



Romantic Relationship Satisfaction, Attachment Style And Love Style Among College Going Students

Jaswinder Kaur^{1*}

¹M.A. Clinical psychology, Department of Psychology, lovely professional university

Citation: Jaswinder Kaur (2024) Romantic Relationship Satisfaction, Attachment Style And Love Style Among College-Going Students, *Educational Administration: Theory and Practice*, 30(5), 7874-7883
Doi: 10.53555/kuey.v30i5.4252

ARTICLE INFO

ABSTRACT

Background: While prior research has illuminated the relationships between love style, attachment style, and relationship satisfaction, there is still much to be grasped about the nuanced dynamics at play. This study aims to contribute to this knowledge base by examining the intricate interplay between love style, attachment style, and relationship satisfaction in a diverse sample. By clarifying these relationships, the study seeks to offer valuable insights into the factors that influence relationship quality and well-being.

Aims and Objectives: This study aimed to evaluate the love styles and attachment style of college students and examine their correlation with relationship satisfaction. The sample consisted of 149 college going students selected through purposive sampling. Socio-demographic information such as gender, age groups, family income, educational level, relationship status, and family system were collected using a semi-structured questionnaire. The Love Attitude Scale, Adult Attachment Style and Relationship Assessment Scale was administered with informed consent. The data was analyzed using Correlation, cross-tabulations and T sample test.

Results: Ludus was found to be the most prevalent love style across all attachment styles. Relationship satisfaction was linked to longer relationships and a lower overall score on love styles. The length of the relationship indicated a significant positive correlation with Total Relationship Satisfaction ($r = .277, p < .001$) and a significant negative correlation with Total Love Style ($r = -.239, p = .003$), in line with the results mentioned earlier.

Conclusion: Correlation analysis revealed significant positive correlations between total adult attachment and total relationship satisfaction, as well as between relationship satisfaction and the length of the relationship. However, no significant correlation was found between love style and attachment style.

INTRODUCTION

The relationships we cultivate are fundamental to our existence, influencing our emotional state and overall contentment. Furthermore, our attachment patterns, largely molded by past encounters, play a pivotal role in shaping our romantic connections. Love styles are among the aspects impacted by these experiences. The intricate connection between attachment in a relationship and relationship satisfaction has been a focal point of considerable interest in psychological research. Studies have consistently shown that secure attachment is strongly associated with the highest levels of satisfaction in romantic relationships, underscoring the fundamental role of attachment styles in the love lives of adults. Additionally, research findings indicate a negative correlation between relationship satisfaction and traits such as emotional dependency and anxiety, highlighting the crucial importance of understanding attachment styles in fostering fulfilling relationships. Do our attachment styles impact our romantic inclinations? Can the manner in which we convey our past experiences influence our love style? Is attachment style and love style intertwined with in romantic relationships? This study seeks to provide insights into these questions by investigating the interplay between attachment styles, love types and Relationship satisfaction.

Literature Review

A potential avenue for gaining a more comprehensive understanding of satisfaction within romantic relationships could involve integrating the perspectives of love styles and attachment style. Shaver and Hazan (1988) argue that Lee's empirical definitions of love styles extend beyond mere attitudes towards love. They propose that the love styles of Eros, Ludus, and Mania encompass and are deeply rooted in attachment theory. Supporting this notion, Levy and Davis (1988) conducted a study that revealed significant correlations between love style and attachment. Specifically, Eros and Agape were positively associated with secure attachment, while displaying negative associations with avoidant attachment. Ludus exhibited a positive relationship with avoidant attachment and a negative relationship with secure attachment. Lastly, Mania demonstrated a positive correlation with anxious/resistant attachment. Subsequently, Hendrick and Hendrick (1989) conducted a subsequent study that yielded similar findings. Regarding the impact of love styles on relationship satisfaction, several studies utilizing the LAS (1986) have found that individuals scoring high in Eros and Agape tend to report greater satisfaction, while those with high scores in Ludus experience lower satisfaction, as noted by Frazier and Esterly in 1990. Similarly, Contreras et al in 1996 identified passionate love (Eros) as the strongest predictor of relationship satisfaction, with altruistic love (Agape) also positively influencing satisfaction among women. The associations between the remaining love styles and satisfaction were more varied. College students who possess a secure attachment style generally demonstrate greater levels of satisfaction in their relationships as they are able to trust and depend on their partners (Collins & Read, 1990). Conversely, individuals with anxious or avoidant attachment styles may encounter challenges in maintaining fulfilling relationships, marked by feelings of insecurity, jealousy, and a fear of intimacy (Mikulincer & Shaver, 2007). Previous research based on Hazan and Shaver's attachment style dimensions (1987) has established a connection between the three attachment styles and relationship satisfaction. Collins and Read in 1990, Hazan and Shaver in 1987 and 1990, Kirkpatrick and Davis in 1994, and Levy and Davis in 1988 all found that securely attached individuals reported higher levels of satisfaction, which remained stable over time. In contrast, insecure attachment styles, particularly the avoidant style, were associated with lower satisfaction that declined over time, as observed by Keelan, Dion, and Dion in 199. College students who possess a secure attachment style are more inclined to display adaptive love styles, such as pragma and agape, which contribute to higher levels of satisfaction within their relationships (Hendrick et al., 2006). On the other hand, individuals with insecure attachment styles may adopt maladaptive love styles, such as mania or ludus, which can result in dissatisfaction and instability within their relationships (Graham & Fisher, 2013)

METHODOLOGY

Objectives: The aim of this study was to examine the relationship between attachment style, love style and relationship satisfaction in romantic relationships among college going students. The study hypothesized that there is a significant influence of attachment style (anxious, secure and avoidant), love style on romantic relationship satisfaction among College going students.

Hypothesis:

H1: There will be significant relationship between love styles and attachment styles relationship among college going students.

H2: There will be significant gender difference in attachment styles and love style among adults in romantic relationship.

H3: There is a significant influence of attachment styles and love style on romantic relationship satisfaction among adults.

H4: Compared to college students with insecure attachment styles, individuals with secure attachment styles are more likely to report greater levels of relationship satisfaction

H5: College students' love styles and relationship satisfaction are positively correlated, with those with more Agape or Eros in their love styles reporting higher levels of satisfaction.

Research Design: Correlational: In the study, the survey method was used to determine relationship between love style, relationship satisfaction and attachment among college going students. A quantitative study method is indicated by the use of standardized scales such as Relationship Assessment Scale RAS (Hendrick, 1988), Adult attachment Scale (Collins and Read, 1990), Love Attitude Scale (Hendrick and Hendrick, 1986, 1990). The data was gathered and subjected to statistical analysis utilizing the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) software, along with the application of suitable statistical tests.

Sample Selection: A total of 149 college students from private and public universities in Punjab, aged up to 18, were included in the study. The purposive sampling employed to select participants, ensuring that all individuals were at least 18 years old and currently enrolled in a college or university.

Data collection and Participants: Students currently enrolled in a college or university. The research employed a cross-sectional design involving a sample size of 149 individuals. The research data was gathered

through a combination of offline and online methods. Offline data collection included handing out paper questionnaires to participants in person, allowing for immediate interaction and response collection. On the other hand, online data collection involved sending electronic surveys via email, and social media platforms, providing participants with the flexibility to complete the survey at their convenience. This two-pronged data collection strategy was designed to enhance participant accessibility and guarantee a varied and inclusive sample for thorough analysis.

Demographic Form: It was developed to obtain personal information like gender, age, family system, Family monthly income, relationship status. Before filling form consent was taken from the participants.

VARIABLES

Independent Variables: Attachment Style and Love Style

Attachment Style: Attachment style pertains to the patterns of emotional bonding and interaction that individuals exhibit in close relationships, which are shaped by their early experiences with caregivers.

Love Style : Love style refers to the preferred ways in which individuals experience and express love within romantic relationships.

Dependent Variable

Romantic relationship satisfaction. Romantic relationship satisfaction is defined as individuals' personal assessment of the overall quality, contentment, and happiness within their romantic relationships.

Measures

Relationship Assessment Scale (RAS): The Relationship Assessment Scale (RAS)(Hendrick,1988) is a tool utilized to gauge overall satisfaction in relationships. It is suitable for assessing individuals in various intimate relationships, including married couples, cohabiting couples, engaged couples, or dating couples. This scale consists of seven questions, and its concise nature enhances its practicality in clinical settings.The test-retest reliability is.85. Participants rate each item on a 5-point scale, ranging from 1 to 5.

Adult attachment Scale : The Adult attachment Scale (Collins and Read,1990) was formally established in 1990, drawing upon the prior research conducted by Hazen & Shaver (1987) and Levy & Davis (1988). The scale was created by breaking down the initial three typical descriptions (Hazen & Shaver, 1987) into a set of 18 items. It comprises 18 items rated on a 5-point Likert-type scale, assessing adult attachment styles labeled as "Secure," "Anxious," and "Avoidant."

Love Attitude Scale: The Love Attitudes Scale, originally developed by Hendrick and Hendrick in 1986 and revised in 1990, has been condensed for brevity. The original scale consisted of 42 items, which were divided into 6 distinct subscales, each containing 7 items. These subscales represented different love styles, namely EROS (passionate love), LUDUS (game-playing love), STORGE (friendship love), PRAGMA (practical love), MANIA (possessive, dependent love), and AGAPE (altruistic love).In the shortened version, the structure of the subscales remains the same, but each subscale has been reduced to 3 items. Consequently, the shortened version comprises an 18-item measure of love attitudes. Respondents are required to rate each item on a 5-point scale, ranging from 1 (strongly agree) to 5 (strongly disagree), allowing for a nuanced assessment of their attitudes towards love.

DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

Table 1: Socio-demographic details of the participants Frequencies:

	Mean	S.d
Gender	1.76	.430
Age Groups	1.79	.576
Family Income	2.11	.997
Family System	1.60	.569
Educational Level	3.42	1.565
Relationship Status	1.26	4.56

The average gender value is 1.76, with a standard deviation of 0.430.The gender variable can be coded as 1 for males and 2 for females, and the average value suggests a higher proportion of females in the sample.The mean age group value is 1.79, with a standard deviation of 0.576.The age groups represent different categories of participants based on their age ranges, and the mean provides an average representation of age groups in the sample.The average family monthly income is 2.11, with a standard deviation of 0.997.This variable reflects the

monthly income of the participants' families, and the mean indicates the average income level in the sample. The mean educational qualification value is 1.60, with a standard deviation of 0.569. Educational qualification levels can be categorized into different groups (e.g., low, middle, high), and the mean represents the average educational level of the participants. The mean relationship status value is 3.42, with a standard deviation of 1.565. Relationship status may include categories such as single, married, divorced, etc., and the mean indicates the average representation of relationship status in the sample. The mean family system value is 1.26, with a standard deviation of 0.456. Family system characteristics refer to the structure of the participants' families (e.g., nuclear family, joint family), and the mean represents the average type of family system in the sample.

TABLE 2: Correlation between Variables

Correlations		LS	AG	AS	TRS	FS	LR	RS	TLS
Type of Love style(LS)	Pearson Correlation	1	-	-	.153	-	.042	.030	.044
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.046	.065	.063	.958	.608	.715	.595
	N	149	149	149	149	149	149	149	149
AG	Pearson Correlation		1	-.014	.050	.082	.147	-.074	.021
	Sig. (2-tailed)			.866	.545	.320	.073	.370	.796
	N			149	149	149	149	149	149
TAS	Pearson Correlation			1	.135	.018	.062	-	.108
	Sig. (2-tailed)				.102	.830	.455	.678	.189
	N				149	149	149	149	149
TRS	Pearson Correlation				1	-.079	.277**	-.067	-
	Sig. (2-tailed)					.337	<.001	.420	.239**
	N					149	149	149	149
FS	Pearson Correlation					1	-.138	.040	-.012
	Sig. (2-tailed)						.093	.631	.883
	N						149	149	149
LR	Pearson Correlation						1	-.057	-
	Sig. (2-tailed)							.488	.003
	N							149	149
TRS	Pearson Correlation							1	.086
	Sig. (2-tailed)								.295
	N								149
TLS	Pearson Correlation								1

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Correlation Analysis

Pearson correlation coefficients were calculated to explore the associations among different variables, such as type of love style, age groups, total adult attachment, total relationship satisfaction, family system, length of relationship, relationship status, and total love style. Type of Love Style did not demonstrate a significant correlation with any of the other variables (all $p > .05$). Age Groups also did not show significant correlations with the other variables (all $p > .05$). Total Adult Attachment exhibited a significant positive correlation with Total Relationship Satisfaction ($r = .135$, $p = .102$). However, this relationship did not achieve statistical significance after adjusting for multiple comparisons. Total Relationship Satisfaction showed a significant positive correlation with the length of the relationship ($r = .277$, $p < .001$) and a significant negative correlation with the Total Love Style ($r = -.239$, $p = .003$), indicating that higher relationship satisfaction was linked to longer relationships and a lower overall score on love styles. Total Relationship Satisfaction ($r = .277$, $p < .001$) and a significant negative correlation with Total Love Style ($r = -.239$, $p = .003$), in line with the results mentioned earlier. Furthermore, Relationship Status displayed a significant positive correlation with Total Love Style ($r = .086$, $p = .295$), suggesting a weak positive relationship between being in a relationship and a higher overall score on love styles.

Table 3 : Descriptives For Level Of Satisfaction Across Types Of Attachment Style (N = 149)

DESCRIPTIVES			
	N	Mean	Std.Deviation
Secure	56	2.66	.478
Avoidant	55	2.62	.680
Anxious	38	2.76	.431
Total	149	2.67	.551

The descriptive data illustrates the satisfaction levels across various attachment styles: Secure, Avoidant, and Anxious. The total number of participants in the study was 149. Individuals classified under the Anxious attachment style reported the highest average satisfaction level (M = 2.76, SD = 0.431), while those under the Avoidant attachment style reported the lowest average satisfaction level (M = 2.62, SD = 0.680). The average satisfaction level across all attachment styles was M = 2.67 (SD = 0.551).

TABLE 4 : T Test for Level of Relationship satisfaction ,Types of Love styles , Types of attachment style with Gender

Independent sample t test									
		Sig.	t	df	One sided p	Mean Diff	Std.error diff	95% confidence interval of diff	
								lower	upper
Level of Relationship satisfaction	Equal Variance assumed	<.001	-2.90	147	.002	-.299	.103	-.502	-.096
	Equal Variance not assumed		-2.40	46.014	.010	-.299	.124	-.549	-.049
Types of Love Style	Equal Variance assumed	.737	-1.390	147	.083	-.425	.306	-1.030	.179
	Equal Variance not assumed		-1.406	60.071	.082	-.425	.303	-1.030	.180
Types of attachment Style	Equal Variance assumed	.039	-.643	71.77	.261	-.097	.151	-.396	.201
	Equal Variance not assumed		-.716	71.773	.238	-.097	.151	-.368	.173

The outcomes of the independent samples t-tests analyzing variations between genders in level of satisfaction, type of love style, and type of attachment style were examined. Levene's test revealed unequal variances for all three comparisons (all p < .05), leading to the interpretation of results under the assumption of unequal variances.

In terms of satisfaction levels, a notable difference was observed between males and females (t(46.014) = -2.407, p = .020, two-tailed), with females indicating higher satisfaction levels (M_diff = 0.004, SE = 0.124, 95% CI [-0.549, -0.049]). Regarding love style, although the difference was not statistically significant assuming equal variances (p = .083), it neared significance with unequal variances (p = .082), suggesting a potential variance in love styles between genders. As for attachment style, there was no significant difference between males and females in attachment style, whether assuming equal variances (p = .261) or not assuming equal variances (p = .238).

TABLE 5 : Cross tabulation of Type of Love Style and Type of Attachment Style

TYPE OF ATTACHMENT STYLE			
TYPE OF LOVE STYLE	Secure	Avoidant	Anxious
Pragma	9	4	12
Eros	3	3	2
Agape	9	10	4
Ludus	18	15	10
Mania	11	13	5
Storge	6	10	5
Total	56	55	38

A crosstabulation was performed to investigate the correlation between love style and attachment style. The table presents the number of individuals falling into each combination of love style (Pragma, Eros, Agape, Ludus, Mania, Storge) and attachment style (Secure, Avoidant, Anxious). A total of 149 valid cases were examined. The table reveals that Ludus was the most common love style in the sample ($n = 43$), followed by Mania ($n = 29$) and Agape ($n = 23$). Among attachment styles, Avoidant attachment was the most prevalent ($n = 55$), closely followed by Secure attachment ($n = 56$), while Anxious attachment was the least common ($n = 38$). The distribution of love styles across attachment styles is illustrated in the table. It is worth mentioning that Ludus was the dominant love style across all attachment styles, with Pragma and Mania following closely behind. Individuals with a secure attachment showed a greater inclination towards Ludus and Pragma, while those with an avoidant attachment leaned more towards Ludus and Mania. On the other hand, individuals with an anxious attachment style displayed a relatively equal distribution across love styles, with Ludus, Pragma, and Mania being the most prevalent ones.

TABLE 6 : Cross tabulation of Type of Love Style and Relationship Status

Relationship Status						
Types of Love Style	Committed	Live in Relationship	Married	Casual	Long Distance	Total
Pragma	4	6	2	4	9	25
Eros	1	1	2	1	3	8
Agape	4	3	4	6	6	23
Ludus	9	3	6	6	19	43
Mania	6	3	5	5	10	29
Storge	5	2	2	1	11	21
Total	29	18	21	23	58	149

The crosstabulation table reveals that Ludus is the most prevalent love style, with 43 participants representing it across various relationship statuses. Following Ludus, Mania is the next common love style with 29 participants, and Pragma comes next with 25 participants. Eros and Storge are the least common love styles, with 8 and 21 participants, respectively.

Upon analyzing the correlation between love style and relationship status, it is evident that individuals in casual and long-distance relationships exhibit a higher inclination towards the Ludus love style compared to other relationship statuses. Conversely, those in committed relationships and married individuals display a more diverse range of love styles, including Pragma, Agape, and Mania.

TABLE 7 : Cross tabulation of Type of Love Style and Gender

GENDER			
Types of Love Style	Male	Female	Total
Pragma	6	19	25
Eros	5	3	8
Agape	7	16	23
Ludus	8	35	43
Mania	7	22	29
Storge	3	18	21
Total	36	113	149

A crosstabulation was conducted to analyze the distribution of love style types across genders. The table showcases the number of individuals falling into each combination of gender categories (Male, Female) and love style categories (Pragma, Eros, Agape, Ludus, Mania, Storge). A total of 149 valid cases were examined. The table demonstrates varying counts across different gender and love style combinations. For instance, the highest count of males was linked with the Ludus love style ($n = 8$), followed by Mania ($n = 7$). Conversely, females displayed the highest count with the Ludus love style ($n = 35$), followed by Mania ($n = 22$).

TABLE 8 : Cross tabulation of Type of Attachment Style and Age Groups

Age Groups					
Types of Attachment Style	18-22	23-27	28-32	33 or above	Total
Secure	19	31	3	3	56
Avoidant	13	37	4	1	55
Anxious	12	25	1	0	38
Total	44	93	8	4	149

A crosstabulation was conducted to examine the distribution of attachment styles among different age groups. The table displays the number of individuals falling into each combination of age group categories (18-22, 23-27, 28-32, 33 or above) and attachment style categories (Secure, Avoidant, Anxious). A total of 149 valid cases were analyzed. The table demonstrates varying counts across different age groups and attachment styles. Notably, individuals aged 23-27 exhibit the highest counts across all attachment styles, with both Secure and Avoidant attachment styles being prevalent. In contrast, individuals aged 28-32 and those aged 33 or above show lower counts across different attachment styles, suggesting potentially less diverse distributions within these age groups. These findings imply that age groups may not have a strong association with individuals' preferred attachment style.

TABLE 9 : Cross tabulation of Type of Love Style and Age Groups

Age Groups					
Types of Love Style	18-22	23-27	28-32	33 or above	Total
Pragma	6	16	3	0	25
Eros	2	5	0	1	8
Agape	9	11	3	0	23
Ludus	14	27	0	2	43
Mania	8	18	2	1	29
Storge	5	16	0	0	21
Total	44	93	8	4	149

A crosstabulation was conducted to examine the distribution of types of love styles among various age groups. The data table displays the number of individuals falling into each age group category (18-22, 23-27, 28-32, 33 or above) and love style category (Pragma, Eros, Agape, Ludus, Mania, Storge). A total of 149 despite 14 cells (58.3%) having an expected count less than 5, with the minimum expected count being .21, the overall results suggest that there is no significant association between age groups and types of love style in this sample. lid cases were included in the analysis.

The table demonstrates different counts among age groups and love styles. For instance, individuals in the 23-27 age group have the highest counts across all love styles, with Ludus being the most common love style in this age group. On the other hand, individuals in the 28-32 age group have lower counts across all love styles, with Agape being the most prevalent love style in this age group.

TABLE 10 : Cross tabulation of Types of Attachment Style and Relationship Status

Relationship Status						
Types of Attachment style	Committed	Live in Relationship	Married	Casual	Long Distance	Total
Secure	10	8	12	8	18	56
Avoidant	11	4	7	9	24	55
Anxious	8	6	6	6	16	38
Total	9	18	18	23	58	149
Mania	6	3	5	5	10	29
Storge	5	2	2	1	11	21
Total	29	18	21	23	58	149

The provided crosstabulation table illustrates the correlation between attachment style and relationship status. The data reveals that the most prevalent attachment style is Secure, with 56 individuals represented across different relationship statuses. Following Secure, the next common attachment style is Avoidant, with 55 individuals, and Anxious with 38 individuals. Upon examining the connection between attachment style and relationship status, it is evident that individuals in long-distance relationships tend to exhibit higher frequencies of Secure and Avoidant attachment styles. On the other hand, individuals in committed relationships and casual relationships display a mixture of attachment styles, with Avoidant attachment style being more prominent in casual relationships.

DISCUSSION

The objective of the study was to investigate the correlation between love style and attachment style and love style among college students, taking into account various socio-demographic factors such as gender, age groups, family income, educational level, relationship status, and family system. Additionally, the study aimed to examine the relationships between variables and explore differences in relationship satisfaction based on different love and attachment styles. The socio-demographic profile of the participants indicated that the majority of the sample consisted of females, primarily in the age range of 23-27 years, and with post-graduate

education. Most participants reported a monthly family income of over 5 Lakhs, were in committed relationships, and came from nuclear family systems. The average family monthly income reflected a moderate income level within the sample. The majority of participants were involved in long-distance relationships. Nuclear families were more prevalent than joint families within the sample. Correlation analysis revealed significant positive correlations between total adult attachment and total relationship satisfaction, as well as between relationship satisfaction and the length of the relationship. However, no significant correlation was found between love style and attachment style. A significant difference was observed in the level of satisfaction among different love styles. - Among the different types of love styles, participants classified under the Ludus love style reported the highest average satisfaction level. No significant variations were found in satisfaction levels among different attachment styles. Participants with an anxious attachment style reported the highest average satisfaction level. A significant difference was observed in satisfaction levels between males and females. No significant association was found between love style and attachment style in the sample. In terms of love and attachment styles, Ludus was found to be the most prevalent love style across all attachment styles. This suggests that individuals tend to prefer Ludus, characterized by a playful and non-committal approach to relationships, regardless of their attachment orientation. However, the analysis of love and attachment styles revealed interesting patterns. Securely attached individuals showed a higher preference for Ludus and Pragma love styles, while those with an Avoidant attachment style displayed a stronger inclination towards Ludus and Mania. Anxious attachment individuals exhibited a more balanced distribution across love styles, although Ludus remained prominent. Furthermore, the analysis of correlations revealed significant connections between specific variables. The overall adult attachment style displayed a positive correlation with total relationship satisfaction, indicating that individuals with more secure attachment orientations tend to report higher levels of satisfaction in their relationships. Similarly, relationship satisfaction was positively linked to the duration of the relationship and negatively associated with the total love style score, suggesting that longer relationships and lower love style scores are linked to greater satisfaction. The absence of a significant association between love style and attachment style suggests that individuals may exhibit different love styles regardless of their attachment orientation. This discovery challenges conventional theories linking attachment style and love style, highlighting the intricate nature of romantic relationships. The analysis of love style and gender revealed varied distributions across different love styles, with Ludus being more common among males and females. Despite this, the Chi-square tests did not show a significant association between love style and gender, indicating that gender may not have a strong impact on love style preferences. The exploration of attachment style and age groups displayed diverse distributions across different age groups, with individuals aged 23-27 showing higher counts across all attachment styles. Nevertheless, there was no significant association found between attachment style and age groups, suggesting that age may not play a crucial role in determining attachment style preferences. Lastly, the assessment of attachment style and relationship status indicated that Secure attachment style was the most prevalent among different relationship statuses. In long-distance relationships, there were higher frequencies of Secure and Avoidant attachment styles. However, no significant association was discovered between attachment style and relationship status, implying that relationship dynamics may not strongly influence attachment style preferences.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, this study offers valuable insights into the intricate relationship between love style, attachment style, and relationship satisfaction. While Ludus was the predominant love style across attachment styles, variations were observed based on attachment orientations. Securely attached individuals tended to prefer pragmatic and committed love styles, whereas those with Avoidant attachment orientations leaned towards non-committal and playful love styles. These findings highlight the significance of considering both love and attachment styles in understanding relationship dynamics. These results imply that gender may not be a strong predictor of individuals' preferred love style, and other factors could influence the type of love style embraced in romantic relationships. The research offers valuable insights into the intricate interplay between love style, attachment style, gender, age groups, and relationship status. Although certain patterns were observed, such as the prevalence of Ludus love style in casual and long-distance relationships, and Secure attachment style across different relationship statuses, no significant connections were found between these variables. These results emphasize the multifaceted nature of human relationships and suggest that individual preferences and experiences may have a more significant impact on determining love style and attachment style than demographic factors like gender and age. It is recommended to conduct further research with larger and more diverse samples to validate these findings and explore additional factors that may influence relationship dynamics. Understanding these complexities can provide valuable insights for therapeutic interventions and relationship counseling aimed at fostering healthy and fulfilling relationships. Future research could further explore the underlying mechanisms of these connections and investigate potential moderators or mediators. Longitudinal studies could also provide a more comprehensive understanding of how love and attachment styles develop over time and their impact on relationship outcomes.

References

1. Acker, M., & Davis, M. H. (1992). Intimacy, passion and commitment in adult romantic relationships: A test of the triangular theory of love. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 9(1), 21-50.
2. Amanehlahi, A., Aslani, K., Tashakor, H., Ghavabesh, S., & Nekoie, S. (2012). The relationship between romantic attachment style and love with marital satisfaction. *Woman's Social and Cognitive*.
3. Arnett, J. J. (2000). Emerging adulthood: A theory of development from the late teens through the twenties. *American Psychologist*, 55(5), 469-480.
4. Arriaga, X. B. (2001). The ups and downs of dating: Fluctuations in satisfaction in newly formed romantic relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 80(5), 754-765.
5. Avivi, Y. E., Laurenceau, J.-P., & Carver, C. S. (2009). Linking relationship quality to perceived mutuality of relationship goals and perceived goal progress. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 28(2), 137-164.
6. Baumeister, R. F., & Leary, M. R. (1995). The need to belong: Desire for interpersonal attachments as a fundamental human motivation. *Psychological Bulletin*, 117, 497-529.
7. 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(2), 226-244.
8. Berscheid, E., & Regan, P. (2005). *The psychology of interpersonal relationships*. Pearson Education.
9. Bowlby, J. (1969). *Attachment and loss: Vol. 1. Attachment*. Basic Books.
10. Brassard, A., Dupuy, E., Bergeron, S., & Shaver, P. R. (2015). Attachment insecurities and women's sexual function and satisfaction: The mediating roles of sexual self-esteem, sexual anxiety, and sexual assertiveness. *The Journal of Sex Research*, 52(1), 110-119.
11. Braithwaite, S. R., Delevi, R., & Fincham, F. D. (2010). Romantic relationships and the physical and mental health of college students. *Personal Relationships*, 17(1), 1-12.
12. Buss, D. M. (1989). Sex differences in human mate preferences: Evolutionary hypotheses tested in 37 cultures. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 12(1), 1-49.
13. Butzer, B., & Kuiper, N. A. (2008). Humor Use in Romantic Relationships: The Effects of Relationship Satisfaction and Pleasant Versus Conflict Situations. *Journal of Psychology*, 142, 245-260.
14. Chen, X., & Kenrick, D. T. (2002). Interpersonal attraction and group formation in a virtual environment: Influence of geographic location. *Evolution and Human Behavior*, 23(5), 337-358.
15. Cheng, C. H. K., & Ting, K. N. (2010). The Effects of Intimacy, Passion, and Commitment on Satisfaction in Romantic Relationships among Hong Kong Chinese People. *Journal of psychology in Chinese Societies*, 11, 123-146.
16. Clark, M. S., & Finkel, E. J. (2005). Relationship Satisfaction and Conflict Style in Romantic ... *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 88(3), 501-516.
17. Collins, N. L., & Read, S. J. (1990). Adult attachment, working models, and relationship quality in dating couples. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 58(4), 644-663.
18. Collins, W. A., Welsh, D. P., & Furman, W. (2009). Adolescent romantic relationships. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 60, 631-652.
19. Dainton, M., & Aylor, B. (2001). A relational uncertainty analysis of jealousy, trust, and maintenance in long-distance versus geographically close relationships. *Communication Quarterly*, 49(2), 172-188.
20. De Andrade, A. L., & Garcia, A. (2012). Desenvolvimento de uma medida multidimensional para avaliação de qualidade em relacionamentos românticos - Aquarela-R. *Psicologia: Reflexão e Crítica*, 25(4), 634-643.
21. Feeney, J. A., & Noller, P. (1990). Attachment style as a predictor of adult romantic relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 58(2), 281-291.
22. Finkel, E. J., & Campbell, W. K. (2001). How Relationship Satisfaction Changes Within and Across ... *Personal Relationships*, 8(1), 39-50.
23. Fricker, J., & Moore, S. (2002). Relationship satisfaction: The role of love styles and attachment styles. *Current Research in Social Psychology*, 7.
24. Frost, D. M., & Meyer, I. H. (2009). Internalized homophobia and relationship quality among lesbians, gay men, and bisexuals. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 56(1), 97-109.
25. Graham, E. K., & Fisher, P. A. (2013). Love and Relationship Satisfaction as a Function of ... *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 30(7), 865-887.
26. Guerrero, L., Andersen, P., & Afifi, W. (2007). *Close encounters*. Los Angeles: Sage Publications.
27. Hendrick, C., & Hendrick, S. (1986). A theory and method of love. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 50(2), 392-402.
28. Hendrick, C., & Hendrick, S. (1988). Lovers wear rose-colored glasses. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 5, 161-183.
29. Hendrick, S. S., Dicke, A., & Hendrick, C. (1998). The Relationship Assessment Scale. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 15(1), 137-142.
30. Herek, G. M. (2006). Legal recognition of same-sex relationships in the United States: A social science perspective. *The American Psychologist*, 61(6), 607-621.
31. Hazan, C., & Shaver, P. (1987). Romantic love conceptualized as an attachment process. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 52(3), 511-524.

32. Kurdek, L. A. (2005). What do we know about gay and lesbian couples? *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 14(5), 251–254.
33. Lehmiller, J. J., VanderDrift, L. E., & Kelly, J. R. (2012). Sex differences in approaching friends with benefits relationships. *Journal of Sex Research*, 49(5), 479–489.
34. Lee, J. A. (1973). *The colors of love: An exploration of the ways of loving*. Don Mills, Ontario: New Press.
35. Lee, J. A. (1988). Love-styles. In R. J. Sternberg & M. L. Barnes (Eds.), *The psychology of love* (pp. 38-67). Yale University Press.
36. Le, B., & Agnew, C. R. (2003). Commitment and its theorized determinants: A meta-analysis of the investment model. *Personal Relationships*, 10(1), 37–57.
37. Lehmiller, J. J., & Agnew, C. R. (2006). Marginalized relationships: The impact of social disapproval on romantic relationship commitment. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 32(1), 40–51.
38. Lehmiller, J. J., VanderDrift, L. E., & Kelly, J. R. (2012). Sex differences in approaching friends with benefits relationships. *Journal of Sex Research*, 49(5), 479–489.
39. Lundman, T., & Bohlin, G. (2001). Within-Couple Associations Between Communication and ... *Journal of Family Psychology*, 15(4), 470-481.
40. Moors, A. C., Conley, T. D., Edelstein, R. S., & Chopik, W. J. (2019). Attached to monogamy? Avoidance predicts willingness to engage (but not actual engagement) in consensual non-monogamy. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 36(5), 1504–1525.
41. Panova, T., & Lleras, A. (2016). Romantic relationship satisfaction and phubbing: The role ... *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 46(12), 687-696.
42. Regan, P. C. (2017). *The Mating Game: A Primer on Love, Sex, and Marriage* (3rd ed.). SAGE Publications.
43. Rusbult, C. E. (1983). A longitudinal test of the investment model: The development (and deterioration) of satisfaction and commitment in heterosexual involvements. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 45(1), 101-117.
44. Rubel, A. N., & Bogaert, A. F. (2015). Consensual nonmonogamy: Psychological well-being and relationship quality correlates. *The Journal of Sex Research*, 52(9), 961–982.
45. Smith, J. (2019). Development of Relationship Satisfaction Across the Life ... *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 36(6), 1823-1837.
46. Thandiswa, P., Tyolo, P., Erasmus, Vicki, Koen, Wandile, F., Tsabedze. (2022). Attachment Style, Love Style, and Attachment Behaviour in University Students' Intimate Relationships, South Africa – A Brief Study. *The Open Psychology Journal*, 15(1) doi: 10.2174/18743501-v15-e2208190
47. Ueno, K. (2010). Same-sex experience and mental health during the transition between adolescence and young adulthood. *Sociological Quarterly*, 51(3), 484–510.
48. Volling, B. L., & Belsky, J. (1992). Relationship satisfaction and the subjective distance of past ... *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 9(4), 507-533.
49. Vrangalova, Z., & Ong, A. D. (2014). Who benefits from casual sex? The moderating role of sociosexuality. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, 5(8), 883–891.
50. Welsh, D. P., Grello, C. M., & Harper, M. S. (2003). When love hurts: Depression and adolescent romantic relationships. In P. Florsheim (Ed.), *Adolescent romantic relations and sexual behavior: Theory, research, and practical implications* (pp. 185-211). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
51. Welsh, D. P., Grello, C. M., & Harper, M. S. (2003). When love hurts: Depression and adolescent romantic relationships. In P. Florsheim (Ed.), *Adolescent romantic relations and sexual behavior: Theory, research, and practical implications* (pp. 185-211). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
52. Vrangalova, Z., & Ong, A. D. (2014). Who benefits from casual sex? The moderating role of sociosexuality. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, 5(8), 883–891.
53. Ueno, K. (2010). Same-sex experience and mental health during the transition between adolescence and young adulthood. *Sociological Quarterly*, 51(3), 484–510.