characteristics: A cross-cultural comparison of different types of attachment and
569 loneliness in Canadian and visiting Chinese students. *Social Behavior and
570 Personality: an International Journal*, 33, 57-68.
- 571 Dunbar, R. I., & Spoors, M. (1995). Social networks, support cliques, and kinship.
572 *Human Nature*, 6, 273-290.
- 573 Eckles, J. E., & Stradley, E. G. (2012). A social network analysis of student retention
574 using archival data. *Social Psychology of Education*, 15(2), 165-180.
- 575 English, T., & Carstensen, L. L. (2014). Selective narrowing of social networks across
576 adulthood is associated with improved emotional experience in daily life.
577 *International journal of behavioral development*, 38(2), 195-202.
- 578 Erez, M., & Gati, E. (2004). A dynamic, multi-level model of culture: from the micro
579 level of the individual to the macro level of a global culture. *Applied Psychology*,
580 53, 583-598.

- 581 Festinger, L., Back, K. W., & Schachter, S. (1950). *Social pressures in informal groups:*
582 *A study of human factors in housing.* New York, NY: Harper & Brothers.
- 583 Fernandez, I., Carrera, P., Paez, D., Alonso-Arbiol, I., Campos, M. & Basabe, N. (2014).
584 Prototypical anger components: A multilevel study. *Cross-Cultural Research, 48,*
585 400-424.
- 586 Ferriani, S., Fonti, F., & Corrado, R. (2013). The social and economic bases of network
587 multiplexity: Exploring the emergence of multiplex ties. *Strategic Organization,*
588 *11,* 7-34.
- 589 Fiori, K. L., Consedine, N. S., & Merz, E. M. (2011). Attachment, social network size,
590 and patterns of social exchange in later life. *Research on Aging, 33,* 465-493.
- 591 Fleenor, J. W., McCauley, C. D., & Brutus, S. (1996). Self-other rating agreement and
592 leader effectiveness. *Leadership Quarterly, 7,* 487-506.
- 593 Felsher, M., & Koku, E. (2018). Explaining HIV risk multiplexity: a social network
594 analysis. *AIDS and Behavior, 22(11),* 3500-3507.
- 595 Fraley, R. C., & Davis, K. E. (1997). Attachment formation and transfer in young adults'
596 close friendships and romantic relationships. *Personal Relationships, 4,* 131-144.
- 597 Fraley, R., Niedenthal, P. M., Marks, M., Brumbaugh, C., & Vicary, A. (2006). Adult
598 attachment and the perception of emotional expressions: Probing the
599 hyperactivating strategies underlying anxious attachment. *Journal of Personality,*
600 *74,* 1163-1190.
- 601 Friedman, M., Rholes, W. S., Simpson, J., Bond, M., Diaz-Loving, R., & Chan, C.
602 (2010). Attachment avoidance and the cultural fit hypothesis: A cross-cultural
603 investigation. *Personal Relationships, 17(1),* 107-126.

- 604 Gaines Jr, S. O., Rios, D. I., & Buriel, R. (1997). Familism and interpersonal resource
605 exchange among Latinas/os. *Culture, values, ethnicity and relationship processes*.
606 *London, UK: Routledge*.
- 607 Gelfand, M.J., Bhawuk, D.P.S., Nishii, L.H., Bechtold, D.J. (2004). Individualism and
608 collectivism. In House, R.J., Hanges, P.J., Javidan, M., Dorfman, P.W., Gupta, V.
609 (Eds.), *Culture, leadership and organizations: The GLOBE study of 62 societies*
610 (pp. 437-512). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- 611 Gerich, J., & Lehner, R. (2006). Collection of ego-centered network data with computer-
612 assisted interviews. *Methodology*, 2, 7-15.
- 613 Gillath, O., Johnson, D. K., Selcuk, E., & Teel, C. (2011). Comparing old and young
614 adults as they cope with life transitions: The links between social network
615 management skills and attachment style to depression. *Clinical Gerontologist*, 34,
616 251-265.
- 617 Gillath, O., Karantzas, G. C., & Selcuk, E. (2017). A net of friends: Investigating
618 friendship by integrating attachment theory and social network analysis.
619 *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 43, 1546-1565.
- 620 Gillath, O., Karantzas, G. C., & Lee, J. (2019). Attachment and social networks. *Current*
621 *Opinion in Psychology*, 25, 21-25.
- 622 Granovetter, M. S. (1973). The strength of weak ties. *American Journal of Sociology*, 78,
623 1360-1380.
- 624 Greenfield, P. M. (2016). Social change, cultural evolution, and human
625 development. *Current Opinion in Psychology*, 8, 84-92.

- 626 Grossmann, K. E., Grossmann, K., & Keppler, A. (2005). Universal and culturally
627 specific aspects of human behavior: The case of attachment. In W. Friedlmeier, P.
628 Chakkarath, & B. Schwarz (Eds.), *Culture and human development: The*
629 *importance of cross-cultural research on the social sciences* (pp.75-97). Lisse, the
630 Netherlands: Swets & Zeitlinger.
- 631 Hanneman, R. A., & Riddle, M. (2005). *Introduction to social network methods*.
632 Riverside, CA: University of California, Riverside.
- 633 Hardin, C. D., & Higgins, E. T. (1996). Shared reality: How social verification makes the
634 subjective objective. In R. M. Sorrentino & E. T. Higgins (Eds.), *Handbook of*
635 *motivation and cognition* (pp. 28 – 84). New York: Guilford Press
- 636 Harris, M. M., Anseel, F., & Lievens, F. (2008). Keeping up with the Joneses: A field
637 study of the relationships among upward, lateral, and downward comparisons and
638 pay level satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 93*(3), 665–673.
- 639 Hegarty, P., & Pratto, F. (2001). The effects of social category norms and stereotypes on
640 explanations for intergroup differences. *Journal of Personality and Social*
641 *Psychology, 80*, 723-735.
- 642 House, R.J., Hanges, P.J., Javidan, M., Dorfman, P.W., Gupta, V. (Eds.), *Culture,*
643 *leadership and organizations: The GLOBE study of 62 societies* (pp. 437-512).
644 Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- 645 Kafetsios, K. (2022). Collective reactions to epidemic threat: Attachment and cultural
646 orientations predict early COVID-19 infection and mortality rates and
647 trajectories. *Social Psychological and Personality Science, 13*(7), 1126-1137.

- 648 Karantzas, G. C., McCabe, M. P., & Cole, S. F. (2012). Chronic illness and relationships.
649 In P. Noller & G. C. Karantzas (Eds.), *Wiley-Blackwell handbook of couples and*
650 *family relationships* (pp.406-420). New York, NY: Wiley-Blackwell Publishing.
- 651 Keeler, A. R., Siegel, J. T., & Alvaro, E. M. (2014). Depression and help seeking among
652 Mexican–Americans: The mediating role of familism. *Journal of Immigrant and*
653 *Minority Health, 16*(6), 1225-1231.
- 654 Kim, H. S., Sherman, D. K., & Taylor, S. E. (2008). Culture and social support. *American*
655 *Psychologist, 63*, 518-526.
- 656 Kristof-Brown, A. L., Zimmerman, R. D., & Johnson, E. C. (2005). Consequences of
657 individuals' fit at work: A meta-analysis of person–job, person–organization,
658 person–group, and person–supervisor fit. *Personnel Psychology, 58*(2), 281-342.
- 659 Leung, A. K. Y., & Cohen, D. (2011). Within-and between-culture variation: individual
660 differences and the cultural logics of honor, face, and dignity cultures. *Journal of*
661 *Personality and Social Psychology, 100*, 507-526.
- 662 Lewin, K. (1936). Some social-psychological differences between the United States and
663 Germany. *Journal of Personality, 4*, 265-293.
- 664 Lewin, K. (1951). *Field theory in social science: Selected theoretical papers*. Chicago,
665 IL: Harper & Brothers.
- 666 Li, L. M. W., Adams, G., Kurtiş, T., & Hamamura, T. (2015). Beware of friends: The
667 cultural psychology of relational mobility and cautious intimacy. *Asian Journal of*
668 *Social Psychology, 18*(2), 124-133.

- 669 Mair, C. A. (2013). Family ties and health cross-nationally: the contextualizing role of
670 familistic culture and public pension spending in Europe. *Journals of Gerontology*
671 *Series B: Psychological Sciences and Social Sciences*, 68(6), 984-996.
- 672 Marin, A., & Hampton, K. N. (2007). Simplifying the personal network name generator
673 alternatives to traditional multiple and single name generators. *Field Methods*, 19,
674 163-193.
- 675 Marsden, P. V., & Campbell, K. E. (1984). Measuring tie strength. *Social Forces*, 63,
676 482-501.
- 677 Marshall, T. C. (2008). Cultural differences in intimacy: The influence of gender-role
678 ideology and individualism—collectivism. *Journal of Social and Personal*
679 *Relationships*, 25, 143-168.
- 680 Mikulincer, M., & Shaver, P. R. (2009). An attachment and behavioral systems
681 perspective on social support. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 26,
682 7-19.
- 683 Paluck, E. L. (2009). Reducing intergroup prejudice and conflict using the media: A field
684 experiment in Rwanda. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 96, 574-
685 587.
- 686 Piña-Watson, B., Ojeda, L., Castellon, N. E., & Dornhecker, M. (2013). Familismo,
687 ethnic identity, and bicultural stress as predictors of Mexican American
688 adolescents' positive psychological functioning. *Journal of Latina/o*
689 *Psychology*, 1(4), 204-217.

- 690 Pietromonaco, P. R., & Barrett, L. F. (2000). The internal working models concept: What
691 do we really know about the self in relation to others? *Review of General*
692 *Psychology, 4*, 155.
- 693 Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Lee, J. Y., & Podsakoff, N. P. (2003). Common
694 method biases in behavioral research: a critical review of the literature and
695 recommended remedies. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 88*(5), 879-03.
- 696 Realo, A., & Allik, J. (2009). On the relationship between social capital and
697 individualism–collectivism. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass, 3*(6),
698 871-886.
- 699 Restubog, S. L. D., & Bordia, P. (2006). Workplace familism and psychological contract
700 breach in the Philippines. *Applied Psychology, 55*(4), 563-585.
- 701 Rothbaum, F., Kakinuma, M., Nagaoka, R., & Azuma, H. (2007). Attachment and Amae
702 Parent—Child Closeness in the United States and Japan. *Journal of Cross-*
703 *Cultural Psychology, 38*, 465-486.
- 704 Schmitt, D. P., Alcalay, L., Allensworth, M., Allik, J., Ault, L., & Austers, I., et al.
705 (2004). Patterns and universals of adult romantic attachment across 62 cultural
706 regions: are models of self and of other pancultural constructs? *Journal of Cross-*
707 *Cultural Psychology, 35*, 367-402.
- 708 Schug, J., Yuki, M., & Maddux, W. W. (2010). Relational mobility explains between-
709 and within-culture differences in self-disclosure toward close friends.
710 *Psychological Science, 21*, 1471-1478.
- 711 Steidel, A. G. L., & Contreras, J. M. (2003). A new familism scale for use with Latino
712 populations. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences, 25*(3), 312-330.

- 713 Suh, E., Diener, E., Oishi, S., & Triandis, H. C. (1998). The shifting basis of life
714 satisfaction judgments across cultures: Emotions versus norms. *Journal of*
715 *Personality and Social Psychology*, 74, 482-493.
- 716 Schwartz, S. H., & Rubel, T. (2005). Sex differences in value priorities: Cross-cultural
717 and multimethod studies. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 89(6),
718 1010-1028.
- 719 Strand, P. S. (2020). The security-seeking impulse and the unification of attachment and
720 culture. *Psychological Review*, 127(5), 778–791.
- 721 Straus, M. A. (2009). The national context effect: An empirical test of the validity of
722 cross-national research using unrepresentative samples. *Cross-Cultural*
723 *Research*, 43(3), 183-205.
- 724 Thayer, S. M., Updegraff, K. A., & Delgado, M. Y. (2008). Conflict resolution in
725 Mexican American adolescents' friendships: Links with culture, gender and
726 friendship quality. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 37(7), 783-797.
- 727 Triandis, H., Marin, G., Betacourt, H., Lisansky, J., & Chang, B. (1982). *Dimensions of*
728 *fami- lism among Hispanic and mainstream navy recruits*. Technical Report No.
729 14, Depart- ment of Psychology, University of Illinois, Champaign
- 730 Van de Vijver, F. J. R., & Leung, K. (2000). Methodological issues in psychological
731 research on culture. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 31, 33-51.
- 732 Vereijken, C. M., Riksen-Walraven, J. M., & Kondo-Ikemura, K. (1997). Maternal
733 sensitivity and infant attachment security in Japan: A longitudinal study.
734 *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 21, 35-49.

- 735 Villarreal, R., Blozis, S. A., & Widaman, K. F. (2005). Factorial invariance of a pan-
736 Hispanic familism scale. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*, 27(4), 409-
737 425.
- 738 Vogel, D. L., & Wei, M. (2005). Adult attachment and help-seeking intent: The
739 mediating roles of psychological distress and perceived social support. *Journal of*
740 *Counseling Psychology*, 52, 347-357.
- 741 Walker, S., Richardson, D. S., & Green, L. R. (2000). Aggression among older adults:
742 The relationship of interaction networks and gender role to direct and indirect
743 responses. *Aggressive Behavior*, 26, 145-154.
- 744 Wang, C. D. C., Jin, L., Han, G., Zhu, W., & Bismar, D. (2021). Cross-cultural
745 differences in adult attachment and depression: A culturally congruent
746 approach. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*. Advance online publication
- 747 Webster, G. D., Gesselman, A. N., & Crosier, B. S. (2016). Avoidant adult attachment
748 negatively relates to classroom popularity: Social network analysis support for the
749 Parent–Partner–Peer Attachment Transfer model. *Personality and Individual*
750 *Differences*, 96, 248-254.
- 751 Wheeler, L., Reis, H. T., & Bond, M. H. (1989). Collectivism-individualism in everyday
752 social life: The middle kingdom and the melting pot. *Journal of Personality and*
753 *Social Psychology*, 57(1), 79-86.
- 754 Wildschut, T., Sedikides, C., Routledge, C., Arndt, J., & Cordaro, F. (2010). Nostalgia as
755 a repository of social connectedness: The role of attachment-related avoidance.
756 *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 98, 573-586.

- 757 Wilkinson, R. B. (2010). Best friend attachment versus peer attachment in the prediction
758 of adolescent psychological adjustment. *Journal of Adolescence*, 33, 709-717.
- 759 Yamagishi, T., & Hashimoto, H. (2016). Social niche construction. *Current Opinion in*
760 *Psychology*, 8, 119-124.
- 761 Yoo, J., & Miyamoto, Y. (2018). Cultural fit of emotions and health implications: A
762 psychosocial resources model. *Social and Personality Psychology*
763 *Compass*, 12(2), e12372.
- 764 Yuki, M., & Schug, J. (2012). Relational mobility: A socioecological approach to
765 personal relationships. In O. Gillath, G. E. Adams & A. D. Kunkel (Eds.),
766 *Relationship science: Integrating evolutionary, neuroscience, and sociocultural*
767 *approaches* (pp. 137-151). Washington D.C.: American Psychological
768 Association.
- 769 Zhang, Y., & Jia, X. (2018). A qualitative study on the grief of people who lose their only
770 child: From the perspective of familism culture. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 9, 869.
- 771 Zohar, D., & Tenne-Gazit, O. (2008). Transformational leadership and group interaction
772 as climate antecedents: a social network analysis. *Journal of applied*
773 *psychology*, 93(4), 744-757.
- 774
- 775

Contents

Results of Intraclass Correlations (ICC)	2
Table 1S. Results of intraclass correlations.	2
Tests of Construct Equivalence.....	3
Table 2S. Tucker’s phi coefficients for ECR and WHOTO scale.	3
Results of Response Surface Analyses	5
Table 3S. Results of RSA results for the effect of familism, attachment style, and their interaction on network outcomes.	6
Figure 1S. Three-dimensional plots of the interactions between familism and attachment style on network outcomes.	9
Figure 2S. Three-dimensional plots of the interactions between familism and attachment style on network outcomes.	10
Full results of the response surface models.	11
Results related to each function of WHOTO.	18

Results of Intraclass Correlations (ICC)

The intraclass correlations (ICC) and design effect (the ratio of the actual variance in a cluster sample to the variance expected with simple random sampling) were computed for each dependent variable to assess the necessity of doing multilevel analysis. Results are shown in Table 2. When the design effect (computed based on ICC) is larger than 2, it indicates that a multilevel analysis approach should be used (Satorra & Muthen, 1995). As shown in the table, all dependent variables on design effect were over the thresholds. Therefore, we used a multilevel approach to conduct the following data analyses.

Table 1S. Results of intraclass correlations.

	ICC	Design effect
n1	0.14	21.19
n2	0.14	19.95
d1	0.11	16.96
d2	0.05	8.00
t	0.09	13.08
m1	0.06	9.43
m2	0.16	24.02

Tests of Construct Equivalence

We followed Van de Vijver and Leung's (1997) approach to construct equivalence of psychological meaning across nations. We computed a Tucker's phi coefficient (Table 3), a congruence coefficient measure, to compare the factorial structure in each nation with the structure in the pooled data. Values lower than .90 are usually seen as an indication of differences in underlying factors. The coefficients showed that the avoidance and anxiety components were relatively equivalent across nations/areas with two of the 42 coefficients lower than .90. Similar patterns were observed for the WHOTO scale. Six of the 63 coefficients were lower than .90. Therefore, all nations/areas' data were used for the following analyses.

Table 2S. Tucker's phi coefficients for ECR and WHOTO scale.

Nation/Area	Avoidance	Anxiety	Proximity seeking	Safe haven	Secure base
1 Australia	1.00	1.00	1.00	.70	.96
2 Canada	1.00	1.00	1.00	.99	.99
3 China	.99	.96	1.00	.96	.91
4 France	.96	.97	1.00	.99	.98
5 Greece	.98	.98	1.00	.95	.99
6 Guatemala	.94	.93	1.00	.95	.99
7 Hong Kong	.99	.95	1.00	.98	.96
8 India	.89	.73	1.00	.86	.89
9 Indonesia ¹			1.00	.96	.90
10 Israel	.98	.97	1.00	.98	.90

¹ Because we did not have all the items to compute attachment avoidance and anxiety for the Indonesian participants, Tucker's phi coefficients were not available for Indonesia.

11 Italy	.99	.98	1.00	.96	.91
12 Japan	.98	.89	1.00	.98	.95
13 Latvia	.96	.98	1.00	.96	.53
14 Netherlands	.99	.99	1.00	.99	.93
15 New Zealand	1.00	.98	1.00	1.00	1.00
16 Portugal	.99	.97	.99	.91	.81
17 South Africa	.99	.97	1.00	.96	.99
18 Spain	.96	.89	1.00	.93	.91
19 Switzerland	.99	.98	.99	.84	.95
20 UK	.99	.98	1.00	.99	.95
21 US	.99	.97	1.00	.99	.99

Results of Response Surface Analyses

Based on a polynomial regression, response surface analyses (RSA) regress an outcome variable onto the linear terms of two predictors, their quadratic terms, and their interaction (Barranti et al., 2017; Humberg et al., 2019). It answers the question how the changes of two predictors jointly predict the outcome. One advantage of this analysis is plotting the interaction effects in three-dimensional space. Following Barranti et al. (2017) and Humberg et al. (2019), we modelled the effects of familism, attachment avoidance (or attachment anxiety), their quadratic terms, and interactions to test their effects on network outcomes with the R package RSA. All level-1 (individual level) predictors including attachment avoidance and attachment anxiety were centered using the group mean. All level-2 (nation/area level) predictors including familism were centered using their grand means. Because familism and attachment style were measured on different scales, they were standardized to be placed on a common metric and results are interpreted based on the relative position of each variable (for a similar procedure of standardizing predictors, see Fleenor et al., 1996; Harris et al., 2008). Detailed results of the polynomial regressions are presented in the following Supplementary Materials.

Five coefficients (α_1 - α_5) are generated by RSA. When examining the effects of the congruence of two predictors (e.g., when both familism and attachment avoidance are high), α_1 indicates if the effect of the congruence on the outcome differs at higher as compared with lower levels, and α_2 indicates whether the effect of the congruence at extreme values have different outcomes than the congruence at non-extreme values. When examining the effects of incongruence of two predictors, α_3 indicates if one type of incongruence (e.g., familism is high and attachment avoidance is low) produces a different level of the outcome than the other incongruence (e.g., familism is low and attachment avoidance is high). Finally, α_4 indicates

whether the incongruence of the two predictors produces a different level of the outcome than the congruence of two predictors. The α_5 is one of the criteria ($\alpha_5 = 0$) to evaluate whether there is a congruent effect that whether social network indexes are higher when the values of familism and attachment are closer to one another (Nestler et al., 2019). Results of α_1 - α_5 coefficients are presented in Table 6. Three-dimensional plots are presented in Figure 1.

Table 3S. Results of RSA results for the effect of familism, attachment style, and their interaction on network outcomes.

	α_1	α_2	α_3	α_4	α_5
n1~ Familism \times Avoidance	-0.92**	-0.21	-0.43	0.02	-0.16
n2~ Familism \times Avoidance	-1.03***	-0.29	-0.51	0.02	-0.14
d1~ Familism \times Avoidance	0.01	0.02	0.04***	0.01	0.01
d2~ Familism \times Avoidance	-0.01	0.02	0.03*	0.0001	0.02
t~ Familism \times Avoidance	-0.06	0.02	0.53***	0.02	0.05
m1~ Familism \times Avoidance	-0.02	-0.01	0.22***	-0.04	0.04
m2~ Familism \times Avoidance	-0.05	0.04	0.49***	0.07	0.05
n1~ Familism \times Anxiety	-0.64*	0.002	-0.72*	-0.25	-0.17
n2~ Familism \times Anxiety	-0.72*	-0.05	-0.80**	-0.22	-0.19
d1~ Familism \times Anxiety	0.01	0.01	0.02**	0.01	0.01
d2~ Familism \times Anxiety	0.01	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.02
t~ Familism \times Anxiety	0.09	0.03	0.38***	0.15	0.05

m1~ Familism × Anxiety	0.12***	-0.02	0.08**	0.002	0.04
m2~ Familism × Anxiety	0.23***	0.01	0.21**	0.05	0.07

Note. In the first column, the first variable represents the outcome and the variables multiplied represent the interaction terms.

It is important to exercise caution when interpreting the coefficients in isolation. Drawing from Nester et al. (2019), establishing a strict congruence effect necessitates meeting several criteria ($\alpha_1 = 0$, $\alpha_2 = 0$, $\alpha_3 = 0$, $\alpha_4 < 0$, and $\alpha_5 = 0$). The findings in the table do not align with a strict congruence effect. Nevertheless, in the following sections, we can still characterize a broader congruence effect based on the indexes.


The main effects and interactions between familism and attachment avoidance. The α coefficients indicate that all main effects and all interactions between familism and attachment avoidance on all network outcomes—network size (n1, n2), density (d1, d2), tie strength (t), and multiplexity (m1, m2) are significant.

For both n1 and n2 (Figures 1-a and b), as suggested by the significant α_1 , network size was greater when both familism and avoidance were at lower levels (both low) than at higher levels (both high). This pattern is consistent with the predicted main effects of familism and avoidance as higher levels of familism and avoidance are both predicted to be associated with a smaller network size (supporting H1a & 2a).

For both d1 and d2 (Figures 1-c and d), α_3 s reveals that density was greater when familism was higher than avoidance, as compared with when avoidance was higher than

familism. This is consistent with our predicted pattern that the main effects of familism and avoidance on density will be incongruent (supporting H1b & 3).

For t (Figure 1-e), α_3 suggests that tie strength was greater when familism was higher than avoidance as compared with when avoidance was higher than familism. This is consistent with our predicted effect of each predictor: network was more strongly tied as familism was higher and avoidance was lower (supporting H1b & 3). Similarly, for both $m1$ and $m2$ (Figure 1-f and g), α_3 also supports the predicted main effects of familism and avoidance: More attachment functions were fulfilled by important others when familism was higher than avoidance as compared with when avoidance was higher than familism (supporting H1b & 3).






Figure 1S. Three-dimensional plots of the interactions between familism and attachment style on network outcomes.

The main effects and interactions between familism and attachment anxiety. For $n1$ and $n2$ (Figure 2-a and b), the negative $\alpha3$ s suggest that network size was higher when anxiety was higher than familism, as compared to when familism was greater than anxiety (blue line from the top left corner to the bottom right corner). This is consistent with the predicted positive effect of anxiety and negative effect of familism on network sizes (supporting H2b & 1a). Moreover, significant $\alpha1$ s reveal that network size was larger when familism and anxiety were both at lower as compared to higher levels. This effect indicates that familism may exert a greater effect on network size than anxiety as the congruence between them matches with the predicted effect of familism (blue line from the top near corner to the bottom far corner).

For $d1$ (Figure 2-c), $\alpha3$ suggests that tie strength was higher when familism was higher than anxiety as compared to when anxiety was higher than familism. This is in line with the hypothesized main effects of familism, which predicts greater tie strength (supporting H1b), and the hypothesized main effect of anxiety, which predicts smaller tie strength (supporting H3).

For t (Figure 2-d), $\alpha3$ suggests that tie strength was higher when familism was higher than anxiety as compared to when anxiety was higher than familism. This is in line with the

hypothesized main effects of familism, which predicts greater tie strength (supporting H1b), and the hypothesized main effect of anxiety, which predicts smaller tie strength (supporting H3).

For m1 and m2 (Figure 2-e and f), positive α_3 s suggest that multiplexity was higher when anxiety was lower than familism, as compared to when familism was lower than anxiety (blue line from the bottom left corner to the top right corner). This is consistent with the predicted positive effect of familism (supporting H1b) and negative effect of anxiety on multiplexity (supporting H3). α_1 was positive, revealing that multiplexity was higher when the values of familism and anxiety matched at higher levels (both high) than at lower levels (both low). This supports our prediction regarding the effects of the congruence between familism and anxiety on multiplexity (supporting H1b and H3).




Figure 2S. Three-dimensional plots of the interactions between familism and attachment style on network outcomes.

Full results of the response surface models.

Predictor1 = familism, Predictor 2 = avoidance, outcome = n1

	Value	Std.Error	DF	t-value	p-value
(Intercept)	10.07633	0.382314	2717	26.35618	<.00001
centered.predictor1	-0.67802	0.288244	17	-2.35225	0.030969
centered.predictor2	-0.24337	0.072824	2717	-3.34191	0.000843
squared.predictor1	-0.12656	0.254398	17	-0.49748	0.625223
interaction	-0.1156	0.071317	2717	-1.62087	0.105161
squared.predictor2	0.029241	0.050402	2717	0.580155	0.561858
Z_anxiety	0.036367	0.069453	2717	0.523618	0.600587

Predictor1 = familism, Predictor 2 = avoidance, outcome = n2

	Value	Std.Error	DF	t-value	p-value
(Intercept)	9.869739	0.39835	2717	24.77657	<.00001
centered.predictor1	-0.7704	0.300312	17	-2.56534	0.020066
centered.predictor2	-0.2618	0.076176	2717	-3.43677	0.000598
squared.predictor1	-0.13548	0.265047	17	-0.51115	0.615821
interaction	-0.15805	0.0746	2717	-2.11859	0.034215
squared.predictor2	0.001315	0.052722	2717	0.024944	0.980102
Z_anxiety	0.037725	0.072649	2717	0.519278	0.603609

Predictor1 = familism, Predictor 2 = avoidance, outcome = d1

	Value	Std.Error	DF	t-value	p-value
(Intercept)	0.383274	0.010524	2224	36.41767	<.00001
centered.predictor1	0.018192	0.007888	17	2.306227	0.033962
centered.predictor2	-0.01767	0.002506	2224	-7.05005	2.38E-12
squared.predictor1	0.009335	0.006953	17	1.342601	0.197055
interaction	0.005173	0.002466	2224	2.09777	0.036038
squared.predictor2	0.000911	0.001759	2224	0.517793	0.604654
Z_anxiety	-0.00561	0.002384	2224	-2.3526	0.01873

Predictor1 = familism, Predictor 2 = avoidance, outcome = d2

	Value	Std.Error	DF	t-value	p-value
(Intercept)	0.517542	0.017332	2717	29.86058	<.00001
centered.predictor1	0.010592	0.012896	17	0.821357	0.422813
centered.predictor2	-0.0223	0.00509	2717	-4.38191	1.22E-05
squared.predictor1	0.01251	0.011364	17	1.100799	0.286327
interaction	0.008725	0.004985	2717	1.750229	0.080192
squared.predictor2	-0.00331	0.003528	2717	-0.93822	0.348217
Z_anxiety	-0.00589	0.004855	2717	-1.21217	0.225553

Predictor1 = familism, Predictor 2 = avoidance, outcome = t

	Value	Std.Error	DF	t-value	p-value
(Intercept)	11.34537	0.124379	2589	91.21581	<.00001
centered.predictor1	0.235779	0.093378	17	2.525003	0.021802
centered.predictor2	-0.29706	0.028808	2589	-10.3114	1.85E-24
squared.predictor1	0.058565	0.082369	17	0.711007	0.486721
interaction	0.049323	0.028485	2589	1.731547	0.083473
squared.predictor2	0.009895	0.020104	2589	0.492186	0.622629
Z_anxiety	-0.13919	0.027465	2589	-5.06784	4.31E-07

Predictor1 = familism, Predictor 2 = avoidance, outcome = m1

	Value	Std.Error	DF	t-value	p-value
(Intercept)	2.532419	0.035421	2717	71.49425	<.00001
centered.predictor1	0.100585	0.026265	17	3.829594	0.001342
centered.predictor2	-0.12408	0.011143	2717	-11.1347	3.43E-28
squared.predictor1	0.011733	0.023137	17	0.507101	0.618598
interaction	0.014965	0.010915	2717	1.371061	0.170469
squared.predictor2	-0.033	0.007728	2717	-4.27018	2.02E-05
Z_anxiety	0.014495	0.010631	2717	1.363532	0.172828

Predictor1 = familism, Predictor 2 = avoidance, outcome = m2

	Value	Std.Error	DF	t-value	p-value
(Intercept)	5.229272	0.0871	2695	60.03766	<.00001
centered.predictor1	0.222216	0.065736	17	3.380418	0.003555
centered.predictor2	-0.26734	0.015634	2695	-17.1005	2.54E-62
squared.predictor1	0.052892	0.058031	17	0.911451	0.374802
interaction	-0.01298	0.01531	2695	-0.84806	0.39648
squared.predictor2	0.000843	0.010844	2695	0.0777	0.938073
Z_anxiety	0.009507	0.014895	2695	0.63828	0.523346

Predictor1 = familism, Predictor 2 = anxiety, outcome = n1

	Value	Std.Error	DF	t-value	p-value
(Intercept)	10.08013	0.381736	2717	26.40603	<.00001
centered.predictor1	-0.67718	0.28767	17	-2.35402	0.03086
centered.predictor2	0.040785	0.069651	2717	0.585564	0.558217
squared.predictor1	-0.14797	0.253611	17	-0.58344	0.567257
interaction	0.127692	0.069146	2717	1.846703	0.064899
squared.predictor2	0.02256	0.050332	2717	0.448227	0.654025
Z_avoidance	-0.22836	0.069779	2717	-3.27263	0.001079

Predictor1 = familism, Predictor 2 = anxiety, outcome = n2

	Value	Std.Error	DF	t-value	p-value
(Intercept)	9.846082	0.398621	2717	24.70035	<.00001
centered.predictor1	-0.76285	0.300381	17	-2.53962	0.021157
centered.predictor2	0.041377	0.072905	2717	0.56754	0.570394
squared.predictor1	-0.1631	0.264814	17	-0.61589	0.546126
interaction	0.085192	0.072377	2717	1.177063	0.239274
squared.predictor2	0.027462	0.052684	2717	0.521258	0.60223
Z_avoidance	-0.25578	0.073039	2717	-3.50195	0.000469

Predictor1 = familism, Predictor 2 = anxiety, outcome = d1

	Value	Std.Error	DF	t-value	p-value
(Intercept)	0.383513	0.010628	2224	36.08375	<.00001
centered.predictor1	0.017778	0.007966	17	2.231748	0.03938
centered.predictor2	-0.00578	0.002394	2224	-2.41379	0.015868
squared.predictor1	0.0102	0.00701	17	1.454973	0.163893
interaction	0.000311	0.002372	2224	0.130931	0.895842
squared.predictor2	0.00028	0.001741	2224	0.161098	0.872031
Z_avoidance	-0.01726	0.002427	2224	-7.11286	1.53E-12

Predictor1 = familism, Predictor 2 = anxiety, outcome = d2

	Value	Std.Error	DF	t-value	p-value
(Intercept)	0.519835	0.017361	2717	29.94247	<.00001
centered.predictor1	0.010106	0.012904	17	0.783219	0.444273
centered.predictor2	-0.00501	0.004869	2717	-1.02831	0.303895
squared.predictor1	0.013829	0.01134	17	1.219477	0.239313
interaction	-0.00302	0.004835	2717	-0.62504	0.532
squared.predictor2	-0.00569	0.003523	2717	-1.61596	0.106219
Z_avoidance	-0.02431	0.004879	2717	-4.9831	6.65E-07

Predictor1 = familism, Predictor 2 = anxiety, outcome = t

	Value	Std.Error	DF	t-value	p-value
(Intercept)	11.33636	0.123465	2589	91.81826	<.00001
centered.predictor1	0.235569	0.092636	17	2.542958	0.021012
centered.predictor2	-0.14717	0.027532	2589	-5.34551	9.80E-08
squared.predictor1	0.06874	0.081568	17	0.842736	0.411077
interaction	-0.05823	0.02738	2589	-2.12675	0.033535
squared.predictor2	0.019497	0.019906	2589	0.979449	0.32745
Z_avoidance	-0.2909	0.027658	2589	-10.5178	2.30E-25

Predictor1 = familism, Predictor 2 = anxiety, outcome = m1

	Value	Std.Error	DF	t-value	p-value
(Intercept)	2.521264	0.035432	2717	71.15808	<.00001
centered.predictor1	0.101187	0.026236	17	3.856856	0.001265
centered.predictor2	0.020718	0.010679	2717	1.940075	0.052474
squared.predictor1	0.0138	0.023038	17	0.599031	0.557051
interaction	-0.00987	0.010605	2717	-0.93047	0.35221
squared.predictor2	-0.02154	0.00773	2717	-2.7863	0.005368
Z_avoidance	-0.13957	0.010702	2717	-13.0415	9.43E-38

Predictor1 = familism, Predictor 2 = anxiety, outcome = m2

	Value	Std.Error	DF	t-value	p-value
(Intercept)	5.253586	0.085977	2695	61.10477	<.00001
centered.predictor1	0.222944	0.064853	17	3.437671	0.003141
centered.predictor2	0.009812	0.014932	2695	0.657088	0.51118
squared.predictor1	0.049857	0.057191	17	0.871757	0.395486
interaction	-0.02143	0.014819	2695	-1.44615	0.148253
squared.predictor2	-0.01963	0.010784	2695	-1.82037	0.068814
Z_avoidance	-0.26779	0.01499	2695	-17.8648	1.50E-67

Results related to each function of WHOTO.

Predictor1 = familism, Predictor 2 = avoidance, outcome = proximity seeking

	Value	Std.Error	DF	t-value	p-value
(Intercept)	5.287986	0.097069	2717	54.47632	<.00001
centered.predictor1	0.227353	0.072747	17	3.125237	0.006162
centered.predictor2	-0.21937	0.023601	2717	-9.29497	2.93E-20
squared.predictor1	0.03872	0.06416	17	0.603496	0.554146
interaction	0.000386	0.023115	2717	0.016708	0.986671
squared.predictor2	0.011454	0.016347	2717	0.700684	0.48356
Z_anxiety	-0.00057	0.022511	2717	-0.02527	0.97984

Predictor1 = familism, Predictor 2 = avoidance, outcome = safe heaven

	Value	Std.Error	DF	t-value	p-value
(Intercept)	4.682852	0.100534	2717	46.57995	<.00001
centered.predictor1	0.220251	0.075483	17	2.917877	0.009592
centered.predictor2	-0.35171	0.022946	2717	-15.3279	6.33E-51
squared.predictor1	0.034568	0.066587	17	0.519143	0.610354
interaction	-0.02809	0.022472	2717	-1.2501	0.211371
squared.predictor2	-0.04234	0.015889	2717	-2.66475	0.00775
Z_anxiety	0.08545	0.021885	2717	3.904499	9.67E-05

Predictor1 = familism, Predictor 2 = avoidance, outcome = secure base

	Value	Std.Error	DF	t-value	p-value
(Intercept)	5.655508	0.098183	2717	57.60157	<.00001
centered.predictor1	0.234225	0.073788	17	3.174285	0.005546
centered.predictor2	-0.24521	0.021624	2717	-11.3394	3.74E-29
squared.predictor1	0.074761	0.065099	17	1.148416	0.2667
interaction	0.029951	0.021178	2717	1.414246	0.157404
squared.predictor2	-0.01512	0.014972	2717	-1.01004	0.312564
Z_anxiety	-0.03351	0.020624	2717	-1.625	0.104279

Predictor1 = familism, Predictor 2 = anxiety, outcome = proximity seeking

	Value	Std.Error	DF	t-value	p-value
(Intercept)	5.322739	0.097164	2717	54.78108	<.00001
centered.predictor1	0.225936	0.072766	17	3.10497	0.006436
centered.predictor2	-0.00069	0.02257	2717	-0.03039	0.975759
squared.predictor1	0.037634	0.064059	17	0.587485	0.564601
interaction	-0.01063	0.02241	2717	-0.47431	0.635314
squared.predictor2	-0.02087	0.01632	2717	-1.27907	0.20098
Z_avoidance	-0.21602	0.022615	2717	-9.55214	2.73E-21

Predictor1 = familism, Predictor 2 = anxiety, outcome = safe heaven

	Value	Std.Error	DF	t-value	p-value
(Intercept)	4.700202	0.097619	2717	48.14866	<.00001
centered.predictor1	0.223682	0.073184	17	3.05645	0.00714
centered.predictor2	0.094184	0.021931	2717	4.294526	1.81E-05
squared.predictor1	0.027767	0.064443	17	0.430877	0.671971
interaction	-0.03431	0.021774	2717	-1.57563	0.115227
squared.predictor2	-0.05252	0.015856	2717	-3.31251	0.000937
Z_avoidance	-0.37159	0.021974	2717	-16.9106	4.49E-61

Predictor1 = familism, Predictor 2 = anxiety, outcome = secure base

	Value	Std.Error	DF	t-value	p-value
(Intercept)	5.658395	0.099436	2717	56.90464	<.00001
centered.predictor1	0.232263	0.074709	17	3.108915	0.006381
centered.predictor2	-0.0289	0.020689	2717	-1.39692	0.16255
squared.predictor1	0.079171	0.065818	17	1.20287	0.245512
interaction	0.001432	0.02054	2717	0.069722	0.94442
squared.predictor2	-0.01941	0.014955	2717	-1.2979	0.194431
Z_avoidance	-0.25387	0.020728	2717	-12.2473	1.31E-33

References

- Barranti, M., Carlson, E. N., & Côté, S. (2017). How to test questions about similarity in personality and social psychology research: Description and empirical demonstration of response surface analysis. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, 8(4), 465-475.
- Fleenor, J. W., McCauley, C. D., & Brutus, S. (1996). Self-other rating agreement and leader effectiveness. *Leadership Quarterly*, 7, 487-506.
- Harris, M. M., Ansaal, F., & Lievens, F. (2008). Keeping up with the Joneses: A field study of the relationships among upward, lateral, and downward comparisons and pay level satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 93, 665-673.
- Humberg, S., Nestler, S., & Back, M. D. (2019). Response surface analysis in personality and social psychology: Checklist and clarifications for the case of congruence hypotheses. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, 10(3), 409-419.
- Nestler, S., Humberg, S., & Schönbrodt, F. D. (2019). Response surface analysis with multilevel data: Illustration for the case of congruence hypotheses. *Psychological Methods*, 24(3), 291.