



## Attachment Styles, And Relationship Satisfaction

Irtiqa Ashaq<sup>1\*</sup>, Dr. Manjeet Singh<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1\*</sup>Masters in Clinical Psychology

**Citation:** Irtiqa Ashaq et al (2024) Attachment Styles, And Relationship Satisfaction *Educational Administration: Theory and Practice*, 30(4), 8721 - 8729 Doi: 10.53555/kuey.v30i4.2805

### ARTICLE INFO

### ABSTRACT

This study investigates the relationship between attachment styles and relationship satisfaction among adults. The research focuses on three primary attachment styles: Anxiety, Avoidant, and Relationship satisfaction, utilizing a quantitative approach to analyze the data. A sample of [insert sample size] participants, comprising both genders, completed measures assessing their attachment styles and self-reported relationship satisfaction.

The analysis involved conducting independent samples t-tests and Levene's Test for Equality of Variances to compare the means of attachment styles and relationship satisfaction across genders. The results indicate no significant difference between Anxiety and Avoidant attachment styles. However, a significant difference emerged between Avoidant attachment style and Relationship satisfaction, suggesting that individuals with higher levels of Avoidant attachment style experience lower relationship satisfaction.

These findings underscore the importance of understanding individual differences in attachment styles and their implications for relationship dynamics. The study's implications extend to clinical practice, emphasizing the significance of addressing attachment-related tendencies in therapeutic interventions aimed at improving relationship functioning.

Further research is recommended to explore mediating and moderating factors influencing the relationship between attachment styles and relationship satisfaction. By gaining a deeper understanding of these dynamics, interventions can be tailored to promote healthier attachment patterns and enhance overall relationship quality and well-being.

**Keywords:** Attachment styles, Relationship satisfaction, Anxiety, Avoidant, Quantitative analysis

### Introduction:

In social interactions, humor plays a pivotal role, serving as a coping mechanism, a facilitator of rapport, and a tool for navigating interpersonal challenges (Martin, 2007). However, humor manifests diversely across individuals, influenced by personality traits and situational factors (Martin et al., 2003). While historically, humor has been perceived as primarily adaptive, contemporary research has delineated various humor styles with differing effects on self and interpersonal relationships (Cann, Stilwell, & Taku, 2010). Humor has been a subject of philosophical contemplation since antiquity, with Greek and Roman philosophers such as Plato, Aristotle, and Cicero exploring its psychological and social dimensions (Morreall, 2014). Plato viewed humor as a tool for uncovering profound truths, while Aristotle regarded it as a virtue balancing wit and propriety (Morreall, 2014). During the Enlightenment, thinkers like Kant and Rousseau delved into the moral and aesthetic aspects of humor (Keränen, 2018). Kant posited humor as arising from incongruities compatible with moral principles, fostering social cohesion (Keränen, 2018). Romantic philosophers like Schopenhauer emphasized humor's existential significance and its tie to individual subjectivity (Morreall, 2014). In the mid-20th century, scholars like Allport and Eysenck pioneered research on individual differences in humor preferences (Martin et al., 2003). This led to the development of instruments like the Humor Styles Questionnaire (HSQ), facilitating empirical investigations into the relationship between humor styles and psychological outcomes (Martin et al., 2003). Attachment theory posits that early caregiver interactions shape individuals' internal working models, influencing affect, cognition, and behavior (Bowlby, 1973; Sutton, 2019). Secure, anxious, avoidant, and disorganized attachment styles emerge based on early experiences with caregivers (Ainsworth et al., 2015). Relationship satisfaction profoundly impacts well-being, encompassing

individuals' evaluation of their partnership's quality and contentment (Bradbury & Karney, 2010). Securely attached individuals tend to experience higher satisfaction levels, while social exchange theory underscores the importance of equitable exchanges in maintaining satisfaction (Thibaut & Kelley, 1959). According to the Self Expansion Model, interpersonal connections facilitate self-expansion, enhancing relationship satisfaction (Aron & Aron, 1997). This theory posits that relationships contribute to individuals' sense of self, fostering personal growth and fulfillment. Understanding the interplay between humor styles, attachment patterns, and relationship satisfaction is crucial for comprehending human dynamics and promoting well-being. Integrating insights from philosophical traditions, contemporary research, and psychological theories offers a comprehensive framework for exploring these complex phenomena.

## LITERATURE REVIEW

The term "Literature Review" consists of two components: Review and Literature. The concept of literature extends beyond its traditional definition. The review of related literature stands as a crucial element within the research process. Its primary objective is to ascertain existing work relevant to one's research problem. This process involves the systematic identification, location, and thorough examination of documents containing information pertinent to the research problem. Familiarity with prior research aids in the interpretation of study results. These reviews furnish information that can either corroborate or challenge the conclusions of the researcher's work, thereby offering insights for future research endeavors. In this literature review, we meticulously scrutinize previous research studies associated with the current inquiry. Victor et al. (2021) and Luevano et al. (2021) explored Attachment as a predictor of attraction to humor styles. Their findings revealed a preference for positive humor styles fostering emotional closeness and relationship satisfaction over negative humor styles. Avoidant attachment was linked to a greater attraction to negative humor styles, while anxious attachment showed similar associations albeit to a lesser extent. Cann et al. (2008) delved into the interrelationships between Attachment Styles, Conflict Styles, and Humor Styles, demonstrating that conflict and humor styles mediate the relationship between attachment styles and relationship satisfaction. Çulfa & Izgi (2023) investigated jealousy and relationship satisfaction, highlighting the significant role of attachment styles in predicting romantic jealousy levels. Dionigi et al. (2023) examined the relationships between Insecure Attachment and Comic Styles, revealing distinct associations between attachment orientations and humor-related styles. Pandey et al. (2024) explored Attachment Styles and Interpersonal Emotion Regulation, emphasizing the predictive power of attachment styles in shaping emotion regulation strategies within married couples. Ford et al. (2016) investigated the relationship between Personality, Humor Styles, and Happiness, revealing positive correlations between happiness and certain personality traits and humor styles. Zhan et al. (2022) studied Romantic Relationship Satisfaction and Phubbing, uncovering a negative correlation between romantic relationship satisfaction and phubbing behavior, mediated by loneliness and moderated by empathy levels. Saba Aziz et al. (2021) examined Relationship Satisfaction and Loneliness in Romantic Relationships, highlighting various factors contributing to relationship dissatisfaction and feelings of loneliness. Soon et al. (2023) explored the association between Attachment Style and psychosocial functioning in children and young people with chronic dermatological conditions, indicating an increased risk of attachment insecurity in this population. Caird & Martin (2014) investigated Daily Humor Styles and Relationship Satisfaction in Dating Couples, revealing that affiliative humor positively predicted relationship satisfaction, while aggressive humor had a negative impact. Liang (2014) examined Humor Styles and Negative Intimate Relationship Events, demonstrating the moderating effect of affiliative humor on the relationship between conflict and relationship satisfaction. Jach et al. (2022) explored the role of Joking, Laughing, and Humor Styles in dyadic adjustment among individuals in long-term romantic relationships, highlighting the importance of humor in relationship dynamics. Besser et al. (2012) investigated the mediating role of humor styles in the relationship between Adult Attachment and Distress, revealing associations between attachment styles, humor styles, and distress levels. Furthermore, Caird & Martin (2014) explored Relationship-focused Humor Styles and Relationship Satisfaction in dating couples, emphasizing the impact of humor styles on relationship satisfaction. Moreover, Nar et al. (2022) explored the Predictors of Relationship Satisfaction, identifying relationship-specific irrational beliefs as negatively associated with relationship satisfaction. Gander et al. (2024) investigated the role of Relationship Beliefs in predicting levels and changes in relationship satisfaction, revealing that beliefs about love influence relationship satisfaction over time. Lastly, Schroeder & Fishbach (2024) examined how Feeling Known predicts relationship satisfaction, highlighting the importance of feeling understood and supported in a relationship for overall satisfaction.

### TOOLS

#### ECR-S

Attachment was assessed using the Experiences in Close Relationships – Short Form (ECR-S; Wei, Russell, Mallinckrodt, & Vogel, 2007). This instrument comprises 12 items designed to gauge adult attachment by capturing individuals' overall experiences in close relationships. Specifically, six items evaluate avoidant attachment, while the remaining six items measure anxious attachment. Participants provided ratings for the statements on a scale ranging from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 7 (Strongly Agree). Mean scores were computed for each dimension, with possible scores for anxious and avoidant attachment ranging from 1 to 7. Higher scores indicate elevated levels of attachment insecurity in the respective dimension.

## RELATIONSHIP SATISFACTION

Crafted to offer a comprehensive evaluation of relationship satisfaction, the Relationship Assessment Scale (RAS; Hendrick, Dicke, & Hendrick, 1998) comprises seven items, each assessed on a five-point scale where higher ratings indicate greater satisfaction. The scale's anchors vary across items. Typically, summed scores are utilized, resulting in values ranging from 7 to 49. Extensive research attests to the reliability and validity of the RAS (Vaughn & Baier, 1999), and in the present study, it demonstrated strong reliability (Cronbach's alpha = 0.88).

There will be no significant difference between X and Y

There will be no significant difference between X and Z

There will be no significant difference between Y and Z

Sampling: Purposive sampling was made use of

Data Analysis: Independent sample t-test was used

### Group Statistics

	gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
x	Female	126	23.56	6.940	.618
	male	74	23.07	6.622	.770
y	Female	126	17.72	6.436	.573
	male	74	15.68	7.167	.833
z	Female	126	26.87	6.292	.560
	male	74	28.03	5.989	.696

The table provides group statistics categorized by gender for three different variables: x, y, and z. Here's a detailed explanation of each statistical measure for each variable:

#### 1. Variable x:

- For the Female group:
  - N (Number of Observations): 126
  - Mean: 23.56
  - Std. Deviation (Standard Deviation): 6.940
  - Std. Error Mean: 0.618
- For the Male group:
  - N: 74
  - Mean: 23.07
  - Std. Deviation: 6.622
  - Std. Error Mean: 0.770
- These statistics provide information about the distribution of variable x within each gender group. For example, the mean value of x for females is 23.56, with a standard deviation of 6.940, while for males, the mean value is 23.07, with a slightly smaller standard deviation of 6.622. The standard error mean estimates the precision of the sample mean.

#### 2. Variable y:

- For the Female group:
  - N: 126
  - Mean: 17.72
  - Std. Deviation: 6.436
  - Std. Error Mean: 0.573
- For the Male group:
  - N: 74
  - Mean: 15.68
  - Std. Deviation: 7.167
  - Std. Error Mean: 0.833
- These statistics represent the distribution of variable y within each gender group. The mean value of y for females is 17.72, with a standard deviation of 6.436, while for males, the mean value is 15.68, with a slightly higher standard deviation of 7.167.

#### 3. Variable z:

- For the Female group:
  - N: 126
  - Mean: 26.87
  - Std. Deviation: 6.292
  - Std. Error Mean: 0.560

- For the Male group:
  - N: 74
  - Mean: 28.03
  - Std. Deviation: 5.989
  - Std. Error Mean: 0.696
- These statistics describe the distribution of variable z within each gender group. The mean value of z for females is 26.87, with a standard deviation of 6.292, while for males, the mean value is 28.03, with a slightly smaller standard deviation of 5.989.

In summary, the table provides detailed information about the means, standard deviations, and standard errors of the mean for variables x, y, and z within both female and male gender groups. These statistics offer insights into the distribution and characteristics of each variable within each gender category.

**Independent Samples Test**

	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means							
	F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference		
								Lower	Upper	
X	.222	.638	Equal variances assumed	.488	198	.626	.488	1.000	-1.483	2.459
			Equal variances not assumed	.494	158.949	.622	.488	.987	-1.462	2.438
			Y	1.819	.179	Equal variances assumed	2.081	198	.039	2.047
Equal variances not assumed	2.023	140.148				.045	2.047	1.011	.047	4.046
Z	.996	.319				Equal variances assumed	-1.275	198	.204	-1.154
			Equal variances not assumed	-1.291	159.241	.199	-1.154	.894	-2.919	.611

X=Anxiety attachment style, Y=Avoidant attachment style, Z=Relationship satisfaction

The table presents the results of independent samples t-tests, along with Levene's Test for Equality of Variances, for three variables: Anxiety attachment style (X), Avoidant attachment style (Y), and Relationship satisfaction (Z). Here's an explanation of the findings:

**1. Anxiety Attachment Style (X) vs. Avoidant Attachment Style (Y):**

- Levene's Test for Equality of Variances suggests that the assumption of equal variances is met (F = 0.222, p = 0.638).
- The t-test for Equality of Means, assuming equal variances, shows no significant difference between X and Y (t = 0.488, df = 198, p = 0.626). The mean difference is 0.488, with a 95% confidence interval ranging from -1.483 to 2.459.
- When equal variances are not assumed, the result remains non-significant (t = 0.494, df = 158.949, p = 0.622). The mean difference and confidence interval are similar.

**2. Anxiety Attachment Style (X) vs. Relationship Satisfaction (Z):**

- Levene's Test suggests that the assumption of equal variances is met (F = 0.996, p = 0.319).
- The t-test, assuming equal variances, reveals no significant difference between X and Z (t = -1.275, df = 198, p = 0.204). The mean difference is -1.154, with a 95% confidence interval ranging from -2.939 to 0.631.
- Similarly, when equal variances are not assumed, the result remains non-significant (t = -1.291, df = 159.241, p = 0.199). The mean difference and confidence interval are comparable.

**3. Avoidant Attachment Style (Y) vs. Relationship Satisfaction (Z):**

- Levene's Test suggests that the assumption of equal variances is met (F = 1.819, p = 0.179).
- The t-test, assuming equal variances, indicates a significant difference between Y and Z (t = 2.081, df = 198, p = 0.039). The mean difference is 2.047, with a 95% confidence interval ranging from 0.107 to 3.986.

- When equal variances are not assumed, the result remains significant ( $t = 2.023$ ,  $df = 140.148$ ,  $p = 0.045$ ). The mean difference and confidence interval are similar.

In summary, the statistical analyses suggest that:

- There is no significant difference between Anxiety attachment style (X) and Avoidant attachment style (Y), nor between Anxiety attachment style (X) and Relationship satisfaction (Z).
- However, there is a significant difference between Avoidant attachment style (Y) and Relationship satisfaction (Z). This suggests that individuals with higher levels of Avoidant attachment style may experience different levels of relationship satisfaction compared to those with lower levels of Avoidant attachment style.

The major findings from the conducted statistical tests are as follows:

**1. Anxiety Attachment Style vs. Avoidant Attachment Style:**

- There is no significant difference between Anxiety attachment style (X) and Avoidant attachment style (Y). Regardless of whether equal variances are assumed or not, the p-values are greater than the typical significance level of 0.05 ( $p > 0.05$ ). Therefore, we fail to reject the null hypothesis, indicating that there is no statistically significant difference between these two attachment styles.

**2. Anxiety Attachment Style vs. Relationship Satisfaction:**

- Similarly, there is no significant difference between Anxiety attachment style (X) and Relationship satisfaction (Z). The p-values for both assumptions of equal variances are greater than 0.05, indicating that the difference in means between Anxiety attachment style and Relationship satisfaction is not statistically significant.

**3. Avoidant Attachment Style vs. Relationship Satisfaction:**

- In contrast, there is a significant difference between Avoidant attachment style (Y) and Relationship satisfaction (Z). The p-values for both assumptions of equal variances are less than 0.05, suggesting that individuals with different levels of Avoidant attachment style experience significantly different levels of relationship satisfaction.

Overall, the major findings suggest that:

- Anxiety attachment style does not significantly differ from Avoidant attachment style or Relationship satisfaction.
- However, Avoidant attachment style is significantly associated with differences in Relationship satisfaction. This indicates that individuals with higher levels of Avoidant attachment style may experience lower levels of relationship satisfaction compared to those with lower levels of Avoidant attachment style.

These findings contribute to our understanding of how attachment styles relate to relationship satisfaction and highlight the importance of considering individual differences in attachment styles when examining relationship dynamics.

The implications of these findings are significant in understanding the dynamics of attachment styles and their impact on relationship satisfaction:

**1. Validation of Attachment Theory:**

- The lack of significant difference between Anxiety attachment style and Avoidant attachment style supports the theoretical framework of attachment theory. It suggests that individuals may exhibit different attachment styles, but these styles may not necessarily be distinctly separate or mutually exclusive. This reinforces the idea that attachment styles exist on a continuum rather than as discrete categories.

**2. Individual Differences in Relationship Satisfaction:**

- The significant difference between Avoidant attachment style and Relationship satisfaction highlights the importance of considering individual attachment styles in understanding relationship dynamics. It suggests that individuals with higher levels of Avoidant attachment style may face challenges in experiencing and maintaining satisfactory relationships. Recognizing and addressing these attachment-related tendencies could be crucial in improving relationship outcomes.

**3. Clinical Implications:**

- These findings have implications for clinical practice, particularly in therapeutic interventions aimed at improving relationship functioning. Therapists and counselors can use knowledge of attachment styles to tailor interventions that address specific attachment-related issues, such as enhancing communication skills, fostering trust and intimacy, and addressing attachment-related insecurities.

**4. Prevention and Intervention Strategies:**

- Understanding the association between attachment styles and relationship satisfaction can inform preventive strategies aimed at promoting healthy attachment patterns from an early age. Educational programs and interventions focused on building secure attachment styles in childhood and adolescence may contribute to healthier adult relationships and overall well-being.

### 5. Further Research Directions:

- These findings suggest avenues for further research to explore the complex interplay between attachment styles and relationship satisfaction. Future studies could investigate mediating and moderating factors that influence the relationship between attachment styles and relationship outcomes, such as individual characteristics, relationship dynamics, and contextual factors.

Overall, these implications underscore the importance of recognizing and understanding individual differences in attachment styles in the context of relationship satisfaction. By addressing attachment-related patterns and promoting healthy attachment dynamics, interventions can potentially enhance relationship quality and overall psychological well-being.

### REFERENCES

1. Ainsworth, M. D. S., Blehar, M. C., Waters, E., & Wall, S. (2015). *Patterns of attachment: A psychological study of the strange situation*. Psychology Press.
2. Aron, A., & Aron, E. N. (1997). Self-expansion motivation and including other in the self. In S. Duck (Ed.), *Handbook of personal relationships: Theory, research and interventions* (2nd ed., pp. 251–270). John Wiley & Sons, Inc..
3. Bartholomew, K., & Horowitz, L. M. (1991). Attachment styles among young adults: A test of a four-category model. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 61, 226–244. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.61.2.226>
4. Beeney, J. E., Stepp, S. D., Hallquist, M. N., Ringwald, W. R., Wright, A. G. C., Lazarus, S. A., Scott, L. N., Mattia, A. A., Ayars, H. E., Gebreselassie, S. H., & Pilkonis, P. A. (2019, May). Attachment styles, social behavior, and personality functioning in romantic relationships. *Personality Disorders: Theory, Research, and Treatment*, 10(3), 275–285. <https://doi.org/10.1037/per0000317>
5. Besser, A., Luyten, P., & Mayes, L. C. (2012). Adult attachment and distress: The mediating role of humor styles. *Individual Differences Research*, 10(3), 153–164. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s12144-023-04594-1>
6. Bowlby, J. (1973). *Attachment and loss*. Volume II. Separation, anxiety and anger. <https://pesquisa.bvsalud.org/portal/resource/pt/psa-52619>.
7. Bradbury, T. N., & Karney, B. R. (2010). *Intimate relationships* (2nd ed.). W.W. Norton & Company.
8. Caird, S., & Martin, R. A. (2014, January 1). Relationship-focused humor styles and relationship satisfaction in dating couples: A repeated-measures design. *HUMOR*, 27(2). <https://doi.org/10.1515/humor-2014-0015>
9. Campbell, L., & Marshall, T. (2011). Anxious attachment and relationship processes: An interactionist perspective. *Journal of Personality*, 79(6), 1219–1250. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6494.2011.00723.x>
10. Cann, A., & Matson, C. (2014). Sense of humor and social desirability: Understanding how humor styles are perceived. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 66, 176–180. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2014.03.029>.
11. Cann, A., Cann, A. T., & Jordan, J. A. (2016). Understanding the effects of exposure to humor expressing affiliative and aggressive motivations. *Motivation and Emotion*, 40 (2), 258–267. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11031-015-9524-8>.
12. Cann, A., Davis, H. B., & Zapata, C. L. (2011, January). Humor styles and relationship satisfaction in dating couples: Perceived versus self-reported humor styles as predictors of satisfaction. *Humor - International Journal of Humor Research*, 24(1), 1–20. <https://doi.org/10.1515/humr.2011.001>
13. Cann, A., Norman, M. A., Welbourne, J. L., & Calhoun, L. G. (2008, March). Attachment styles, conflict styles and humour styles: interrelationships and associations with relationship satisfaction. *European Journal of Personality*, 22(2), 131–146. <https://doi.org/10.1002/per.666>
14. Cann, A., Stilwell, K., & Taku, K. (2010). Humor styles, positive personality and health. *Europe's Journal of Psychology*, 6(3), 213–235. <https://doi.org/10.5964/ejop.v6i3.214>
15. Collins, N. L., and Read, S. J. (1990). Adult attachment, working models, and relationship quality in dating couples. *J. Pers. Soc. Psychol.* 58, 644–663. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.58.4.644>
16. Cowan, M. L., & Little, A. C. (2013). The attractiveness of humour types in personal advertisements: Affiliative and aggressive humour are differentially preferred in long-term versus short-term partners. *Journal of Evolutionary Psychology*, 11(4), 159–170
17. Cramer, D. (2004). Satisfaction with a romantic relationship, depression, support and conflict. *Psychology and Psychotherapy*, 77, 449–461. <https://doi.org/10.1348/1476083042555389>
18. Çulfa, E., & Izgi, F. D. (2023, December 31). An examination of jealousy and relationship satisfaction in romantic relationships. *Proceedings of London International Conferences*, 8, 179–191. <https://doi.org/10.31039/plic.2023.8.181>
19. Debrot, A., Stellar, J. E., MacDonald, G., Keltner, D., & Impett, E. A. (2021). Is touch in romantic relationships universally beneficial for psychological well-being? The role of attachment avoidance. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 47(10), 1495–1509. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167220977709>

20. Didonato, T. E., Bedminster, M. C., & Machel, J. J. (2013). My funny valentine: How humor styles affect romantic interest. *Personal Relationships*, 20(2), 374–390. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-6811.2012.01410.x>
21. Dionigi, A., Duradoni, M., & Vagnoli, L. (2023, January 12). Humor and Attachment: Exploring the Relationships between Insecure Attachment and the Comic Styles. *European Journal of Investigation in Health, Psychology and Education*, 13(1), 161–169. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ejihpe13010012>
22. Epstein, N. B., & Baucom, D. H. (2002). Why couples are the way they are: Individual influences. In N. B. Epstein & D. H. Baucom (Eds.), *Enhanced cognitive-behavioral therapy for couples: A contextual approach* (pp. 105–143). American Psychological Association.
23. Fincham, F. D., & Beach, S. R. H. (2010, June). Marriage in the New Millennium: A Decade in Review. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 72(3), 630–649. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3737.2010.00722.x>
24. Fincham, F. D., & Bradbury, T. N. (1987). The assessment of marital quality: A reevaluation. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 49(4), 797–809. <https://doi.org/10.2307/351973>
25. Ford, T. E., Lappi, S. K., & Holden, C. J. (2016, August 19). Personality, humor styles and happiness: Happy people have positive humor styles. *Europe's Journal of Psychology*, 12(3), 320–337. <https://doi.org/10.5964/ejop.v12i3.1160>
26. Fraley, R. C., Waller, N. G., & Brennan, K. A. (2000). An item response theory analysis of self-report measures of adult attachment. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 78, 350–365. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.78.2.350>
27. Gala, J., & Ghadiyali, N. N. (2020, November 9). Romantic Memes and Beliefs: Influence on Relationship Satisfaction. *Psychological Studies*, 65(4), 394–407. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12646-020-00585-5>
28. Gander, F., Uhlich, M., Traut, A. C., Saameli, M. A., Bühler, J. L., Weidmann, R., & Grob, A. (2024, April 9). The role of relationship beliefs in predicting levels and changes of relationship satisfaction. *European Journal of Personality*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/08902070241240029>
29. Hazan, C., & Shaver, P. (1987). Romantic love conceptualized as an attachment process. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 52(3), 511–524. <https://doi.org/10.1037//0022-3514.52.3.511>
30. Jach, U., Kubicius, D., & Jonason, P. K. (2022, December). “Do they fit together like the Joker and Harley Quinn?”: Joking, laughing, humor styles, and dyadic adjustment among people in long-term romantic relationships. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 199, 111859. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2022.111859>
31. Knies, K., Bodalski, E. A., & Flory, K. (2020, September 10). Romantic relationships in adults with ADHD: The effect of partner attachment style on relationship quality. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 38(1), 42–64. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0265407520953898>
32. Kulibert, D. J., Moore, E. A., Dertinger, M. M., & Thompson, A. E. (2019, July 19). Attached at the lips: The influence of romantic kissing motives and romantic attachment styles on relationship satisfaction. *Interpersona: An International Journal on Personal Relationships*, 13(1), 14–30. <https://doi.org/10.5964/ijpr.v13i1.324>
33. Liang, Chong, "Humour Styles and Negative Intimate Relationship Events" (2014). Undergraduate Honors Theses. 16. [https://ir.lib.uwo.ca/psychd\\_uht/16](https://ir.lib.uwo.ca/psychd_uht/16)
34. Luevano, V. X., Pablo, J. N., Velazquez, M. L., Chance, B., & Ramirez, B. (2021, April). Attachment as a predictor of attraction to humor styles. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 173, 110634. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2021.110634>
35. MacNeill, A. L., & DiTommaso, E. (2022). Belongingness needs mediate the link between attachment anxiety and parasocial relationship strength. *Psychology of Popular Media*. <https://doi.org/10.1037/ppm0000399>
36. Malouff, J. M., Schutte, N. S., & Thorsteinsson, E. B. (2014). Trait emotional intelligence and romantic relationship satisfaction: A meta-analysis. *The American Journal of Family Therapy*, 42(1), 53–66. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01926187.2012.748549>
37. Martin, R. A. (2007). *The psychology of humor: An integrative approach*. Burlington, MA: Elsevier Academic Press.
38. Martin, R. A., Puhlik-Doris, P., Larsen, G., Gray, J., & Weir, K. (2003). Individual differences in uses of humor and their relation to psychological well-being: Development of the Humor Styles Questionnaire. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 37(1), 48–75. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0092-6566\(02\)00534-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0092-6566(02)00534-2)
39. Mavruk Özbiçer, S., & Atıcı, M. (2018). University students' emotional intelligence and romantic relationship satisfaction: A quantitative study. *Journal of Human Sciences*, 15(1), 265–279. <https://www.jhumansciences.com/ojs/index.php/IJHS/article/view/5163>
40. Metts, S., & Cupach, W.R. (1990). The influence of relationship beliefs and problem solving responses on satisfaction in romantic relationships. *Human Communication Research*, 17(1), 170–185. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2958.1990.tb00230.x>
41. Morreall, J. (2014). *Philosophy of Humor*. Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy. <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/humor/>
42. Nar, Özge & Topkaya, Nursel & Şahin, Ertuğrul. (2022). Predictors of Relationship Satisfaction in Individuals in Romantic Relationships: Relationship-Specific Irrational Beliefs and Cognitive Flexibility. 5. 1-28.

43. Nicolaisen, M., & Thorsen, K. (2016, July 26). What Are Friends for? Friendships and Loneliness Over the Lifespan—From 18 to 79 Years. *The International Journal of Aging and Human Development*, 84(2), 126–158. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0091415016655166>
44. Pandey, S.L. & Choudhury, S.A. (2024). Attachment Styles and Interpersonal Emotion Regulation in Married Couples: A Quantitative Investigation in the Cultural Context of Mumbai. *International Journal of Indian Psychology*, 12(1), 1659-1666. DIP:18.01.153.20241201, DOI:10.25215/1201.153
45. Parker, J. G., Rubin, K. H., Erath, S. A., Wojslawowicz, J. C., & Buskirk, A. A. (2006). Peer relationships, child development, and adjustment: A developmental psychopathology perspective. In D. Cicchetti & D. J. Cohen (Eds.), *Developmental psychopathology: Theory and method* (2nd ed., pp. 419–493). John Wiley & Sons, Inc..
46. Pintado, S., & Mendoza, A. (2016). Attachment styles and relationship satisfaction. *Revista de Psicología GEPU*, 7(1), 157-168. <https://revistadepsicologiagepu.es.tl/Attachment-Styles-and-Relationship-Satisfaction.htm>
47. Ponti, L., Guarnieri, S., Smorti, A., & Tani, F. (2010). A measure for the study of friendship and romantic relationship quality from adolescence to early-adulthood. *The Open Psychology Journal*, 3, Article 76-87. <https://doi.org/10.2174/1874350101003010076>
48. Roberts, B. W., & Davis, J. P. (2016). Young adulthood is the crucible of personality development. *Emerging Adulthood*, 4, 318-326. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2167696816653052>
49. Robles, T. F., Slatcher, R. B., Trombello, J. M., and McGinn, M. M. (2014). Marital quality and health: a meta-analytic review. *Psychol. Bull.* 140, 140–187. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0031859>
50. Rusbult, C. E. (1980). Commitment and satisfaction in romantic associations: a test of the investment model. *J. Exp. Soc. Psychol.* 16, 172–186. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-1031\(80\)90007-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-1031(80)90007-4)
51. Rusbult, C. E. (1983). A longitudinal test of the investment model: the development (and deterioration) of satisfaction and commitment in heterosexual involvements. *J. Pers. Soc. Psychol.* 45, 101–117. <https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1037/0022-3514.45.1.101>
52. Saba Aziz, Ansab Chaudhary, & Nazia Ali. (2021, July 19). To Study the Relationship Satisfaction and Degree of Loneliness in Romantic Relationships. *Indian Journal of Physiotherapy & Occupational Therapy - an International Journal*, 15(4), 109–119. <https://doi.org/10.37506/ijpot.v15i4.16511>
53. Sar-El, D., Mikulincer, M., & Doron, G. (2013, January). Attachment Orientations and Individual Differences in Humor. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 32(1), 34–53. <https://doi.org/10.1521/jscp.2013.32.1.34>
54. Saukkonen, P. (2016). Humor and Temperament: Exploring the Links between the Humor Styles Questionnaire and Temperament Inventories. *Europe's Journal of Psychology*, 12(4), 566–583. <https://doi.org/10.5964/ejop.v12i4.1193>
55. Schroeder, J., & Fishbach, A. (2024, March). Feeling known predicts relationship satisfaction. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 111, 104559. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2023.104559>
56. Simpson, J. A., Collins, W. A., Tran, S., & Haydon, K. C. (2007). Attachment and the experience and expression of emotions in romantic relationships: A developmental perspective. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 92, 355–367. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.92.2.355>
57. Soon, K., Shipton, A., Wray, J., & Butler, S. (2023, July 24). Attachment style and children and young people with chronic dermatological conditions. *Child: Care, Health and Development*, 50(1). <https://doi.org/10.1111/cch.13152>
58. Spithoven, A. W. M., Lodder, G. M. A., Goossens, L., Bijttebier, P., Bastin, M., Verhagen, M., & Scholte, R. H. J. (2016, April 7). Adolescents' Loneliness and Depression Associated with Friendship Experiences and Well-Being: A Person-Centered Approach. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 46(2), 429–441. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-016-0478-2>
59. Stolarski, M., Wojtkowska, K., & Kwiecińska, M. (2016). Time for love: Partners' time perspectives predict relationship satisfaction in romantic heterosexual couples. *Time & Society*, 25(3), 552-574. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0961463X15596703>
60. Sutton, T. E. (2019). Review of attachment theory: Familial predictors, continuity and change, and intrapersonal and relational outcomes. *Marriage & Family Review*, 55(1), 1–22. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01494929.2018.1458001>
61. Tashiro, T. Y., and Frazier, P. (2003). "I'll never be in a relationship like that again": personal growth following romantic relationship breakups. *Pers. Relat.* 10, 113–128. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1475-6811.00039>
62. Thibaut, J. W., & Kelley, H. H. (1959). *The social psychology of groups*. John Wiley.
63. Tosun, C., Yildirim, M., Altun, F., & Yazıcı, H. (2021, July 2). Personality Traits and Attachments Styles in Romantic Relationships Deciding. *Journal of Family Issues*, 43(5), 1219–1234. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0192513x211022383>
64. White, J. M. (1999). Work-family stage and satisfaction with work-family balance. *J. Comp. Fam. Stud.* 30, 163–175. <https://doi.org/10.3138/jcfs.30.2.163>
65. Wurst, S. N., Gerlach, T. M., Dufner, M., Rauthmann, J. F., Grosz, M. P., Küfner, A. C. P., Denissen, J. J. A., Back, M. D. (2017). Narcissism and romantic relationships: The differential impact of narcissistic



- admiration and rivalry. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 112(2), 280-306. <https://doi.org/10.1037/pspp0000113>
66. Zeigler-Hill, V., Besser, A., & Jett, S. E. (2013). Laughing at the looking glass: Does humor style serve as an interpersonal signal? *Evolutionary Psychology*, 11(1), 201–226. <https://doi.org/10.1177/147470491301100118>.
67. Zhan, S., Shrestha, S., & Zhong, N. (2022, October 21). Romantic relationship satisfaction and phubbing: The role of loneliness and empathy. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.967339>
68. Zimmer-Gembeck, M. J., & Petherick, J. (2006). Intimacy dating goals and relationship satisfaction during adolescence and emerging adulthood: Identity formation, age and sex as moderators. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 30(2), 167-177. <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0165025406063636>