

# BETTER TOGETHER

## Discovering Joy in Company

INITIATIVE



# Talk to that one

Platonic Matching in the Metropolregion  
Rhein Neckar

## Summary

"Loneliness can hurt. However, it is also a wake-up call to take action.

Two concrete groups with higher than usual loneliness rates are beginning tertiary education students and job starters and young professionals coming to a new city or indeed a new country.

While in loneliness literature various workshop and training formats have been evaluated and found effective to some degrees, the simple act of sponsoring, nudging or creating connections for people has been done less so. One reason might be that obtaining ethics approval to essentially run a non-commercial matching service might be hard to get.

Still, helping people develop connections simply by connecting them is too good an opportunity to pass up and not to try, and so this project - „talk to that one“ will run a regional pilot with an accompanying validation.

For further questions, please do not hesitate to contact us.

**Christian Langkamp**

**Initiative GemEinsamkeit**

**This document will be held in english for the first phase as Internationals and young professionals are predominantly targeted and translated into German in a 2nd phase.**

**The first few pages are additional information for the prospect user, the rest of the document (after FAQ) is detailed information for potential evaluators and collaborators.**

Version 1.00 Monat 2025-07

## **Quick overview - What it is and isn't What You Need to Know (Whether You're a Student or an Administrator)**

- This is not a dating app. It is a project focused on helping people meet platonically, for one good conversation.
- We use your answers to suggest 1:1 conversation partners. You only receive matches—not an open list, not swiping.
- The algorithm is open, non-commercial, and auditable. No data is ever sold. No one sees your profile.
- Participation is optional, anonymous, and designed to give you control at every step.
- It is developed by researchers and practitioners in the loneliness field—not by a startup or venture-backed company.

### **How it works in 7 steps**

1. Get the invitation link or flyer from your university, international office, or peer group.
2. Fill out a long profile questionnaire (45 minutes). This includes your interests, humor, conversational style, and what kind of friendship you're looking for.
3. Complete a few filter questions on age, language, and match openness.
4. Wait for your match. Once a cohort is full, matches are generated in batches. This usually happens within 1-2 weeks of your sign-up.
5. Receive an email with one personal match and a short intro or suggestion.
6. Meet for one conversation. Arrange the location yourself—ideally somewhere calm, public, and neutral.
7. (Optional) Give feedback. After your meeting, you can tell us how it went, so we can improve the system.

## Social Norms and Participant safety

No tracing is possible, we don't know any of the people on the platform. They could be out for dates, scams, frauds, ... so be careful with your personal data and what you divulge before the first meetup. Best not give out your surname.

Ideally make a profile that has some photos, or something so that the person can at least get an image of you. However the "compatibility" vouch comes from the connection score. The open question is whether you want to provide a "vouched or verified profile. This is a profile from a platform with some communication mechanism as well as a verification mechanism. Couchsurfing is here the stereotypical prototype, but Internations or Meetup work just the same. The main point here is that it makes it costly for you to misbehave, as the other person could report you given your communication data trail and get your profile banned.

Ideally once you are matched meet up in a neutral location as soon as possible without any superficial telegram correspondence. The time spent for information gained ratio on social media is just off the charts worse than the gut feeling impression you get within 5 or 10 min of conversation.

As much as we aim to provide good matches, it is not a guarantee. Please do not think of this as a guaranteed perfect friend. Think of it as a statistical improvement, from a 5 % likelihood to the random person in the cafeteria you talk to to a say 25 % likelihood of a good match given that another friend recommends that person as being a good match. This will still mean that there will be some people with whom the chemistry is not right, where you don't hit it off, without anything being wrong with you or them.

Please reflect however after the meetup what went well, what the recommendation might have gotten right about you or them, and maybe how you may also wish to adjust your search pattern.

## FAQ

- Is this a dating app? - No
- Who sees my profile? - No one, it is just used to calculate matches.
- Is there customer support? - No, essentially there are simply no resources for independent and individual support. Questions and complaints can be written to [talktothatone@initiative-gemeinsamkeit.de](mailto:talktothatone@initiative-gemeinsamkeit.de) but at this point we have no feeling for that part
- Is there safety support? - we can delete profiles of people whom there are complaints about, but as we know nothing of the people behind them, there is little we can do. This part is outsourced to the social enforcement features of the platforms like Meetup.com, Nebenan.de, Couchsurfing and Internations.

## Theoretical and Empirical Basis Problem Framing

When students start university or young people full of energy move abroad for their first jobs they often expect a rather rapidly established rich social life, to have the best time in their life, to enjoy both friendships and romantic relationships.

So expectations are for finding easily good friends, only to find that many German Tertiary Education Institutes are actually quite badly equipped for this. And soon disappointment triggers loneliness, specifically defined as the realisation that one's desired social connections are not matched by the observed quality and quantity of actual connections. Academic research corroborates all this, and a good introductory summary can be found in the recent paper by Vanessa Wenig 2025 on the loneliness of University students, where also the other prior research gets summarized (Wenig, Heinrichs, Heumann 2025 Social-ecological factors associated with loneliness in University students: results from the German cross-sectional StudiBiFra study doi: 10.3389/fpsy.2025.1469811): They find that a total of 28% of students experienced loneliness during their studies, with males and gender-diverse students substantially worse afflicted. These numbers also ties reasonably well together with Diehl Jansen 2018, (i.e. pre-Covid pandemic, so the matter is not (just) a relict from that period), where 32.4 % felt moderately lonely and 3.2 % severe lonely.

Unfortunately these numbers dont allow for further drilldown, but it may be reasonable to assume that 20 % of the lonely students will manage reasonably well even without general assistance, but maybe 10 % could actually substantially profit from direct intervention and improve their wellbeing from a meaningful reduction of loneliness.

When it comes to interventions, most psychological programs circle around a collection of trainings for emotional validation, coping, social skills training or mindfulness. Whilst these are important, essentially they improve coping mechanisms, not solve the actual underlying problem of lack of social connections. While it is good to take responsibility for ones own share (and with all respect for the stigmatization discussion, some onus will always stay with the person affected to become active and seek encounters), there is substantial evidence that significant blame lies with the lack of social infrastructure at the institutions:

Group meetings that are shallow or intimidating. Friendship apps that feel artificial or gamified. Large parties that are anonymous and suitable only for part of the population. Expensive hospitality locations. Whilst it is easy to criticise all this, it is a bit more difficult to identify what could work, but is currently missing.

## Theoretical and Empirical Basis Storyline

Imagine you're at an event. You are new in town, new at the university or your job,

You see twenty people who all seem kind and interesting. Maybe you've seen some of them before. You'd like to start a conversation – but how? And with whom? With the small group that already found each other? Or the person standing alone by the bar?

In moments like these, all it takes is a small nudge from the outside. Someone who already knows you a little – and doesn't leave connection up to chance. Someone who says:

**“Hey, I just talked to someone who'd be great for you to meet. Why don't you go over there – talk to that one.”**

That's the idea behind TalkToThatOne.

## Project Summary

**Talk to That One** is a non-commercial digital prototype designed to match individuals for meaningful one-on-one conversations. Using a detailed survey and algorithmic matching, the platform introduces strangers for a one-hour meeting based on compatibility in values, interests, and conversation styles.

Unlike dating apps or group-based social platforms, this service is explicitly platonic, slow, and intentional. It targets students, international arrivals and city newcomers, and others who lack access to natural social connectors. Initial validation will take place through pilot cohorts in the cities of the Rhein-Neckar-region.

## Objectives

- Evaluate if direct platonic matching can substantially contribute to students social connection buildup in first year at university
- Evaluate whether on the basis of friendship variables good matches can be created
- Evaluate whether people accept and follow up on suggested matches

## Theoretical and Empirical Basis

### Problem hypothesis: Missing connectors and third places.

One key hypothesis—based on observation and anecdotal evidence—is that within social networks such as those at universities, the number of social intermediaries or “bridge builders” has significantly declined. While students may be digitally connected to hundreds of peers through social media, the quality of these links tends to remain superficial. The traditional role of human connectors—what Granovetter called “bridging ties” between disjointed social groups, or what Putnam described as “schmoozers” who sustain community capital—has not been replaced by digital interaction. The result is a vacuum: many newcomers remain unintegrated, with no one actively pulling them into the social fabric.

This gap is particularly visible during the early months of university, when local student networks are still unformed and fragile. Unlike models such as the Oxford and Cambridge college systems—where structured buddy programs and regular social rituals help each cohort generate its own pool of connectors—most German university environments lack both institutionalized rituals and informal intermediaries.

At the same time, the decline of accessible **third spaces** further limits organic social contact. Rising hospitality prices make cafés and bars less viable for students. High rents and academic pressure mean students have less time and disposable income to participate in extracurricular activities or join societies where friendships might otherwise develop naturally. Even formerly “free” spaces like university cafeterias and libraries are often unsuitable for initiating conversation.

In sum, we are seeing the convergence of two structural trends: **fewer people actively connecting others**, and **fewer casual environments where connection can happen organically**. Without the ability to train human connectors at scale, a digital system that identifies compatible pairs and makes timely introductions becomes a pragmatic substitute. This project aims to **mimic the local connector**—the person who knows just enough about both sides to say: **“Talk to that one.”**

## Theoretical and Empirical Basis - Theoretical foundations

The project design is informed by several key concepts from sociology, psychology, and network theory:

**Weak ties and structural holes (Granovetter, Burt):** Social integration often depends on weak links that bridge disconnected groups. These ties—created by so-called network brokers—are essential for bringing together people from different social circles and fostering inclusion.

**Schmoozers and social capital (Putnam)** Community life thrives on individuals who informally connect others. These “schmoozers” generate bridging capital, helping new ties form between strangers, especially in settings lacking formal integration mechanisms.

**Loneliness as relational quality (Luhmann):** Maike Luhmann’s research emphasizes that loneliness is not about the number of contacts, but the perceived lack of meaningful, high-quality connections. This project targets compatibility, not contact frequency.

**Spark moments and shared insights (C.S. Lewis, Hall):** While friendship formation typically requires sustained time and interaction (Hall, 2018), research and anecdotal accounts suggest that certain encounters—those involving shared niche interests or deeply held values—can accelerate the process by creating an immediate sense of familiarity. C.S. Lewis described this as the moment of recognition: “What! You too? I thought I was the only one.” This can be understood as an intensified form of homophily—the tendency to spark connect with very similar others—serving as an initial catalyst for disclosure and trust.

**Loss of third places (Oldenburg):** Informal spaces for spontaneous interaction—cafés, libraries, campus corners—are shrinking, especially for students facing high living costs and time pressure. The result is fewer low-barrier social environments and natural encounter opportunities.

**Choice overload and decision paralysis (Iyengar & Lepper):** Too many options can lead to inaction. Social matching that reduces complexity and curates high-potential introductions makes it easier for users to act.

**Friendship as role-based and multidimensional (Langkamp):** Friendships involve different expectations and interaction styles. Effective matching must go beyond shared hobbies to align values, conversational habits, and emotional preferences.

## **Solution Design - Basic User flow**

### **What users do:**

Get link / flyer and click to join  
Fill out questionnaire 1 (interests, social styles, language, etc.)  
(Optionally) Fill out questionnaire 2 (readiness, filters)  
Wait for match (explained as a delay due to batch matching)  
Receive email with match and intro blurb  
Meet for 1 hour (user arranges location)  
(Optionally) give feedback on match quality

### **What they don't do:**

No profile browsing  
No public exposure  
No follow-up algorithm pressure  
No messaging platform required

### **Light explanation of timing:**

First matches expected within ~1-2 weeks of pool filling  
No guarantee of instant match—depends on compatibility and response density

### **Who facilitates what:**

Optional: digital "schmooser" emails  
Optional: local partners (e.g. student union, international center)

## Solution Design - Algorithm Logic

The matching mechanism unfolds in two phases. In each, participating students receive 3-5 carefully selected matches spaced over several weeks. This staged delivery counters decision fatigue and reduces the psychological barrier of choosing from a large, undifferentiated group.

Rather than leaving initial connections to chance—as at a typical university party or orientation event—this system applies structured preselection based on self-reported interests, conversational preferences, and friendship goals.

The matching algorithm operates in three layers:

1. Interest vector scoring: All users rate their interest level (e.g. “curious,” “interested,” “expert”) across ~80 categories. These are normalized and then evaluated via scalar product to find shared affinities, while heavily penalizing uniform “expert” inflation.
2. Friendship preference matching: A secondary layer compares preferred social styles (e.g. object-focused vs. emotionally focused friendships) based on selections derived from the „Practical Friendship” framework.
3. Compatibility filtering: Exclusions by age, gender, location, and availability are applied last.

While there is no rigorous literature quantifying the **baseline probability of platonic compatibility** from random encounters (e.g. at a bar or party), several studies affirm that „shared interests and humor” increase perceived similarity and interaction quality. In the absence of direct data, we estimate the baseline at under 5% for cold approach interactions and hypothesize a multiple-fold increase (e.g. to 20-30% given a large enough sample group) through targeted matching. This figure remains speculative but is directionally supported by user feedback from similar 1:1 matching pilots in social contexts.

To avoid overfitting, early-stage data from the feedback forms and match ratings will be used to evaluate:

1. perceived match quality
2. actual meetup occurrence
3. interest in further interaction

This iterative feedback will refine the weighting of interests, humor, and social preferences in future algorithm versions.

## A feasible future vision

In a more connected university environment, every new student completes a brief onboarding questionnaire during enrollment—providing information on interests, personality traits, and conversational preferences. This data, managed either by the university itself or a trusted third-party service, is used to generate curated matches for 1:1 introductions.

### Phased and Adaptive Matching

Each student receives a first batch of 3–5 high-compatibility matches early in the term. These are not just random peers, but individuals with aligned friendship styles and shared affinities. A second, larger pool of potential matches (e.g. 10–20) is stored and activated over time, depending on interaction feedback or contextual triggers.

### Situational Nudges

During orientation events or campus gatherings, the system can send context-aware nudges: “You’re near someone we think you’ll enjoy meeting.” Optionally, if the university employs trained student connectors, these facilitators can help initiate introductions—restoring the human role of matchmaker where it’s most effective.

### Network Growth Over Time

By the end of week 3, most students will have had structured opportunities to meet 5–10 peers with real potential for friendship—reducing the randomness and stress of social initiation. As preferences evolve during the academic year, profiles are updated and new matches emerge, encouraging continued engagement.

To sustain momentum, institutions can offer monthly “cross-campus lunch pairings”—matching students from different faculties to expand their social landscape and promote interdisciplinary community.

This future is not one of engineered relationships, but of facilitated possibility: a structure that increases the chance of meaningful connection, while leaving space for organic growth.

## Risks and Limits

This intervention is intentionally minimalist—but it still depends on several fragile assumptions. Below are the key risks and limits, grouped by type:

### A. Participation and Critical Mass

The system only works if a sufficiently dense group signs up and participates actively. A cohort of 30 signups with only 10 viable matches (due to incompatibility or dropout) would undermine trust in the system. To avoid this:

Parallel regional launches are necessary to reach a functioning match pool early. Early match quality must be high enough to trigger positive word-of-mouth.

**Failure scenario:** A small, unmatched cohort loses motivation. This results in a self-reinforcing downward spiral in participation and perception.

### B. Activation and Follow-through

Even if students sign up, there's no guarantee they will respond to a match suggestion or show up. This is especially true for:

Students with high social anxiety or prior rejection experiences  
International students unfamiliar with the format  
Users missing emails due to spam filters or burnout

**Failure scenario:** Pings and nudges may help, but beyond a certain point, non-response becomes a design-killing problem.

### C. Overprecision vs. Serendipity

A matching system, by design, selects for similarity or alignment. But friendships often form through unexpected chemistry, shared adversity, or random encounters. Excessive algorithmic precision risks creating predictable, unmemorable interactions and eliminating the “chaotic fun” of social life

### D. Structural Limits - what this project does not solve

Even a good match doesn't guarantee friendship—and poor early experiences may discourage users further. There's no built-in follow-up; users must navigate next steps on their own. The system can't overcome deeper barriers like time pressure, cultural mismatch, or emotional fatigue. **It offers a starting point, not a shortcut**—the real work of friendship still lies ahead.

## Technical Architecture and Workflow

### A modular, privacy-conscious matching prototype

#### System Overview:

The prototype combines LimeSurvey (for data collection) and a Python-based backend (for matching). It is modular, auditable, and can be deployed entirely within a university system—no external hosting required. This allows full institutional control, including closed-network onboarding and full GDPR compliance.

Step	Process	Tools	Notes
<b>Profile Input</b>	Questionnaire 1	LimeSurvey	Interests (0-5), friend style, humor, personality. Generates pseudonymous ID.
<b>Match Readiness</b>	Questionnaire 2	LimeSurvey	Match filters: openness, age/gender/region preferences, group affiliations
<b>Matching</b>	Algorithmic + Optional Manual	Python script	Vector-based matching with scoring logic.
<b>Delivery</b>	Email Notification	Email client (customizable)	Optional human intro via local “digital schmoozer”
<b>Feedback Loop</b>	Match Rating	LimeSurvey	Used to fine-tune future algorithms and evaluate success

#### Key Features:

**GDPR-first:** No personal identifiers stored. Users are anonymous to each other until they choose to connect.

**Modular:** Each component (survey, match logic, delivery) can be swapped or scaled independently.

**Deployable in-house:** Designed for easy integration into university IT ecosystems.

## Evaluation Plan for Funders and Institutional Partners

### Goal:

Show that this project tracks success, learns iteratively, and can scale responsibly. Focus on measurable user engagement and system performance.

### Pilot Evaluation: Match Quality and User Experience

Pilot cohort: 60–80 participants in one university town

Primary method: Post-match user feedback (quantitative + qualitative)

Metric	Target	Measurement Method
Match completion (not ghosted)	≥ 70%	Email delivery + user confirm
Self-rated "Good Match" (4–5/5)	≥ 50%	Feedback form
Self-rated "Very Good Match" (5/5)	≥ 20%	Feedback form
Feedback form response rate	≥ 40%	Platform analytics
Second match completion	≥ 50%	Feedback form
Third match completion	≥ 40%	Feedback form

All data is pseudonymized. No names, photos, or private info stored. Participation in feedback is optional.

### Engagement as Proxy Signal

- who follow through with at least one meetup
- who request a second match
- Opt-in rates for follow-up features (e.g. group coffee, stranger lunch)
- Drop-off pattern analysis: Are highly lonely or less social users failing to engage?

### How Feedback Is Used

- Immediate: Improve algorithm scoring (e.g. interests vs. humor balance)
- Mid-term: Adjust onboarding / framing language
- Long-term: Identify which user subgroups benefit most

## Evaluation Plan for Research Collaboration and Dataset Preparation

### Goal:

Explore whether structured 1:1 matching measurably reduces loneliness and enhances perceived social connection—while building an open, anonymized dataset for future study.

### Voluntary Pre/Post Self-Assessment:

Collected before first match and again after 4 weeks

Domain	Tool / Format
Loneliness Symptoms	Gierveld 11
Quality of social ties	Adapted network satisfaction
Social needs	Max Neef Questions
Opt Sense of belonging	
Opt Behavioural indicators	Frequency of interaction, Invitations received

### Dropout & Inactivity Analysis

Cross-tab engagement (or non-engagement) with baseline loneliness scores:

- Do highly lonely participants engage less?
- Do positive match experiences change follow-up behavior?
- Are there early predictors of retention?

### Dataset Notes

- Pseudonymized ID for all participants
- Matching variables + pre/post responses stored as structured vectors
- All open comments anonymized and categorized
- Dataset intended for open sharing with institutional ethics clearance (2026)

### Future Research Questions

- Does pre-match loneliness predict match quality perception?
- Can similarity of humor or conversational goals outweigh shared interests?
- How do social needs (Max-Neef categories) relate to match satisfaction and friendship preferences?

## Ethical, Legal, and Data Governance

### Data Protection (GDPR)

- All user data is pseudonymized and collected via GDPR-compliant LimeSurvey infrastructure.
- No names, contact information, or biometric data are collected.
- Participation is entirely consent-based. A clear, transparent data protection statement is presented before data collection begins.
- No data is shared with commercial third parties or external platforms.
- For institutional deployments, data storage and processing can occur fully in-house, ensuring data never leaves the university or school network.

### Ethics Position

There is currently no university ethics approval, as the project operates outside an academic affiliation. However, the system is built to meet academic ethical standards in spirit and practice. Constructive advice for further improvement is highly welcome ([talktothatone@initiative-gemeinsamkeit.de](mailto:talktothatone@initiative-gemeinsamkeit.de))

The matching process is part of a living prototype, with the possibility to adjust match parameters or survey items as feedback is received.

All data collected is intended to support future scientific research and, once anonymized further, may be shared as part of an open-source dataset for transparency and replication.

## Operational Responsibility and Safeguards

### Oversight during 2025 Pilot

- All operational and legal responsibility during the 2025 pilot lies with **Initiative GemEinsamkeit**, a registered nonprofit association (gemeinnützige UG) under German law.
- Match delivery, participant communication, and system monitoring are managed through a LimeSurvey + Python-based backend.
- Data is stored and processed in compliance with GDPR, hosted under German jurisdiction.
- All user inquiries or safety concerns can be directed to: [talktothatone@initiative-gemeinsamkeit.de](mailto:talktothatone@initiative-gemeinsamkeit.de)\*\*
- **Known limitation:** The system is currently maintained by a single lead organizer. While this is manageable for a pilot cohort, **scaling would require institutional or volunteer support**, particularly for user-facing roles (e.g. match delivery, safety response, support triage).

### Strategic Partnerships for scaling

We are actively seeking nonprofit-aligned tech collaborators who:

- Share our values of privacy, psychological safety, and public benefit
- Respect our need to retain core intellectual property and steering control
- Can help us develop stable, audit-ready components for use in schools, universities, and civic programs

Partnerships may involve co-development, hosting, or modular tool integration—always grounded in a shared commitment to ethical, user-first deployment.

## A little request at the end

We hope the content of this booklet has been helpful to you and that you find a few more ideas to try out in the coming year. We also want to help other people, and for that, we need your assistance in three ways:

### 1. Spread the Word:

If you feel ready, talk to others about loneliness and share the materials that have helped you—conversations, links, this booklet, or anything else.

### 2. Provide Feedback:

Let us know what has been particularly helpful to you. What effective methods have you found in your environment that we might not be aware of? In which places were you best able to reduce your loneliness and establish connections? We maintain a map of such welcoming places and would love to hear more tips. <https://initiative-gemeinsamkeit.de/kontaktgelegenheiten/>

### 3. Share Your Thoughts:

For written feedback or anything else, feel free to email us at:

Initiative GemEinsamkeit  
Gaisbergstr. 43, 69115 Heidelberg  
[hallo@initiative-gemeinsamkeit.de](mailto:hallo@initiative-gemeinsamkeit.de)

## About us

The Initiative GemEinsamkeit is a small NGO with the aim of creating a knowledge and networking platform for practical, applied work on loneliness. Globally and in Germany, there are already numerous projects that have helped lonely people and fostered sociability and high-quality friendships. Through building our network and ongoing discussions with our partners, we aim to:

1. Collect promising, ready-to-use approaches.
2. Discuss them in suitable online and in-person formats.
3. Provide professional support for their implementation in pilot projects and gather feedback.
4. Aggregate these approaches into a comprehensible, publicly accessible, and continuously evolving collection (Open Educational Resource).
5. Distribute finalized ready-to-use approaches within our network.

We do not conduct our own scientific research, as scientific research and societal analysis are already comprehensively and excellently carried out by the European research network "Loneliness in Europe" and the Kompetenznetzwerk Einsamkeit mandated by the Federal Government / BMFSJ through 2026. Our role is to support the third and final step: integrating analytical results with practical experiences and "packaging" them into ready-to-use guidelines. In this way, we aim to contribute to addressing loneliness in Germany.

We currently finance our activities through thank-you donations from institutions that use our templates free of charge, speaking fees for online or in-person presentations on workplace loneliness and private contributions of the team. Otherwise, we strive to operate with a minimal footprint.

If you or your company have the opportunity to make a direct, unrestricted donation, we recommend recipients such as the telephone hotlines like krisenchat or Mutes or any of the new initiatives addressing youth loneliness in response to the latest statistics published in 2024.

## Material current and in preparation

### Current Leaflets / mostly in German

1. Wege finden aus der Einsamkeit (Betroffene, German)  
Advice for lonely people
2. Wege zeigen aus der Einsamkeit (Helfen im Privatumfeld, German)  
Advice how to assist lonely people in one's own private surrounding
3. Wege gestalten aus der Einsamkeit (Helfen im Ehrenamt, German)  
Advice how to assist lonely people in various forms of charitable work
4. Finding ways out of Loneliness (Non-German speaking in Germany, English)

### In Preparation or under Discussion / Concept phase

1. Evaluation und Evidenzbewertung (German, sufficient material on Evaluation of evidence of measures has been published in English by Campaign to End Loneliness and Foundation for Social Connection)
2. Recipe book for social connection - collection of ideas - under development - draft under development online (Rezeptbuch)
3. Toolbox (quite literally) for social connection - draft under development online (Werkzeugkoffer)
4. Kleine Freundschaftslehre (we do not need to write a small primer for making friends, because it has been written - the friendship formula by Shumway)
5. Wege Finden - Additional advice collections for focus groups whose special situation could not be adequately covered in the general leaflet „Wege Finden“ (Lonely parents, the very old, LGBTQ, Youth, migrants and refugees)

