

THE PATHWAY TO GROWTH INTIMACY

Closeness Without Possession. Freedom Without Abandonment. Becoming Without Self-Erasure.

An integrative conceptual framework for interpersonal and relational development

Can two people become deeply known without making one another smaller?

Definitive Working Article | Revised from Conceptual V1 and V2 | KyZethX House | 2026

CONCEPTUAL STATUS

Growth Intimacy is proposed here as an original integrative Ethos of Love framework. It is not a diagnosis, attachment style, clinical treatment, or psychometrically validated construct. Its component mechanisms are informed by established relationship science and philosophy; the integrated framework itself remains conceptual and open to empirical testing.

Abstract

Growth Intimacy is proposed as a relational framework for understanding how people may become increasingly known to one another while preserving authenticity, autonomy, psychological safety, individuality, and the capacity for continued growth. It asks not only how closeness forms, but what kind of closeness allows both people to remain recognizable to themselves while the relationship deepens.

The framework integrates research on the interpersonal process model of intimacy, perceived partner responsiveness, secure-base support, Self-Determination Theory, self-expansion, the Michelangelo phenomenon, capitalization, risk-regulation, authenticity, secrecy, deception, and trust repair. It adds an Ethos philosophical architecture through the Jeju Principle and the Ethos of Love Compass.

The revised model distinguishes five enabling conditions from eight relational pillars and proposes a recursive pathway: Encounter -> Reveal -> Respond -> Safety -> Release -> Live/Explore -> Voluntary Return -> Share -> Affirm -> Reality-Test -> Repair/Update -> Expand -> Encounter Again. It further develops three practical ideas: the Freedom Test, separation as a possible participant in intimacy, and provisional trust - an approach that remains open to connection without surrendering reality-testing.

The opposite of intimacy is not separation. The deeper threat to Growth Intimacy is the loss of freedom, truth, or authentic connection.

Keywords: intimacy; autonomy; responsiveness; secure base; self-expansion; non-possession; authenticity; voluntary return; jealousy; relational growth; Jeju Principle; Ethos of Love Compass

I. Why Another Framework for Intimacy?

Relationship science already explains many mechanisms through which closeness develops. The interpersonal process model emphasizes disclosure and perceived partner responsiveness; secure-base research examines support for exploration and goals; Self-Determination Theory explains how autonomy and relatedness can coexist; self-expansion research describes how close relationships can enlarge perspectives, identities, resources, and competence.

Growth Intimacy does not attempt to replace these theories. It asks a narrower developmental and ethical question:

What kind of closeness allows two people to become increasingly known without requiring either person to become smaller?

This shifts the evaluative center. Closeness alone is not sufficient. A relationship can be intense yet controlling, affectionate yet dependent, transparent yet coercive, or emotionally significant while gradually eroding individuality. Growth Intimacy therefore evaluates intimacy partly by what happens to the self inside it.

- Do I become more recognizable to myself?
- Can your growth occur without being treated as a threat to my security?
- Can my growth occur without being treated as disloyalty?
- Can truth enter the relationship without punishment or manipulation?
- Can closeness survive boundaries, distance, and separate life?
- Can we become increasingly known while remaining genuinely two people?

Growth Intimacy is closeness that supports becoming rather than requiring self-erasure.

II. Working Definition and Scope

Growth Intimacy is a form of authentic closeness in which two people become increasingly known to one another through truth, responsiveness, and trust while preserving enough freedom, psychological safety, and individuality for each person to continue becoming themselves.

Relational scope

The framework is intentionally broader than romantic partnership. It may be relevant to intimate friendship, chosen family, familial relationships, romantic relationships, and other bonds in which people become deeply consequential to one another. The form of the relationship may differ; the developmental question remains whether intimacy enlarges or diminishes the people participating in it.

The central Ethos contrast

Possessive Intimacy	Growth Intimacy
Stay close so I can feel secure.	I feel secure enough in our closeness to let you grow.
Closeness becomes proof of belonging.	Closeness remains meaningful because it stays substantially voluntary.
Difference may feel like distance.	Difference can remain part of intimacy.
Control is used to reduce uncertainty.	Courage and truth are used to live with uncertainty.

Permanence is not the measure of significance, and category is not the measure of intimacy.

III. Cross-Study: Where the Framework Meets the Literature

The proposed framework is an integration, not a renaming. Each research tradition contributes a mechanism; Growth Intimacy connects those mechanisms around the ethical problem of closeness, freedom, truth, and becoming.

Research tradition	Contribution	Growth Intimacy integration
Interpersonal process model	Self-disclosure, partner disclosure, and perceived responsiveness contribute to experienced intimacy.	Truth + Responsiveness
Perceived partner responsiveness	People experience closeness when partners are understood as attentive and supportive toward central features of the self.	Responsiveness
Secure-base support	Responsive, nonintrusive support can facilitate exploration, personal goals, and growth.	Secure-Base Support
Thriving through relationships	Close relationships can function as sources of strength and relational catalysts in opportunities for growth.	Becoming
Self-Determination Theory	Autonomy and relatedness can coexist; autonomous relational motivation is associated with healthier relational functioning.	Freedom
Self-expansion	Close relationships can expand perspectives, skills, identities, efficacy, and resources.	Mutual Expansion
Michelangelo phenomenon	Partners can affirm and facilitate movement toward one another's ideal selves.	Affirmation
Capitalization	Sharing positive experiences and receiving active-constructive responses can support intimacy and relationship well-being.	Return + Share + Celebrate
Risk regulation	People must negotiate the desire for connection against vulnerability to rejection.	Courage + Trust
Partner authenticity	Perceived authenticity is associated with trust, satisfaction, commitment, and more adaptive relational goals.	Authenticity
Secrecy and disclosure	Privacy, secrecy, disclosure, and deception are relationally distinct; secrecy is influenced by relationship dynamics and cannot be reduced to a simple moral binary.	Privacy vs Deception
Philosophy of dialogue	Buber's I-Thou tradition emphasizes encounter with the other as Other rather than merely as an object to manage.	Presence + Non-possession

The literature supports component mechanisms, not the integrated Ethos construct. The theoretical contribution of Growth Intimacy is the synthesis: intimacy is treated as developmental when closeness and responsiveness coexist with autonomy, truth, reality-testing, and non-possession.

IV. Conditions Before the Pillars

A key refinement from the earlier drafts is that some qualities should not be treated as additional pillars. They are better understood as enabling conditions that determine whether the pillars can function as Growth Intimacy at all.

1. Authenticity

The relationship represented should sufficiently correspond to the relationship actually being enacted. Perfect transparency is neither possible nor desirable; systematic falsification is incompatible with Growth Intimacy.

2. Voluntariness

Closeness must remain substantially chosen. Affection obtained through coercion, guilt, surveillance, threats, manipulation, or manufactured obligation violates the framework.

3. Psychological and Relational Safety

Truth requires some reasonable expectation that vulnerability will not routinely be mocked, exploited, weaponized, or punished.

4. Reciprocity Across Time

Growth Intimacy does not require mathematical 50/50 exchange. It does require longitudinal evidence that both people participate in the relationship and allow both lives to matter.

5. Reality-Testability

Beliefs about the relationship must remain revisable. A framework that explains away every contradiction in order to preserve closeness becomes ideology rather than discernment.

Privacy protects individuality. Deception manufactures reality.

Open Heart. Open Eyes.

V. The Eight Pillars of Growth Intimacy

1. Presence - Receive What Is Here

Presence asks us to encounter the person before converting the encounter into a prediction. It is the discipline of experiencing today before forcing today to certify tomorrow.

2. Truth - Become Knowable

Growth Intimacy requires increasing knowability, not total access. Feelings, boundaries, desires, uncertainty, and changed realities must be capable of entering the relationship without requiring performance.

3. Responsiveness - Understand, Validate, Care

Disclosure alone does not produce intimacy. Its reception matters. Responsiveness means that what becomes known is met with attention, understanding, validation, curiosity, or care.

4. Freedom - Preserve the Self

Autonomy and relatedness are not opposites. Each person retains boundaries, outside relationships, private thought, goals, exploration, change, and the right to revise participation.

5. Secure-Base Support - Be Available Without Interfering

Support does not mean doing another person's becoming for them. Growth-supportive care can encourage exploration, tolerate productive struggle, and remain available without unnecessary intrusion.

6. Mutual Expansion - Become More, Not Smaller

A developmental relationship exposes people to new perspectives, capacities, experiences, identities, and possibilities. The ethical limit is crucial: I support your authentic becoming; I do not sculpt you into my preferred version of you.

7. Trust, Boundaries, and Repair - Make Safety Behavioral

Trust is not the absence of rupture. It is partly revealed in what follows rupture: accountability, clarification, changed behavior, boundary revision, forgiveness where warranted, and withdrawal of trust where reality requires it.

8. Non-Possession - Let Intimacy Remain Voluntary

Non-possession does not mean indifference. It means refusing to make control, exclusivity, or ownership the proof that intimacy matters. Love may care deeply while still protecting the other's agency.

Love without possession does not mean loving less. It means refusing to make ownership the evidence that love was real.

VI. The Recursive Pathway to Growth Intimacy

The framework is more useful as a process than as a checklist. Growth Intimacy is better imagined as a spiral: people revisit similar relational tasks at deeper levels as the relationship changes.

Stage	Relational movement
ENCOUNTER	I become present to you.
REVEAL	Something real about me becomes knowable.
RESPOND	What is revealed is met with care, validation, curiosity, or support.
SAFETY	Repeated responsiveness makes further authenticity more possible.
RELEASE	Connection does not require uninterrupted access.
LIVE / EXPLORE	Each person continues family life, work, travel, friendships, goals, solitude, and discovery.
VOLUNTARY RETURN	Connection resumes because it is chosen rather than extracted.
SHARE	Independent experiences are carried back into the relationship.
AFFIRM	The other person's experience and becoming are received with interest rather than competition.
REALITY-TEST	Patterns across time are compared with words, expectations, hopes, and fears.
REPAIR / UPDATE	Misreadings, ruptures, assumptions, agreements, and boundaries are revised.
EXPAND	Both people leave the cycle with more knowledge, capacity, self-understanding, or relational clarity.
ENCOUNTER AGAIN	The relationship re-enters the cycle from a new developmental position.

Growth Intimacy is not a staircase toward fusion. It is a spiral through which connection and individuality repeatedly meet.

VII. Separation Can Participate in Intimacy

One of the most important developments in the revised framework is the distinction between separation and relational loss. Growth Intimacy does not assume that uninterrupted proximity is the highest form of connection.

The opposite of intimacy is not separation.

Separation can participate in Growth Intimacy when it preserves agency, supports exploration, and is followed by authentic voluntary return. Family time, work, travel, solitude, friendships, learning, and independent experiences can give the relationship something new to receive rather than functioning automatically as evidence of distance.

This produces a smaller relational cycle inside the larger pathway:

*Connection -> Release -> Independent Expansion -> Voluntary Return -> Sharing ->
Responsive Reception -> Relational Expansion*

This proposition is compatible with secure-base and Self-Determination perspectives: supportive relationships need not eliminate exploration, and autonomy need not mean emotional detachment. Capitalization research further helps explain why returning with positive experiences can itself become intimacy-building.

Healthy closeness does not require uninterrupted contact. Sometimes its security is revealed in the return.

VIII. The Freedom Test

Growth Intimacy is easiest to believe in when the other person is actively choosing closeness with us. The deeper test occurs when the other person is choosing a life beyond us.

- Can I remain caring while you travel, work, spend time with family, or build experiences that do not include me?
- Can I celebrate relationships and opportunities that enlarge your life without automatically treating them as threats to my place in it?
- Can I tolerate experiences I cannot witness or control?
- Can I allow you to enjoy forms of connection, play, or discovery in which I am not the central participant?
- Can I receive your voluntary return as affection rather than demanding proof for why you were away?

I do not have to be present in every beautiful moment of your life to know that I may have a meaningful place in it.

The Freedom Test is not a demand for unlimited tolerance. It does not require a person to accept betrayal, violated agreements, chronic neglect, coercion, or deception. Freedom operates together with Truth. When reality changes, the interpretation and the relationship may need to change with it.

IX. Illustrative Reflective Case: The Return After Living

Case status. The following anonymized case is used to illustrate and stress-test the framework. It is not a clinical assessment, a controlled study, or evidence about another person's private motives.

Phase 1 - Care without demand

After a demanding workday, Person B thanks Person A for an earlier call and indicates that rest is needed. Person A responds with warmth but does not create an obligation to continue the interaction. The following day, Person B independently reinitiates contact.

Phase 2 - Independent life remains legitimate

Person B spends meaningful time with family while Person A continues work and daily responsibilities. The relationship is not treated as requiring constant access, and family connection does not have to be interpreted as competition with the friendship.

Phase 3 - Voluntary return and capitalization

While living independently, Person B voluntarily brings pieces of the day back into the relationship: discoveries, purchases, photographs, stories, and plans. The experience is not merely lived apart; selected parts are intentionally shared.

Phase 4 - Shared learning across distance

Later, the two engage through video in a playful learning activity, practicing dance steps while physically apart. The activity becomes a small episode of mutual engagement, teaching, correction, humor, and skill development - an example of connection that does not require physical proximity.

Phase 5 - Future-oriented inclusion without guarantee

Person B describes future activities they may share and makes practical arrangements that could preserve communication during upcoming travel. These behaviors can reasonably be described as future-oriented inclusion and effort toward continued contact. They do not establish the precise emotional category, hidden motive, or permanence of the bond.

Phase 6 - Both lives enter the relationship

Before the interaction ends, Person B asks about Person A's day. This matters because Growth Intimacy is not one person witnessing another. Reciprocity requires space for both lives to enter the relational field.

Observed pattern	Framework interpretation	Epistemic limit
Separate family/work life	Autonomy and relatedness coexist.	Separation does not prove distance; closeness does not prove exclusivity.
Voluntary initiation and calls	Behavior consistent with reciprocity and chosen return.	Frequency cannot reveal every private motive.
Sharing positive experiences	Independent life is carried back into shared relational space.	Sharing alone cannot prove permanence or a specific category of love.
Remote learning/play	Mutual engagement and self-expansion can occur across distance.	Shared play is not proof of a particular relational label.
Future-oriented plans	The other person is being included in anticipated experience.	A future plan is not a guarantee.
Practical effort to remain connected	Communication is treated as worth facilitating.	Effort supports significance but does not make access obligatory.
Asking about the other's life	Responsiveness and reciprocity remain bidirectional.	A caring question does not eliminate uncertainty elsewhere.

Case conclusion. The strongest interpretation remains behavioral and longitudinal: this interaction is consistent with autonomy-preserving connection, reciprocity, capitalization, responsiveness, mutual engagement, future-oriented inclusion, and voluntary return. The framework deliberately stops short of claiming access to another person's private motives.

X. Jealousy: A Practice Point, Not a Moral Failure

Freedom often becomes most difficult when it activates vulnerability. Jealousy is therefore a useful stress test for Growth Intimacy. The framework does not require a person to deny, shame, or spiritually bypass jealousy. Suppression would undermine Truth.

Instead, the emotion is treated as information that can move through the Ethos of Love Compass:

Compass direction	Practice
SOUTH - TRUTH	I may wish I were the person sharing that experience. Jealousy is present; it does not need to be disguised.
EAST - FREEDOM	The other person retains agency over relationships, travel, play, attractions, and experiences unless mutual agreements establish specific commitments.
WEST - COURAGE	I can experience uncertainty without automatically converting it into interrogation, surveillance, punishment, withdrawal, or control.
NORTH - PURPOSE	I ask what kind of person I am becoming through the way I handle attachment, longing, comparison, and uncertainty.
CENTER - LOVE	I can care deeply while preserving both the other person's agency and my own dignity, boundaries, and responsiveness to reality.

Courage is not the absence of jealousy. It is refusing to make jealousy the leader.

XI. Authenticity, Performance, Privacy, and Deception

Growth Intimacy must remain capable of surviving the performance problem: people can appear close without being fully congruent internally. A single affectionate behavior, call, message, or disclosure cannot reveal private consciousness.

Not all performance is deception

Type	Description	Compatibility
Adaptive social performance	Ordinary politeness, role behavior, emotional regulation, or presenting a composed self.	Generally compatible
Protective performance	Holding back because trust, readiness, or safety is incomplete.	Potentially compatible
Manipulative performance	Creating a materially false impression of closeness, identity, intention, or commitment in order to influence another person's choices.	Incompatible

Privacy is not deception

Growth Intimacy does not create a right to total access. A person may say, "I am not ready to talk about that," keep private thoughts, or maintain psychological space. The ethical problem begins when a person intentionally constructs a materially false relational reality on which the other person is expected to rely.

A boundary says: there are things I am not ready to share. Deception says: I will give you a false version of reality and allow you to rely upon it.

Provisional trust

Because certainty about another person's inner world is impossible, Growth Intimacy rejects both naive certainty and compulsive suspicion. Its alternative is provisional trust: trust what longitudinal consistency has earned while preserving the capacity to revise that trust when contradictory evidence emerges.

Trust should not require blindness. Growth Intimacy asks us to remain open enough to love and awake enough to see.

XII. The Jeju Principle: A Philosophy of Time

The Jeju Principle addresses a recurrent human temptation: converting uncertainty about tomorrow into dissatisfaction with today. Its core proposition is:

Do not demand forever from something beautiful before allowing yourself to experience today.

Yet a philosophy of presence can become dangerous if it is used to dismiss evidence. The revised framework therefore pairs Jeju with Truth:

*Do not invent tomorrow.
Do not falsify today.*

Do not invent tomorrow protects against anxious prediction: uncertainty is not evidence of danger, and present meaning does not require a guarantee of permanence. Do not falsify today protects against naivete: contradictions, coercion, repeated dishonesty, and violated agreements should not be romanticized away.

Together they produce a mature form of presence: open to what is beautiful, responsive to what is true, and unwilling to require tomorrow to certify the significance of today.

Jeju is not asking us to romanticize the present. It is asking us to inhabit it.

XIII. The Ethos of Love Compass as Relational Practice

Relationship science largely explains mechanisms. The Compass asks a practical and ethical question: How should I behave inside a relationship while reality remains incomplete?

NORTH - PURPOSE

Does this connection contribute to the people we are becoming? Purpose protects relationship from becoming mere preservation at any cost.

EAST - FREEDOM

Can both people remain self-directed? Is closeness still substantially chosen? Freedom prevents affection from becoming control.

SOUTH - TRUTH

What is actually happening? Truth separates observation from projection and allows new evidence to revise the story.

WEST - COURAGE

Can I tolerate uncertainty without compulsively controlling? Can I also tolerate an unwanted truth if it arrives? Courage works in both directions.

CENTER - LOVE

Can I care without possessing, dehumanizing, manipulating, or abandoning myself? Love coordinates the directions rather than replacing them.

A practical Compass sequence

- What happened? - Truth
- What story am I adding? - Truth
- What feeling is asking for acknowledgment? - Truth
- Can the other person remain free? - Freedom
- Can I tolerate not knowing yet? - Courage
- Does my response support who I am becoming? - Purpose
- Can I care without controlling or self-abandoning? - Love
- Then: observe what happens next.

The Compass makes discernment compatible with tenderness.

XIV. Three Relational Architectures

Architecture	Underlying message	Primary risk / requirement
Possessive Intimacy	Stay close so I can remain secure.	Control replaces freedom; uncertainty becomes a problem to eliminate.
Performed Intimacy	I will appear close enough for you to believe we are secure.	Appearance replaces congruence; the represented relationship diverges from reality.
Growth Intimacy	Let us know one another truthfully enough that closeness and freedom can coexist.	Requires courage, boundaries, reciprocity, reality-testing, and repair.

Growth Intimacy is a recursive relational process in which authentic disclosure, perceived responsiveness, autonomy, secure-base support, trust, repair, and mutual expansion allow two people to become increasingly known while preserving the freedom and individuality necessary for each to continue becoming themselves.

XV. What Growth Intimacy Is Not

- It is not secure attachment renamed.
- It is not self-expansion renamed.
- It is not Buddhist nonattachment renamed.
- It is not total transparency or unlimited access.
- It is not emotional detachment disguised as freedom.
- It is not the claim that healthy relationships never hurt or activate jealousy.
- It is not permission to tolerate deception, coercion, violated agreements, or chronic nonreciprocity.
- It is not a promise that every close relationship should become closer.
- It is not a scientifically validated construct at this stage.

Freedom without responsiveness becomes detachment. Responsiveness without freedom can become control. Growth Intimacy requires both.

XVI. Boundary Conditions and Failure Modes

A useful theory should identify how it can fail. Growth Intimacy is undermined when one or more of the following becomes persistent:

- Coercive access: closeness is demanded rather than chosen.
- Self-erasure: one person must become smaller to preserve the bond.
- Chronic nonreciprocity: one person carries nearly all disclosure, care, initiation, repair, or adaptation across time.
- Strategic deception: a materially false relationship is maintained to influence the other person.
- Boundary punishment: saying no, asking for space, or changing a preference triggers retaliation.
- Possessive certainty-seeking: surveillance, testing, interrogation, or control is used to eliminate uncertainty.
- Rescue dependence: support becomes a substitute for another person's agency or responsibility.

- Growth capture: one person's development is welcomed only when it follows the other person's preferred direction.
- Spiritual bypassing: Jeju, non-possession, forgiveness, or "freedom" is used to rationalize evidence that should change the relationship.

XVII. Proposed Research Directions

The framework is now specific enough to generate empirical questions. A future Growth Intimacy Inventory could examine the following proposed dimensions:

- authenticity and relational congruence
- perceived responsiveness
- autonomy preservation
- psychological and relational safety
- secure-base support
- mutual expansion
- boundary respect
- repair capacity
- non-possession
- longitudinal reciprocity
- voluntary return
- reality-responsive or provisional trust

Future research could test whether these dimensions predict relational thriving above and beyond established measures of attachment security, perceived partner responsiveness, self-expansion, relationship autonomy, trust, and authenticity. Longitudinal and dyadic designs would be especially appropriate because the framework predicts that Growth Intimacy reveals itself through patterns across time rather than isolated moments.

Illustrative propositions for testing

- Autonomy-supportive closeness will predict greater relational growth when perceived responsiveness is also high.
- Voluntary return after periods of independent activity will be associated with relational security when it occurs within a broader pattern of reciprocity and congruence.
- Non-possession will be adaptive only when paired with boundaries and reality-testing; without them, it may become indistinguishable from passivity or avoidance.
- Growth Intimacy will predict perceived personal expansion without requiring increased fusion or reduced individuality.
- Repair quality after rupture will be more predictive of durable trust than apology language alone.

XVIII. Conclusion: A Pathway of Becoming

Perhaps intimacy has been misunderstood when its highest expression is imagined as two people becoming inseparable. Growth Intimacy proposes another possibility.

Two people can become deeply known without becoming psychologically fused. They can influence one another without redesigning one another. They can support growth without controlling direction. They can experience longing without converting longing into entitlement. They can establish trust without pretending certainty exists. They can maintain private selves without manufacturing false relational realities.

They can leave an interaction, live independently, encounter the world, spend time with family and friends, travel, learn, change, and return carrying something new. In this model, separation does not automatically threaten intimacy. Under supportive conditions, separation can become one of the places where freedom proves that connection is not captivity.

The difficult emotions do not disappear. Jealousy, fear, longing, uncertainty, and the wish to be chosen remain human. Growth Intimacy does not ask us to stop feeling them. It asks whether Truth can name them, Freedom can prevent them from becoming control, Courage can tolerate what remains uncertain, Purpose can orient us toward becoming, and Love can keep care from becoming possession.

I can miss you without summoning you.

I can feel jealousy without restricting you.

I can love you without possessing you.

I can let you bring back stories from a life I did not have to control.

Jeju supplies the temporal discipline: tomorrow does not have to guarantee today before today is allowed to matter. Truth supplies the epistemic discipline: today should not be beautified into something the evidence cannot support.

Open Heart. Open Eyes.

Love what is here. Protect the freedom that makes it real. Let truth determine what happens next.

And perhaps the most concise expression of Growth Intimacy remains the question from which it began:

Can we know each other deeply without either of us becoming smaller?

Selected Scholarly Foundations

- Laurenceau, J.-P., Barrett, L. F., & Pietromonaco, P. R. (1998). Intimacy as an interpersonal process: The importance of self-disclosure, partner disclosure, and perceived partner responsiveness in interpersonal exchanges. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 74(5), 1238-1251. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.74.5.1238>
- Reis, H. T., Clark, M. S., & Holmes, J. G. (2004). Perceived partner responsiveness as an organizing construct in the study of intimacy and closeness. In D. J. Mashek & A. Aron (Eds.), *Handbook of Closeness and Intimacy*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Feeney, B. C. (2004). A secure base: Responsive support of goal strivings and exploration in adult intimate relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 87(5), 631-648. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.87.5.631>
- Feeney, B. C., & Collins, N. L. (2015). Thriving through relationships. *Current Opinion in Psychology*, 1, 22-28. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.copsyc.2014.11.001>
- Aron, A., Lewandowski, G. W., Branand, B., Mashek, D., & Aron, E. N. (2022). Self-expansion motivation and inclusion of others in self: An updated review. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 39(12), 3821-3852. <https://doi.org/10.1177/02654075221110630>
- Rusbult, C. E., Finkel, E. J., & Kumashiro, M. (2009). The Michelangelo phenomenon. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 18(6), 305-309. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8721.2009.01657.x>
- Gable, S. L., Reis, H. T., Impett, E. A., & Asher, E. R. (2004). What do you do when things go right? The intrapersonal and interpersonal benefits of sharing positive events. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 87(2), 228-245. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.87.2.228>
- Gable, S. L., Gonzaga, G. C., & Strachman, A. (2006). Will you be there for me when things go right? Supportive responses to positive event disclosures. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 91(5), 904-917. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.91.5.904>
- Murray, S. L., Holmes, J. G., & Collins, N. L. (2006). Optimizing assurance: The risk regulation system in relationships. *Psychological Bulletin*, 132(5), 641-666. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.132.5.641>
- Knee, C. R., Lonsbary, C., Canevello, A., & Patrick, H. (2005). Self-determination and conflict in romantic relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 89(6), 997-1009. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.89.6.997>
- La Guardia, J. G., & Patrick, H. (2008). Self-determination theory as a fundamental theory of close relationships. *Canadian Psychology*, 49(3), 201-209. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0012760>
- Wickham, R. E. (2013). Perceived authenticity in romantic partners. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 49(5), 878-887. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2013.04.001>
- Davis, C. G., & Tabri, N. (2023). The secrets that you keep: Secrets and relationship quality. *Personal Relationships*, 30(2), 620-635. <https://doi.org/10.1111/pere.12472>
- Bedrov, A., & Gable, S. L. (2024). Keeping and sharing secrets at the interpersonal level. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 18(2), e12942. <https://doi.org/10.1111/spc3.12942>
- Cole, T. (2001). Lying to the one you love: The use of deception in romantic relationships. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 18(1), 107-129. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0265407501181005>
- Peterson, C. (1996). Deception in intimate relationships. *International Journal of Psychology*, 31(6), 279-288. <https://doi.org/10.1080/002075996401034>
- Buber, M. (1923/1970). *I and Thou* (W. Kaufmann, Trans.). Charles Scribner's Sons. Philosophical context also informed by the Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy entry on Martin Buber.
- Fromm, E. (1956). *The Art of Loving*. Harper & Brothers.
- Editorial note: Growth Intimacy, the Freedom Test, the Jeju Principle, and the Ethos of Love Compass are developing Ethos Universe constructs. The literature above supports component mechanisms and conceptual boundary conditions; it does not validate the integrated framework itself.