Meta-Analysis Procedures

Search procedures. Cross-sectional and longitudinal studies were searched from various disciplines within psychology (e.g., clinical, developmental, social/personality): (a) PsychINFO (1888-2006), Dissertation Abstracts (1861-2006), and Pub Med were searched using the key terms love, passionate love, romantic love, marital satisfaction, relationship satisfaction, love and aging, and long-term couples: (b) reference lists of eligible articles from Masuda’s (2003) meta-analysis were scanned; and (c) a manual search of journals that mainly publish articles concerning relationship issues were scanned.

Inclusion criteria. Studies had to meet the following criteria to be included: publication in English; assessment of romantic love, passionate love, companionate love, or mania; assessment of relationship satisfaction (the few studies that assessed any of the types of love in long-term couples but not satisfaction were reviewed in an earlier section); samples of individuals college age or older in some sort or romantic relationship (from dating to married). (Several studies were excluded because they utilized students in elementary or middle school.)

Coding. We coded for the following variables and conducted analyses for each separately: (a) Eros (romantic love), (b) Storge (companionate love), (c) Mania, and (d) passionate love. The Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient was the measure of effect size. This correlation coefficient represents the association between love of a particular type and relationship satisfaction, both measured on continuous scales.
Multiple effect sizes. Some studies reported several effect sizes for the same construct. For example, some studies reported separate effect sizes separately by gender, relationship stages, and across measures. Within any given analysis combining results across studies, we collapsed effect sizes to meet the assumption of independence, such that only one effect size per study was included.

Relationship length groupings. Effect sizes were computed separately for short-term and long-term relationships. The short-term group included studies reporting on samples of college students, mostly single or dating. Studies with samples that included engaged, cohabiting, or married participants were also assigned to the short-term group, if they met all three of the following conditions: (a) participants comprised less than the majority of the sample, (b) the average relationship length overall was less than 4 years, and (c) participants were mostly college-age (18-23 yrs old). The long-term relationship group included studies assessing middle-aged participants, the majority of which were married around 10 years or more. If the relationship status could not be determined or if the sample was quite heterogeneous and did not report effect sizes separately by relationship stage or length, the study was not included in the meta-analysis. Studies reporting separate effect sizes across relationship stages were not collapsed within a given analysis, but were kept separate allowing for distinctions among short and long-term relationships.

Effect size computations. As recommended by Lipsey and Wilson (2001), all effect sizes were transformed using Fisher’s Z_r-transformation (Hedges & Olkin, 1985). Inverse-variance-weighted-aggregate effect sizes were calculated using SPSS macros for meta-analysis created by Lipsey and Wilson (2001). All Z_r-transformed correlations were
transformed back to $r_s$ (for purposes of reporting results) after all analyses were performed.

Weighted aggregate effect sizes (for correlations with satisfaction) were computed separately for each love type (romantic, companionate, obsessive, and undifferentiated passionate love) across short and long-term relationship groups. To examine differences across relationship groups we used Lipsey and Wilson’s (2001) analog to ANOVA model and SPSS macros for meta-analysis. The following conventions (Cohen, 1988) were used to interpret the magnitude of effect sizes: small (.10), medium (.25), and large (.40).
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