

Research Paper

Attachment Style and Intimacy among Romantic Relationships

Akansha Kumari^{1*}, Dr. Rema M.K.²

ABSTRACT

The study was aimed to investigate the relation between attachment styles and intimacy among romantic relationships (dating, cohabiting and married) and gender difference and difference between the types of relationship status (dating, cohabiting and married) in each of the variables. Attachment styles has 3 different styles- Secure, Ambivalent and Avoidant and intimacy which has 5 different types- Emotional, Social, Sexual, Intellectual, Recreational and 1 conventionality scale. A set of two questionnaires were used in this study regarding each of the variables. A total of 150 young adults of the age 18-40 years participated in online survey, using Google forms, in which 58% were males and the rest 42% were females among these 49% were dating individuals, 31% cohabiting and the rest 19% were married. The result showed the relation between secure attachment style with all 5 intimacy types, a significant negative relation was seen between ambivalent attachment style and emotional intimacy. And a significant negative relation between avoidant attachment style and social intimacy. There was no significant difference found between secure attachment and avoidant attachment among gender. However, there was a gender difference present in avoidant attachment with males having higher level of avoidant attachment. There was a gender difference found in one of the types of intimacy indicating females having higher level of intellectual intimacy. The results on one-way Anova showed that there was no difference in attachment styles among dating, cohabiting and married individuals. And one-way Anova for intimacy types showed that the emotional intimacy was higher for married individuals.

Keywords: Attachment styles, Intimacy, Relationship Status, Gender Difference

Attachment Style

Bowlby's Attachment Theory suggests that humans have a natural need to form close bonds with others, particularly with caregivers in infancy. These bonds help individuals feel secure and protected. The attachment system is activated when an individual senses danger, and the caregiver soothes them to restore feelings of safety. This trigger and response sequence forms internal working models in the individual's mind, which determine their attachment style. There are four major styles of attachment: Secure, Avoidant, Anxious/Ambivalent, and Disorganized. These styles are determined by childhood relationships with parents and affect how individuals view themselves and their close relationships. Attachment bonds built during infancy manifest themselves into adult romantic relationships, where partners serve as attachment figures for each other. Other

¹MSc Clinical Psychology Student, Kristu Jayanti College (Autonomous)

²Assistant Professor, Department of Psychology, kristu Jayanti College (Autonomous), Bangalore, India

*Corresponding Author

Received: May 14, 2023; Revision Received: August 07, 2023; Accepted: August 11, 2023

Attachment Style and Intimacy among Romantic Relationships

behavioral systems such as caregiving and sex are also in operation in adult romantic relationships. The Attachment theory suggests that experiences with caregivers in infancy contribute to the building of internal working models that extend into adulthood and affect how individuals behave in close relationships. Hazan and Shaver (1987) researched romantic love as an attachment process and found that adult romantic relationships share features with infant-caregiver relationships. Attachment styles towards romantic partners are influenced by an individual's attachment history and can be categorized as secure, avoidant, or anxious. Individual differences in attachment style are commonly conceptualized along two continuous dimensions: attachment-related anxiety and attachment-related avoidance. Early attachment relationships with primary caregivers determine an individual's ability to give or receive intimacy and to have a desire for their partner, and relationships throughout the lifespan are influenced by and reflective of those formed in childhood.

Intimacy

The concept of intimacy has been explored by various theoretical perspectives such as psychoanalytic, humanistic, existential, cultural, cognitive, feminist, and sociological. The desire for intimacy can also be understood on different theoretical levels. Freud believed that the desire for intimacy is a need for wish fulfillment to satisfy psychosexual developmental gaps. Erikson indicated that the ability to acknowledge intimacy with another individual depends on the psychosocial development of a strong sense of self and identity. Tillich believed that the desire for intimacy could be best explained through an existential and humanistic perspective. Intimacy is defined as a subjective relational experience in which the core components are trusting self-disclosure to which the response is communicated empathy. It is the willingness to share one's inner feelings, experiences, fantasies, and important thoughts. Intimacy is a process that develops over time and is never entirely realized. The concept of intimacy in relationships is multidimensional and includes emotional, social, sexual, intellectual, and recreational aspects. Emotional intimacy involves sharing feelings openly and being understood by a supportive partner. Social intimacy involves sharing a common social network. Sexual intimacy involves physical closeness and affection. Intellectual intimacy involves understanding each other's ideas and thoughts. Recreational intimacy involves sharing hobbies and leisure activities. Psychological intimacy involves learning more about each other through gestures and secrets. Intimacy has been linked to sexual pleasure and has been found to reduce the risk of mental illness and stress-related symptoms. People who lack close connections are more susceptible to feelings of loneliness and despair.

“Attachment Style as a Predictor of Adult Romantic Relationships” by Judith A. Feeney and Patricia Noller in the year 1990. Questionnaire measures of attachment style, attachment history, beliefs about relationships, self-esteem, limerence, loving, love addiction, and love styles were administered to 374 undergraduates. The results suggest that attachment theory offers a useful perspective on adult love relationships.

A research done by Jeffrey A. Simpson in the year 1990 on “Influence of attachment style on romantic relationships”. This investigation examined the impact of secure, anxious, and avoidant attachment styles on romantic relationships in a longitudinal study involving 144 dating couples. For both men and women, the secure attachment style was associated with greater relationship interdependence, commitment, trust, and satisfaction than were the anxious or avoidant attachment styles. The anxious and avoidant styles were associated with less frequent positive emotions and more frequent negative emotions in the relationship, whereas the reverse was true of the secure style. Six-month follow-up interviews revealed

Attachment Style and Intimacy among Romantic Relationships

that, among those individuals who disbanded, avoidant men experienced significantly less post-dissolution emotional distress than did other people.

A research was done in the year 2005 by Chandra M. Grabill and Kathryn A. Kerns on "Attachment style and intimacy in friendship". Two studies with college students tested the hypothesis that a secure attachment style enhances intimacy in friendship. Three intimacy characteristics were studied: self-disclosure; responsiveness to a partner's disclosure; and feeling understood, validated, and cared for by a partner during conversations. In Study 1, individuals with a secure attachment style were higher on all three intimacy characteristics. In Study 2, a lab-based assessment of intimacy revealed some relations between attachment and intimacy, providing mixed support for the hypothesis. Both studies found gender differences in intimacy characteristics. The findings provide a starting point for a model accounting for individual differences in friendship.

METHOD

Research Design

The current research uses Quantitative design to study the relation between attachment style and intimacy among romantic relationships. The foundation of quantitative techniques of research is the collecting and analysis of numerical data, typically via formal paper-and-pencil instruments like surveys, tests and checklists. To achieve this objective the study will be using correlation tool.

Statement of the Problem

The present study is undertaken to evaluate the relationship between attachment styles and intimacy among romantic relationships who are dating, cohabiting and married individuals. In addition the study also identified gender difference among attachment styles and intimacy. The study also aimed to understand the difference in attachment style and intimacy among dating, cohabiting and married individuals.

Objective

- To find if there is any significant relationship between attachment styles and intimacy.
- To find if there is any gender difference among attachment styles
- To find if there is any gender difference among intimacy.
- To find if there is any difference in attachment styles among dating, cohabiting and married individuals.
- To find if there is any significant difference in intimacy among dating, cohabiting and married individuals.

Hypothesis

- H₀₁- There is no significant relationship between attachment styles and intimacy.
- H₀₂- There is no significant gender difference among attachment styles.
- H₀₃- There is no significant gender difference among intimacy.
- H₀₄- There is no significant difference in attachment styles among dating, cohabiting and married individuals.
- H₀₅- There is no significant difference in intimacy among dating, cohabiting and married individuals.

Attachment Style and Intimacy among Romantic Relationships

Variables

- Intimacy (Dependent variable)
- Attachment Style (Independent variable)

Demographic Variable

- Age
- Gender
- Relationship Status
- Relationship Duration

Inclusion Criteria

- Adults who are dating
- Couples living together
- Married couples
- Adults in the age range of 18-40

Exclusion Criteria

- Adults who are not dating
- Adults who are not a citizen of India
- Divorced couples are excluded
- Adults diagnosed with depression or other mental disorder

Sample

Sampling Technique- The study make use of purposive sampling technique

Sample Size- 150 adults (86- females, 63 males, 74 dating, 47 married and 29 live-in together)

Tools used for the study

Attachment style scale (2016) was developed by Naseem Ahmed, Azmat Jahan and Nasheed Imtiaz tries to measure the individual's attachment pattern among ambivalent, avoidant and secure. The scale has a high reliability of 0.80 and high validity along with 27 items and a 5 point Likert scale.

Personal Assessment of Intimacy in Relationships by Schaefer and Olson.,1981. A 36-item measure of relationship intimacy, encompassing five different factors and one “faking” scale. The five factors are: emotional intimacy, social intimacy, sexual intimacy, recreational intimacy, intellectual intimacy and 1 conventionality scale.

Respondents answer each item on a 5-point scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). Cronbach alpha coefficient for the PAIR scale ranged from 0.72 to 0.93, indicating good internal consistency and reliability.

Statistical tool used

The statistical techniques used for the data analysis in this study are: Correlation analysis, Independent sample t-test, and regression.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The present study investigated the relationship between attachment styles (secure, ambivalent and avoidant) and intimacy (emotional, sexual, recreational, intellectual, conventionality scale and social). The study also examined the difference between gender (males and females) and relationship status (dating, cohabiting and married individuals) on attachment styles and intimacy. The results included an analysis of responses by 150 participants who are dating, cohabiting and married.

Table 1 Relationship between attachment styles and intimacy

Attachment style	Intimacy											
	EI		SI		RI		II		CS		SoI	
	r	p	r	p	r	p	r	p	r	p	r	p
Secure	.175*	.032	.189*	.021	.247**	.002	.193*	.018	.152	.063	.406**	.01
Ambivalent	-.197*	.016	-.002	.982	-.155	.059	-.148	.071	-.314**	.000	-.156	.057
Avoidant	-.131	.110	-.144	.079	-.072	.382	-.119	.147	-.054	.382	-.345**	.000

Note. ** $p < 0.01$, * $p < 0.05$

H₀₁- There was no significant relationship between attachment styles and intimacy

The Pearson correlation between secure attachment and emotional intimacy was found to be $r = .175$ and a significance level of .032 which was less than the significance level of 0.05 indicating that there was a very weak positive correlation between secure attachment and emotional intimacy. The correlation between secure attachment and sexual intimacy was found to be $r = .189$ and a significance level of .021 which was less than the significance level of 0.05 indicating that there was a very weak positive correlation between secure attachment and sexual intimacy. The correlation between secure attachment and recreational intimacy was found to be $r = .247$ and a significance level of .002 which was less than the significance level of 0.01 indicating that there was a very weak positive correlation between secure attachment and recreational intimacy. The correlation between secure attachment and intellectual intimacy was found to be $r = .193$ and a significance level of .018 which was less than the significance level of 0.05 indicating that there was a very weak positive correlation between secure attachment and intellectual intimacy. The correlation between secure attachment and conventionality scale was higher than the significant the significant level of .05 indicating that there was no significant relationship between these two variables. The correlation between secure attachment and social intimacy was found to be $r = .406$ and a significance level of .000 which was less than the significance level of 0.01 indicating that there was a positive correlation between secure attachment and social intimacy. The correlation between ambivalent attachment and emotional intimacy was found to be $r = -.197$ and a significance level of .016 which is less than the significance level of 0.05 indicating that there was a weak negative correlation between ambivalent attachment and emotional intimacy. There was no correlation found between ambivalent attachment with social, sexual, recreational, intellectual intimacy. The correlation between ambivalent attachment and conventionality scale was found to be $r = -.314$ and a significance level of .000 which was less than the significance level of 0.01 suggesting that there was a moderate negative correlation between ambivalent attachment and conventionality scale. The result showed that there was no correlation between avoidant attachment with sexual, emotional,

Attachment Style and Intimacy among Romantic Relationships

recreational, intellectual intimacy and conventionality scale. The correlation between avoidant attachment and social intimacy was found to be $r = -.345$ and a significance level of .01 which was less than the significance level of 0.01 suggesting that there was a moderate negative correlation between avoidant attachment and social intimacy. Therefore, the result indicates that there was a partial correlation between attachment style and intimacy. Hence, the null hypothesis “There was no significant relationship between attachment style and intimacy” was partially rejected. And this could be supported by the following studies, one study done by Jeffrey A Simpson on “Influence of Attachment style on romantic relationships and the result found that individuals who show secure attachment style tend to have more positive emotions towards each other and have high relationship satisfactions. A review article by Christina Stefanou and Marita P. McCabe on “Adult attachment and Sexual Functioning” the review found that individuals with secure attachment style tend to have more positive sexual outcomes and higher levels of sexual satisfaction. There are not much studies which showed the relation between secure attachment style and recreational intimacy, however system theory which is an interdisciplinary study of coherent sets of interconnected and interdependent components that might be natural or man-made it is a theory of interacting processes and how they impact each other through time to allow some bigger whole to continue to exist and in the context of relationships, it suggest that couple recreational activities contribute to several aspects of marital relationships which includes couple bonding, developing collective interest which is an important aspect of secure attachment style. A study by Rosalba Raffagnino and Camilla Matera on “Shared leisure and couple satisfaction” found that shared leisure activity was positively associated with couple satisfaction”. A study done by Z. Raeesipoor, R. Fallahchai, and E. Zarei on “Adult attachment styles, communication patterns and marital satisfaction” found that individuals with secure attachment style are more likely to engage in constructive communication with their partners, which contributes to higher level of marital satisfaction.

One study done by Brooke C. Feeney on "Attachment Style and Friendship Quality: A Longitudinal Study" found that attachment style plays an important role in shaping the quality of social relationships, individuals with a secure attachment style may be more adept at forming and maintaining close relationships. There was no correlation found between secure attachment style and conventionality scale.

Table 2 Difference in attachment styles among males and females

Variables	Male			Female			t	p
	N	M	SD	N	M	SD		
Secure attachment								
Ambivalent attachment	63	27.44	5.579	87	27.54	5.185	-.108	.914
Avoidant attachment	63	29.16	7.421	87	30.86	7.358	-1.394	.165
	63	28.86	6.834	87	26.34	5.140	2.570**	.011

Note. ** $p < 0.01$

Ho2- There was no significant gender difference among attachment styles

The table shows the difference between males and females among three types of attachment style. The mean value for secure attachment for males was 27.44 and 27.54 for females. With corresponding standard deviation of 5.579 and 5.185 respectively. To determine whether the observed difference in means was statistically significant for the population, a t-test was conducted. The calculated “t” value for secure attachment style between two groups

Attachment Style and Intimacy among Romantic Relationships

-.108 with corresponding “p” value of .914, since this value was not statistically significant at .05 level. Therefore, there was no gender difference among secure attachment style. The mean value for ambivalent attachment for males was 29.16 and 30.86 for females. With corresponding standard deviation of 7.421 and 7.358 respectively. To determine whether the observed difference in means was statistically significant for the population, a t-test was conducted. The calculated “t” value for ambivalent attachment style between two groups -1.394 with corresponding “p” value of .165, since this value was not statistically significant at .05 level. Therefore, ambivalent attachment style has no gender difference. The mean value for avoidant attachment for males was 28.86 and 26.34 for females. With corresponding standard deviation of 6.834 and 5.140 respectively. To determine whether the observed difference in means was statistically significant for the population, a t-test was conducted. The calculated “t” value for avoidant attachment style between two groups 2.570 with corresponding “p” value of .011, since this value was statistically significant at .01 level. Hence, it can be concluded that there was significant gender difference among avoidant attachment style. Therefore, the null hypothesis “there was no significant gender difference among attachment styles” was partially accepted. The result showed that there was no gender difference found in secure and ambivalent attachment styles. However, from the result we found that there was a slight gender difference in avoidant attachment style, the data shows that the males tend to show more avoidant attachment style than females, which aligns with the study done by Marco Del Giudice on “Sex Differences in Romantic Attachment: A Meta-Analysis” found gender difference in avoidant attachment, with males showing higher avoidant attachment than females and there was no such gender difference in secure and ambivalent attachment style.

Table 3 Difference in intimacy among males and females

Variables	Male			Female			t	p
	N	M	SD	N	M	SD		
Emotional Intimacy	63	20.71	5.955	87	22.38	6.010	-1.684	.095
Social Intimacy	63	17.97	4.177	87	18.78	4.373	-1.145	.254
Sexual Intimacy	63	20.97	3.818	87	21.99	3.339	-1.738	.084
Intellectual Intimacy	63	20.16	4.786	87	22.28	5.103	-2.600**	.010**
Recreational Intimacy	63	21.25	5.177	87	21.45	4.117	-.256	.798

Note. ** p < 0.01

Ho3- There was no significant gender difference among intimacy

The table shows the difference between males and females among intimacy. The mean value for emotional intimacy for males was 20.71 and 22.38 for females. With corresponding standard deviation of 5.955 and 6.010 respectively. To determine whether the observed difference in means was statistically significant for the population, a t-test was conducted. The calculated “t” value for emotional intimacy between two groups -1.684 with corresponding “p” value of .095, since the value was not statistically significant at .05 level, it can be concluded that there was no gender difference among emotional intimacy. The mean value for social intimacy for males was 17.97 and 18.78 for females. With corresponding standard deviation of 4.177 and 4.373 respectively. To determine whether the observed difference in means was statistically significant for the population, a t-test was conducted. The calculated “t” value for social intimacy between two groups -1.145 with corresponding “p” value of .254, since this value was not statistically significant at .05 level, it can be concluded that there was no gender difference among social intimacy. The mean

Attachment Style and Intimacy among Romantic Relationships

value for sexual intimacy for males was 20.97 and 21.99 for females. With corresponding standard deviation of 3.818 and 3.339 respectively. To determine whether the observed difference in means was statistically significant for the population, a t-test was conducted. The calculated “t” value for sexual intimacy between two groups -1.738 with corresponding “p” value of .084, since this value was not statistically significant at .05 level, it can be concluded that there was no gender difference among sexual intimacy. The mean value for intellectual intimacy for males was 20.16 and 22.28 for females. With corresponding standard deviation of 4.786 and 5.103 respectively. To determine whether the observed difference in means was statistically significant for the population, a t-test was conducted. The calculated “t” value for intellectual intimacy between two groups -2.600 with corresponding “p” value of .010, since this value was statistically significant at .05 level, it can be concluded that there was significant difference in intellectual intimacy between males and females. The mean value for recreational intimacy for males was 21.25 and 21.45 for females. With corresponding standard deviation of 5.177 and 4.117 respectively. To determine whether the observed difference in means was statistically significant for the population, a t-test was conducted. The calculated “t” value for recreational intimacy between two groups -.256 with corresponding “p” value of .798, since this value was not statistically significant at .05 level, it can be concluded that there was no gender difference among recreational intimacy. Therefore, the null hypothesis “there was no significant gender difference among intimacy” was partially accepted. There was a research on “Gender Differences in Love and Intimacy” by Elaine Hatfield and Richard Rapson that women are more inclined to communication, affection, and emotional intimacy than men.

Table 4 Descriptive statistics and one- way Anova for Attachment styles

Variables	Dating		Cohabiting		Married		F	P
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD		
Secure	26.91	4.555	27.86	5.469	28.21	6.317	.945	.391
Ambivalent	28.92	6.868	30.34	8.595	31.96	7.220	2.479	.087
Avoidant	27.09	5.498	27.62	6.276	27.74	6.716	.190	.827

H₀₄- There was no significant difference in attachment styles among dating, cohabiting and married individuals.

The mean value and standard deviation for Secure attachment style of individuals who are dating was 26.91 and 4.55 respectively, the mean value and standard deviation for Secure attachment style of individuals who are cohabiting was 27.86 and 5.46 respectively, the mean value and standard deviation for Secure attachment style of individuals who are married was 28.21 and 6.31 respectively. The analysis of variance shows that F=.945 (ns) and p value was .391 (p>0.05), indicating that there was no significant difference found in Secure attachment style among dating, cohabiting and married individuals. The mean and the standard deviation for Ambivalent attachment style of individuals who are dating was 28.92 and 6.86 respectively, the mean and the standard deviation for Ambivalent attachment style of individuals who are cohabiting was 30.34 and 8.59 respectively, the mean and the standard deviation for Ambivalent attachment style of individuals who are married was 31.96 and 7.22 respectively. The analysis of variance shows that F=2.47 (ns) and p value was .087 (p>0.05), indicating that there was no significant difference found in Ambivalent attachment style among dating, cohabiting and married individuals. The mean value and standard deviation for Avoidant attachment style of individuals who are dating was 27.09 and 5.49 respectively, the mean value and standard deviation for Avoidant attachment style of individuals who are cohabiting was 27.62 and 6.27 respectively, the mean value and

Attachment Style and Intimacy among Romantic Relationships

standard deviation for Avoidant attachment style of individuals who are married was 27.74 and 6.71 respectively. The analysis of variance shows that $F=.190$ (ns) and p value was $.827$ ($p>0.05$), indicating that there was no significant difference found in Avoidant attachment style among dating, cohabiting and married individuals. This clearly shows that the null hypothesis was accepted as the p value was greater than 0.05, indicating that “There was no significant difference in attachment styles among dating, cohabiting and married couples”.

Table 5 Descriptive statistics and one- way Anova for Intimacy

Variables	Dating		Cohabiting		Married		F	p
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD		
EI	22.80	5.470	21.41	5.834	20.09	6.685	3.029	.051*
SoI	18.78	4.052	18.45	4.830	17.89	4.365	.614	.543
SI	22.05	3.235	20.97	3.794	21.15	3.895	1.429	.243
II	21.81	5.117	21.62	4.694	20.57	5.212	.893	.412
RI	21.91	3.680	21.41	5.717	20.49	5.021	1.385	.254

Note. * $p < 0.05$

H₀₅- There was no significant difference in intimacy among dating, cohabiting and married individuals.

The mean value and standard deviation for emotional intimacy of individuals who are dating was 22.80 and 5.47 respectively, the mean value and standard deviation for emotional intimacy of individuals who are cohabiting was 21.41 and 5.83 respectively, the mean value and standard deviation for emotional intimacy of individuals who are married was 20.09 and 6.68 respectively. The analysis of variance shows that $F= 3.029$ and p value was $.051$ ($p=0.05$), indicating that it was statistically significant and emotional intimacy was found higher in dating individuals as compared to cohabiting and married individuals. The mean value and standard deviation for social intimacy of individuals who are dating was 18.78 and 4.05 respectively, the mean value and standard deviation for social intimacy of individuals who are cohabiting was 18.45 and 4.83 respectively, the mean value and standard deviation for social intimacy of individuals who are married was 17.89 and 4.36 respectively. The analysis of variance shows that $F=.614$ and p value was $.543$ ($p>0.05$), indicating that it was not statistically significant and there was no difference among dating, cohabiting and married individuals in social intimacy. The mean value and standard deviation for sexual intimacy of individuals who are dating was 22.05 and 3.23 respectively, the mean value and standard deviation for sexual intimacy of individuals who are cohabiting was 20.97 and 3.79 respectively, the mean value and standard deviation for sexual intimacy of individuals who are married was 21.15 and 3.89 respectively. The analysis of variance shows that $F=1.429$ and p value was $.243$ ($p>0.05$), indicating that it was not statistically significant and there was no difference among dating, cohabiting and married individuals in sexual intimacy. The mean value and standard deviation for intellectual intimacy of individuals who are dating was 21.81 and 5.11 respectively, the mean value and standard deviation for intellectual intimacy of individuals who are cohabiting was 21.62 and 4.69 respectively, the mean value and standard deviation for intellectual intimacy of individuals who are married was 20.57 and 5.21 respectively. The analysis of variance shows that $F=.893$ and p value was $.412$ ($p>0.05$), indicating that it was not statistically significant and there was no difference among dating, cohabiting and married individuals in intellectual intimacy. The mean value and standard deviation for recreational intimacy of individuals who are dating was 21.91 and 3.68 respectively, the mean value and standard deviation for recreational intimacy of individuals who are cohabiting was 21.41 and 5.71 respectively, the mean value and

Attachment Style and Intimacy among Romantic Relationships

standard deviation for recreational intimacy of individuals who are married was 20.49 and 5.02 respectively. The analysis of variance shows that $F=1.385$ and p value was $.254(p>0.05)$, indicating that it was not statistically significant and there was no difference among dating, cohabiting and married individuals in recreational intimacy. Therefore, the null hypothesis "There was no significant difference in intimacy among dating, cohabiting and married individuals" was partially accepted. There was no specific study which showed that emotional intimacy was higher for dating individuals however, there was an article titled "The Construct of Relationship Quality" by Saif R. Farooqi showed that dating individuals reported greater intimacy when partner feedback was positive but this study did not compare emotional intimacy between dating, cohabiting, and married individuals. Therefore, it is important to conduct further research to determine whether emotional intimacy differs among individuals with different relationship status.

CONCLUSION

According to the research the following hypothesis were studied and the result were found to be:

- The null hypothesis H_{01} - There was no relationship between attachment styles and intimacy was partially rejected. As secure attachment was positively correlated with emotional, sexual, social, recreational and intellectual intimacy. Ambivalent attachment style was negatively correlated with emotional intimacy and conventionality scale. Avoidant attachment style was negatively correlated with social intimacy.
- The null hypothesis H_{02} - There was no gender difference among attachment style was partially accepted. As gender difference was found in avoidant attachment style with males having higher avoidant attachment than females.
- The null hypothesis H_{03} - There was no gender difference among intimacy was partially accepted. As gender difference was found in intellectual intimacy with females having higher levels of intellectual intimacy than males.
- The null hypothesis H_{04} - There was no difference in attachment style among dating, cohabiting and married individuals was accepted.
- The null hypothesis H_{05} - There was no difference in intimacy among dating, cohabiting and married individuals was partially accepted. As there was difference found in emotional intimacy, indicating that married individuals have high level of emotional intimacy than dating and cohabiting individuals.

Implications

The study spotted the light on attachment style and there intimacy type. The findings explain how that attachment style is related to the intimacy of an individual in a romantic relationship. The study also suggests that understanding different attachment styles can help individuals unpack how they relate to their partner when it comes to intimacy. The findings are in addition to the existing literature and can be helpful in couple therapy to understand an individual's attachment pattern and also in understanding the intimacy issues. The findings of the study also throw light upon the gender differences in intimacy and attachment style which can help therapists tailor interventions to meet the unique needs of each partner.

Limitations

One limitation can be the method of data collection, as the data was collected via self-report Google forms, the authenticity of the data cannot be calculated. The participants might not understand the questions, randomly answered the questions, technical glitch in the middle of

the test, etc. might have affected the data. Another limitation can be on the generalization of this data. Due to the small sample size, we cannot generalize these findings on the population. Lastly, there can be many other external or internal factors which might affect the data as the data was not controlled to get the honest responses.

REFERENCES

- Ahmad, N., Jahan, A., & Imtiaz, N. (2016). Measure of Attachment Style. *International Journal of Indian Psychology*, 3(4). <https://doi.org/10.25215/0304.082>
- Aykutoğlu, B., & Uysal, A. (2017). The Relationship between Intimacy Change and Passion: A Dyadic Diary Study. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 8. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2017.02257>
- Bartholomew, K. (1990). Avoidance of Intimacy: An Attachment Perspective. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 7(2), 147–178. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0265407590072001>
- Bartholomew, K., & Horowitz, L. N. (1991). Attachment styles among young adults: A test of a four-category model. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 61(2), 226–244. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.61.2.226>
- Brassard, A., Shaver, A. P. R., & Lussier, B. (2007). Attachment, sexual experience, and sexual pressure in romantic relationships: A dyadic approach. *Personal Relationships*, 14(3), 475–493. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-6811.2007.00166.x>
- Cassidy, J. (2001). Truth, lies, and intimacy: An attachment perspective. *Attachment & Human Development*, 3(2), 121–155. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14616730110058999>
- Collins, N. L., & Feeney, B. C. (2004). An Attachment Theory Perspective on Closeness and Intimacy. [https://labs.psych.ucsb.edu/collins/nancy/UCSB_Close_Relationships_Lab/Publications_files/CollinsFeeney\(2004\)-Chapter3.pdf](https://labs.psych.ucsb.edu/collins/nancy/UCSB_Close_Relationships_Lab/Publications_files/CollinsFeeney(2004)-Chapter3.pdf), 173–198. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781410610010-17>
- Czyżowska, D., Gurba, E., Czyżowska, N., Kalus, A., Sitnik-Warchulska, K., & Izydorczyk, B. (2019). Selected Predictors of the Sense of Intimacy in Relationships of Young Adults. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 16(22), 4447. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph16224447>
- Dandurand, C., & Lafontaine, M. (2013). Intimacy and Couple Satisfaction: The Moderating Role of Romantic Attachment. *International Journal of Psychological Studies*, 5(1). <https://doi.org/10.5539/ijps.v5n1p74>
- Duggan, E. S., & Brennan, K. (1994). Social Avoidance and its Relation to Bartholomew's Adult Attachment Typology. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0265407594111009>
- Ein-Dor, T., Doron, G., Solomon, Z., Mikulincer, M., & Shaver, P. R. (2010). Together in pain: Attachment-related dyadic processes and posttraumatic stress disorder. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 57(3), 317–327. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0019500>
- Farooqi, S. R. (2014). The Construct of Relationship Quality. *Journal of Relationships Research*, 5. <https://doi.org/10.1017/jrr.2014.2>
- 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. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.58.2.281>
- Fuller, T., & Fincham, F. D. (1995). Attachment style in married couples: Relation to current marital functioning, stability over time, and method of assessment. *Personal Relationships*, 2(1), 17–34. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-6811.1995.tb00075.x>
- Gewirtz-Meydan, A., & Finzi-Dottan, R. (2018). Sexual Satisfaction Among Couples: The Role of Attachment Orientation and Sexual Motives. *Journal of Sex Research*, 55(2), 178–190. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00224499.2016.1276880>
- Gleeson, G., & Fitzgerald, A. (2014). Exploring the Association between Adult Attachment Styles in Romantic Relationships, Perceptions of Parents from Childhood and

Attachment Style and Intimacy among Romantic Relationships

- Relationship Satisfaction. *Health*, 06(13), 1643–1661. <https://doi.org/10.4236/health.2014.613196>
- Grabill, C. M., & Kerns, K. A. (2000). Attachment style and intimacy in friendship. *Personal Relationships*, 7(4), 363–378. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-6811.2000.tb00022.x>
- Greeff, A. P., & Malherbe, H. L. (2001). Intimacy and Marital Satisfaction in Spouses. *Journal of Sex & Marital Therapy*, 27(3), 247–257. <https://doi.org/10.1080/009262301750257100>
- Guerrero, L. K., Farinelli, L. A., & McEwan, B. (2009). Attachment and Relational Satisfaction: The Mediating Effect of Emotional Communication. *Communication Monographs*, 76(4), 487–514. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03637750903300254>
- Hand, M. M., Thomas, D. O., Buboltz, W. C., Deemer, E. D., & Buyanjargal, M. (2013a). Facebook and Romantic Relationships: Intimacy and Couple Satisfaction Associated with Online Social Network Use. *Cyberpsychology, Behavior, and Social Networking*, 16(1), 8–13. <https://doi.org/10.1089/cyber.2012.0038>
- Honari, B., & Saremi, A. (2015). The Study of Relationship between Attachment Styles and Obsessive Love Style. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 165, 152–159. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.12.617>
- Huang, S. H. (2023). The Different Types of Attachment Styles. *Simply Psychology*. <https://www.simplypsychology.org/attachment-styles.html>
- Kirkpatrick, L. A., & Davis, K. L. (1994). Attachment style, gender, and relationship stability: A longitudinal analysis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 66(3), 502–512. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.66.3.502>
- Kirkpatrick, L. A., & Hazan, C. (1994). Attachment styles and close relationships: A four-year prospective study. *Personal Relationships*, 1(2), 123–142. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-6811.1994.tb00058.x>
- Moore, K. N., McCabe, M. P., & Stockdale, J. E. (1998). Factor analysis of the Personal Assessment of Intimacy in Relationships Scale (PAIR): Engagement, communication and shared friendships. *Sexual and Marital Therapy*, 13(4), 361–368. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02674659808404254>
- Reiter, M. K., Richmond, K., Stirlen, A., & Kompel, N. (2009). Exploration of Intimacy in Intercultural and Intracultural Romantic Relationships in College Students. *College Student Journal*, 43(4), 1080–1083. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ872323>
- Robinson, L. (2023). How Attachment Styles Affect Adult Relationships. *HelpGuide.org*. <https://www.helpguide.org/articles/relationships-communication/attachment-and-adult-relationships.htm>
- Schaefer, M., & Olson, D. L. (1981b). Assessing Intimacy: The Pair Inventory*. *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy*, 7(1), 47–60. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1752-0606.1981.tb01351.x>

Acknowledgement

The author(s) appreciates all those who participated in the study and helped to facilitate the research process.

Conflict of Interest

The author(s) declared no conflict of interest.

How to cite this article: Kumari, A. & Rema, M.K. (2023). Attachment Style and Intimacy among Romantic Relationships. *International Journal of Indian Psychology*, 11(3), 1986-1997. DIP:18.01.185.20231103, DOI:10.25215/1103.185