

Influence of Attachment Styles on Intimacy and Love Styles

Komal Katyayani^{1*}

ABSTRACT

This study investigates the influence of the four attachment styles on intimacy and love styles among young adults in India. N= 101 participants aged 18 to 35. Data collection was done via survey method which consisted of basic demographics form and established self-measure tools to assess the attachment styles, intimacy and love styles. Correlation analysis and Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) were employed to analyse the data. The findings reveal significant negative relationships between certain attachment styles (secured and dismissing) and love styles (agape, eros, and ludus) and significant mean differences among love styles in terms of attachment styles, indicating that attachment styles play a role in shaping love dynamics. However, no significant relationships were found between intimacy types and attachment styles. Limitations such as sampling constraints and small sample size are acknowledged, and recommendations for future research, including stratified sampling and longitudinal studies, are provided. This research sheds light on the complex interplay between attachment styles and love styles among young adults. While certain attachment styles may influence the expression of specific love styles, the relationship between attachment styles and intimacy types requires further investigation.

Keywords: Attachment Styles, Love, Intimacy, Romantic Relationships

At least once in our lives, we've all pondered the question, "Is love enough?" Throughout history, social psychologists have been intrigued by human relationships, seeking to understand how our behavior intertwines with the quality of our connections. Among these connections, romantic relationships among adults stand out as particularly influential in shaping our social interactions (Kamp Dush et al. 2008; Lavner and Bradbury 2010; Whisman et al. 2000). **Attachments** are pivotal in fostering emotional bonds, trust, and intimacy within romantic relationships. Mooney (2009) cited Bowlby (1982) describing attachment as "The dimension of the infant-caregiver relationship involving protection and security regulation. Within this theoretical framework, attachment is conceptualized as an intense and enduring affectional bond that the infant develops with the mother figure, a bond that is biologically rooted in the function of protection from danger". Having established attachment as the emotional bond between individuals, it's imperative to delve into Attachment Theory, developed by John Bowlby and further expanded upon by Mary Ainsworth. Attachment Theory posits that humans inherit a neurobiological attachment system during infancy. This system is vital for survival, facilitating the development of emotional connections with primary caregivers who provide nurturing and protection during

¹Student, Amity Institute of Psychology and Allied Sciences, Amity University, Noida, Uttar Pradesh.

*Corresponding Author

Received: April 25, 2024; Revision Received: May 06, 2024; Accepted: May 10, 2024

Influence of Attachment Styles on Intimacy and Love Styles

upbringing. (Mikulincer & Shaver, 2016). Attachment styles are derived from the theory, and these attachment patterns influence how individuals perceive, approach, and navigate relationships throughout their lives. Bartholomew and Horowitz (1991) formulated a four category model of adult attachment based on two dimensions: a person's self-image (positive or negative) and their image of others (positive or negative). Combining these dimensions results in *four attachment styles*: (i) *Secured*, (ii) *Preoccupied*, (iii) *Dismissing* and (iv) *Fearful*. Securely attached individuals generally feel comfortable with intimacy and are able to trust others as well as have positive views of themselves and their relationships, as well as are able to effectively communicate their needs and emotions and often have stable and satisfying relationships. Preoccupied individuals often have a fear of abandonment and a heightened need for closeness and reassurance from their partners. They may worry about their worthiness or their partner's commitment, and may exhibit neediness or demanding behaviours in relationships. Dismissing individuals tend to prioritize independence and self-reliance over intimacy and may avoid emotional closeness as well as may face difficulty expressing their feelings and/or needs. They may also downplay the importance of relationships or maintain emotional distance from their partners. Lastly, fearfully attached individuals (also known as disorganized attachment style) have elements of both preoccupied and dismissing attachment which leads them to desire closeness but also fear rejection or intimacy. They may struggle with conflicting feelings and behaviors in relationships, leading to ambivalence and instability.

Intimacy can be a language of displaying affection and many scholars and even laymen have different concepts or definitions and ways to express it. Intimacy has been characterized as both a fixed state and culmination of a relationship and as an ongoing result of a process that evolves or varies over time. (Laurenceau, Barrett & Pietromonaco, 1998). Kelly (2005) mentioned that *intimacy is multidimensional*- neither just physical, nor just emotional. Intimacy inexplicably blends the entirety of the human experience: the physical, emotional, intellectual, and spiritual dimensions. Schaefer and Olson (1981) created a tool for assessing intimacy types (*PAIR*- Personal Assessment of Intimacy in Relationships). According to them, there are *5 types of intimacy*: (i) Social, (ii) Emotional, (iii) Sexual, (iv) Recreational and (v) Intellectual. Emotional Intimacy has been described as the sensation of deep emotional closeness, where individuals feel comfortable and unrestricted in sharing their thoughts and feelings in a supportive and genuinely understanding environment. Social intimacy is when a couple shares friends, acquaintances, and a comparable social circle. Sexual intimacy encompasses engaging in sexual activities and exchanging affectionate gestures, such as touching and physical proximity. Intellectual intimacy involves the exchange of ideas and discussions pertaining to work and life-related matters. Recreational intimacy involves sharing hobbies, pastimes, and engaging in leisure activities together. (Schaefer & Olson, 1981)

Love, among all feelings, has been an essential part of our lives. Not just in literature and art, but also in psychology, the themes of love are widely discussed. Raffagnino & Puddu (2018) cited Kansky (2018) and O'Leary, Acevedo, Aron, Huddy & Mashek (2012) in their literature review article that love is an emotion commonly experienced by individuals in romantic partnerships, regarded as a vital aspect alongside factors like intimacy, commitment, and affection, contributing significantly to relationship satisfaction and longevity. Lee (1973) conceptualized love using a colour wheel analogy, suggesting that just as there are primary and secondary colours, there are also primary and secondary types of love. The primary love types, analogous to primary colours, include *Eros*, *Ludus*, and *Storge*. *Eros*, represented by the colour red, involves loving an idealized person, *intense* and *passionate love*. *Ludus*,

Influence of Attachment Styles on Intimacy and Love Styles

symbolized by the colour blue, is characterized by *game-playing love*. Storge, depicted by the colour yellow, represents love based on *friendship*. Additionally, Lee identified three secondary love types, which are combinations of the primary types. *Mania*, a blend of Eros and Ludus (red + blue = purple), represents *obsessive love*. *Agape*, formed by combining Eros and Storge (red + yellow = orange), embodies *altruistic love*. *Pragma*, a fusion of Ludus and Storge (blue + yellow = green), reflects realistic and *practical love*. These six love styles, derived from various combinations of the primary and secondary types, provide a framework for understanding the complexities of romantic relationships.

Jannini, Giraldi, and Vignesh (2024) conducted a large-scale quantitative survey across six countries, including the USA, UK, Italy, France, Germany, and Spain, to investigate intimacy issues among middle and old-aged individuals. The study involved over 6,000 participants aged 40 to 75 years, with an additional 630 men per country experiencing erectile dysfunction (ED). Results indicated that trust and mutual respect were key aspects of intimacy, with emotional intimacy outweighing physical intimacy in importance and satisfaction. Concerns about the decline of physical intimacy with age were prevalent, attributed to health issues, work stress, and time constraints. Alarmingly, many participants, especially men, lacked awareness of andropause symptoms, highlighting the need for education. Despite a desire to improve sexual lives, individuals were reluctant to discuss intimacy concerns with healthcare professionals, underscoring the importance of trust and communication in patient-HCP relationships.

Xian, Choi & Ahmad (2023) investigated the relationship between love relationship satisfaction, love styles, and suicidal ideation among 873 Malaysian university students. Findings revealed no association between relationship satisfaction and suicidal ideation. However, love styles showed significant correlations, with Eros (passionate love) positively linked to suicidal ideation, while Mania (possessive love) emerged as a strong predictor. Love styles also predicted relationship satisfaction, highlighting their role in understanding relationship dynamics among university students. Gender differences were observed, with females showing higher suicidal ideation prevalence. The study emphasizes addressing possessive love tendencies and promoting healthy relationship dynamics to reduce suicidal ideation risk among students, recommending tailored intervention programs and psychological support services.

Trifonova, Tokarev & Levenkova (2023) investigated how emotions, particularly love styles, influence intrinsic student motivation, aiming to enhance learning environments. Despite limited exploration in educational literature, the study employed various methods including theoretical analysis, literature review, and personality assessment. Twenty-eight Linguistics students participated, aged 20 to 25. Results identified Ludus, Pragma, and Agape as dominant love styles, with 51% of respondents exhibiting below-average or low motivation. The study proposed a model comprising intellectual stimulation, flexible assessment, and reflection to address prevailing motives influenced by love styles. The authors advocate for testing the model to foster sustained student motivation and enhance educational outcomes.

A study investigated by Stoimenovska, Mantova & Katica (2023) explores the relationship between love languages and attachment styles among 108 female participants in committed relationships. The majority had been together for over ten years and held undergraduate degrees. Results showed that individuals with secure attachment styles preferred quality time, physical touch, and words of affirmation, while those with avoidant attachment styles favored acts of service and receiving gifts. Anxious attachment style individuals also preferred quality

Influence of Attachment Styles on Intimacy and Love Styles

time and receiving gifts, while dismissive attachment style individuals showed the lowest preference for all love languages. However, statistical analysis did not support a significant association between attachment styles and preferred love languages. Despite this, the findings shed light on the complex relationship between attachment styles and love languages, underscoring the importance of recognizing individual differences in expressing and receiving love in relationships.

Shahbazi, Zarei, and Koraei (2023) explored the relationship between emotional and cognitive intimacy and promiscuity in married men, mediated by their attitude towards infidelity. The study, involving 384 married men from Bushehr, Iran, utilized convenience sampling and structural equation modelling for data analysis. Results revealed that emotional and cognitive intimacy were directly associated with attitude towards infidelity and promiscuity. However, cognitive intimacy showed no direct association with promiscuity. These findings highlight the complex dynamics influencing promiscuity among married men and suggest implications for interventions promoting healthy relationships.

Wang (2023) conducted a study aiming to provide a detailed explanation by synthesizing previous experiments and research findings. Additionally, it addresses a new question regarding how parents influence their children's cognitive development, particularly their communication skills, drawing on several studies. The research highlights that the influence of parenting styles on attachment styles primarily hinges on parental responsiveness, with insecure attachment styles often linked to insecure parenting styles. Furthermore, the study underscores that parents' communication methods with their children can impact their cognitive development. Thus, parental influence comprehensively affects children in various aspects, emphasizing the importance for parents to adopt secure behaviors to ensure their children's well-being and future success.

The aim of the current research is to assess how the different attachment styles have an influence on the intimacy styles as well as love styles, with the objectives to investigate if there is any influence on the types of intimacy by the attachment styles and to investigate if each attachment style has a particular, fixed love style.

Hypotheses:

- There will be a significant relationship between dismissing avoidant attachment style and ludus love style
- There will be a significant relationship between secure attachment style and agape love style.
- There will be a significant relationship between preoccupied attachment style and mania love style.
- There will be a significant difference among the love styles in terms of attachment styles
- There will be a significant difference among the intimacy types/styles in terms of attachment styles
- There will be a significant difference in sexual intimacy scores between individuals with dismissing avoidant attachment style and those with other attachment styles.
- There will be a significant difference in emotional intimacy scores between individuals with dismissing avoidant attachment style and those with other attachment styles.

Influence of Attachment Styles on Intimacy and Love Styles

Sample

The study comprised a sample size of 101 individuals, specifically targeting young adults aged between 18 and 35 years. Participants were required to have been involved in a romantic relationship at least six months prior to their participation in the study. Data collection was conducted through surveys, utilizing questionnaires to gather basic demographics as well as self-measure tools for assessment and information. Convenience sampling was employed as the sampling method, facilitating the recruitment of participants based on accessibility and availability rather than specific selection criteria.

Instruments

Three measures were used in this study:

- **RSQ (Relationship Style Questionnaire):** The Relationship Style Questionnaire (RSQ) is a widely used self-report measure developed by Griffin and Bartholomew (1994) to assess attachment styles in adults. The questionnaire consists of 30 items having 5 point likert scale, designed to measure four attachment styles: secure, preoccupied, dismissive-avoidant, and fearful-avoidant.
- **PAIR (Personal Assessment of Intimacy in Relationships):** The PAIR consists of 36 Likert-scale items that individuals respond to based on their perceptions of intimacy in their relationships, developed by Schaefer & Olson (1981). It covers various domains of intimacy (Emotional, Social, Sexual, Intellectual and Recreational) allowing for a comprehensive assessment of relational closeness. The questionnaire has been widely used in research and clinical settings to assess and understand intimacy dynamics in different types of relationships.
- **Love Attitudes Scale (Short Form):** Developed by Hendrick & Hendrick (1998), the Love Attitudes Scale (LAS) is a widely-used tool for assessing six of Lee's (1973) love styles- Eros (passionate love), Ludus (game-playing love), Storge (friendship love), Pragma (logical, "shopping list" love), Mania (possessive, dependent love), and Agape (all-giving, selfless love). Comprising six subscales, each with seven items, the LAS (Short form) in total consists of 18 items. It was created in response to the demand for concise love scales by choosing the top four out of seven items per subscale based on extensive data collection, and embarked on the restandardization process. Three studies involving over 2700 participants resulted in the development of two new short forms of the LAS, featuring 4-item and 3-item subscales respectively. Analysis indicates that these versions exhibit even stronger psychometric properties compared to the original scale.

Procedure

The study employed a comprehensive procedure to investigate intimate relationships among young adults in using online and offline data collection methods. Convenience sampling was utilized to select participants aged 18 to 35 who were currently or had been in a romantic relationship at least six months ago. The study utilized three established tools: the Relationship Style Questionnaire (RSQ), the Love Attitudes Scale (LAS), and the Personal Assessment of Intimacy in Relationships (PAIR). Data analysis was conducted using SPSS, involving the calculation of correlations between variables and Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) to explore any significant relationships and differences across groups in terms of attachment styles. Through this rigorous procedure, the study provided some valuable insights as follows:

RESULTS

Correlation Results

Table 1: Correlation between the Love styles and Attachment Styles

Pearson's Correlation- Attachment Style and Love Styles						
Attachment Styles	EROS	STORGE	LUDUS	PRAGMA	AGAPE	MANIA
SECURED	-0.655	-0.243	0.347	-0.307	-0.468	0.372
Sig.	0.001	0.253	0.097	0.145	0.021	0.074
DISMISSING	0.066	-0.003	-0.403	0.06	0.031	0.022
Sig.	0.749	0.989	0.041	0.771	0.882	0.914
FEARFUL	0.093	0.269	0.003	-0.025	-0.033	0.239
Sig.	0.687	0.238	0.99	0.914	0.887	0.297
PREOCCUPIED	0.004	-0.229	0.045	-0.141	-0.125	-0.276
Sig.	0.985	0.223	0.813	0.457	0.51	0.14

Table 2: Correlation between Attachment Styles and Intimacy Styles

Spearman Correlations between Attachment Styles and Intimacy Styles					
Attachment Styles	Emotional	Social	Sexual	Intellectual	Recreational
SECURED	-0.038	-0.075	-0.309	-0.261	0.077
	0.858	0.729	0.141	0.219	0.721
DISMISSIVE	0.038	-0.262	-0.187	-0.323	-0.074
	0.852	0.196	0.359	0.107	0.719
FEARFUL	0.049	0.097	0.204	-0.001	0.209
	0.833	0.676	0.375	0.998	0.364
PREOCCUPIED	-0.229	0.045	-0.141	-0.125	-0.276
	0.223	0.813	0.457	0.51	0.14

As we can refer to the tables above (table 1 and 2), it was found that there were significant relationships between:

- eros and secured attachment.
- agape and secured attachment.
- ludus and dismissing avoidant attachment style.

However, there is no significant relationship between intimacy styles and attachment styles.

MANOVA Results

Multivariate analysis of variance was to compare the means of all three variables and their subcategories. It was revealed that there is a significant effect of attachment style love styles eros, ludus, agape and mania are statistically significant with significance values 0.04, 0.003, 0.003 and 0.049, respectively. However, no statistically significant difference was found in types/styles of intimacy mean scores and attachment styles. (Table 3)

In multiple comparisons table (Table 4), it is noted that there is a significant mean difference between:

Influence of Attachment Styles on Intimacy and Love Styles

- Dismissing and secured attachment styles in terms of Eros Love Style with the significant level of 0.042
- Fearful and secured attachment styles in terms of Ludus type of love with the significance level of 0.007
- Preoccupied and secured attachment styles in terms of Ludus type of love with the significance level of 0.039
- Dismissing and secured attachment styles in terms of Agape Love Style with the significant level of 0.008
- Preoccupied and secured attachment styles in terms of Agape type of love with the significance level of 0.015

Table 3: Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

Independent Variable	Dependent Variables	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
ATTACHMENT STYLES	EROS	12.473	3	4.158	2.884	0.04
	STORGE	6.823	3	2.274	1.291	0.282
	LUDUS	14.383	3	4.794	4.901	0.003
	PRAGMA	0.479	3	0.16	0.109	0.955
	AGAPE	18.862	3	6.287	5.098	0.003
	MANIA	8.08	3	2.693	2.721	0.049
	EMOTIONAL	33.263	3	11.088	0.962	0.414
	SOCIAL	80.835	3	26.945	1.752	0.162
	SEXUAL	18.843	3	6.281	0.547	0.652
	INTELLECTUAL	49.056	3	16.352	0.995	0.398
RECREATIONAL	52.119	3	17.373	0.952	0.419	

Table 4: Multiple Comparisons

Multiple Comparisons							
Dependent Variable	(I) ATTACHMENT	(J) ATTACHMENT	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound
EROS	DISMISSING	FEARFUL	0.4469	0.35226	0.658	-0.5554	1.4491
		PREOCCUPIED	0.5564	0.3217	0.398	-0.3589	1.4717
		SECURED	.9925*	0.33986	0.042	0.0256	1.9595
	FEARFUL	DISMISSING	-0.4469	0.35226	0.658	-1.4491	0.5554
		PREOCCUPIED	0.1095	0.3416	0.991	-0.8624	1.0815
	PREOCCUPIED	SECURED	0.5456	0.35875	0.513	-0.4751	1.5664
		DISMISSING	-0.5564	0.3217	0.398	-1.4717	0.3589
		FEARFUL	-0.1095	0.3416	0.991	-1.0815	0.8624
	SECURED	FEARFUL	0.4361	0.3288	0.625	-0.4994	1.3716
		DISMISSING	-.9925*	0.33986	0.042	-1.9595	-0.0256
		FEARFUL	-0.5456	0.35875	0.513	-1.5664	0.4751
		DISMISSING	0.4469	0.35226	0.658	-0.5554	1.4491

Influence of Attachment Styles on Intimacy and Love Styles

		PREOCCUPIED	-0.4361	0.3288	0.625	-1.3716	0.4994
STORGE	DISMISSING	FEARFUL	0.4481	0.38937	0.724	-0.6597	1.556
		PREOCCUPIED	0.3846	0.3556	0.76	-0.6271	1.3964
		SECURED	0.7318	0.37567	0.291	-0.337	1.8007
	FEARFUL	DISMISSING	-0.4481	0.38937	0.724	-1.556	0.6597
		PREOCCUPIED	-0.0635	0.3776	0.999	-1.1378	1.0108
		SECURED	0.2837	0.39655	0.916	-0.8445	1.412
	PREOCCUPIED	DISMISSING	-0.3846	0.3556	0.76	-1.3964	0.6271
		FEARFUL	0.0635	0.3776	0.999	-1.0108	1.1378
		SECURED	0.3472	0.36345	0.822	-0.6869	1.3813
	SECURED	DISMISSING	-0.7318	0.37567	0.291	-1.8007	0.337
		FEARFUL	-0.2837	0.39655	0.916	-1.412	0.8445
		PREOCCUPIED	-0.3472	0.36345	0.822	-1.3813	0.6869
LUDUS	DISMISSING	FEARFUL	0.4982	0.29018	0.404	-0.3275	1.3238
		PREOCCUPIED	0.2299	0.26501	0.861	-0.5241	0.9839
		SECURED	-0.5673	0.27997	0.257	-1.3639	0.2293
	FEARFUL	DISMISSING	-0.4982	0.29018	0.404	-1.3238	0.3275
		PREOCCUPIED	-0.2683	0.2814	0.823	-1.0689	0.5324
		SECURED	-1.0655*	0.29553	0.007	-1.9063	-0.2246
	PREOCCUPIED	DISMISSING	-0.2299	0.26501	0.861	-0.9839	0.5241
		FEARFUL	0.2683	0.2814	0.823	-0.5324	1.0689
		SECURED	-.7972*	0.27086	0.039	-1.5679	-0.0266
	SECURED	DISMISSING	0.5673	0.27997	0.257	-0.2293	1.3639
		FEARFUL	1.0655*	0.29553	0.007	0.2246	1.9063
		PREOCCUPIED	.7972*	0.27086	0.039	0.0266	1.5679
PRAGMA	DISMISSING	FEARFUL	0.0543	0.35495	0.999	-0.9556	1.0642
		PREOCCUPIED	-0.0171	0.32416	1	-0.9394	0.9052
		SECURED	-0.1421	0.34246	0.982	-1.1165	0.8323
	FEARFUL	DISMISSING	-0.0543	0.35495	0.999	-1.0642	0.9556
		PREOCCUPIED	-0.0714	0.34421	0.998	-1.0508	0.9079
		SECURED	-0.1964	0.3615	0.961	-1.225	0.8321
	PREOCCUPIED	DISMISSING	0.0171	0.32416	1	-0.9052	0.9394
		FEARFUL	0.0714	0.34421	0.998	-0.9079	1.0508
		SECURED	-0.125	0.33132	0.986	-1.0677	0.8177
	SECURED	DISMISSING	0.1421	0.34246	0.982	-0.8323	1.1165
		FEARFUL	0.1964	0.3615	0.961	-0.8321	1.225
		PREOCCUPIED	0.125	0.33132	0.986	-0.8177	1.0677
AGAPE	DISMISSING	FEARFUL	0.337	0.32584	0.785	-0.5901	1.2641
		PREOCCUPIED	0.0957	0.29758	0.991	-0.7509	0.9424
		SECURED	1.1068*	0.31437	0.008	0.2124	2.0013
	FEARFUL	DISMISSING	-0.337	0.32584	0.785	-1.2641	0.5901
		PREOCCUPIED	-0.2413	0.31598	0.9	-1.1403	0.6578
		SECURED	0.7698	0.33185	0.153	-0.1743	1.714
	PREOCCUPIED	DISMISSING	-0.0957	0.29758	0.991	-0.9424	0.7509
		FEARFUL	0.2413	0.31598	0.9	-0.6578	1.1403

Influence of Attachment Styles on Intimacy and Love Styles

	SECURED	SECURED	1.0111*	0.30415	0.015	0.1458	1.8765
		DISMISSING	-1.1068*	0.31437	0.008	-2.0013	-0.2124
		FEARFUL	-0.7698	0.33185	0.153	-1.714	0.1743
		PREOCCUPIED	-1.0111*	0.30415	0.015	-1.8765	-0.1458
MANIA	DISMISSING	FEARFUL	0.7967	0.29188	0.065	-0.0338	1.6272
		PREOCCUPIED	0.4205	0.26657	0.481	-0.3379	1.1789
		SECURED	0.1955	0.28161	0.923	-0.6057	0.9968
	FEARFUL	DISMISSING	-0.7967	0.29188	0.065	-1.6272	0.0338
		PREOCCUPIED	-0.3762	0.28306	0.624	-1.1815	0.4292
		SECURED	-0.6012	0.29727	0.259	-1.447	0.2446
	PREOCCUPIED	DISMISSING	-0.4205	0.26657	0.481	-1.1789	0.3379
		FEARFUL	0.3762	0.28306	0.624	-0.4292	1.1815
		SECURED	-0.225	0.27245	0.877	-1.0002	0.5502
	SECURED	DISMISSING	-0.1955	0.28161	0.923	-0.9968	0.6057
		FEARFUL	0.6012	0.29727	0.259	-0.2446	1.447
		PREOCCUPIED	0.225	0.27245	0.877	-0.5502	1.0002
EMOTIONAL	DISMISSING	FEARFUL	0.1484	0.99595	0.999	-2.6853	2.982
		PREOCCUPIED	1.2769	0.90956	0.581	-1.311	3.8648
		SECURED	1.1186	0.9609	0.717	-1.6154	3.8526
	FEARFUL	DISMISSING	-0.1484	0.99595	0.999	-2.982	2.6853
		PREOCCUPIED	1.1286	0.96583	0.714	-1.6194	3.8766
		SECURED	0.9702	1.01432	0.822	-1.9157	3.8562
	PREOCCUPIED	DISMISSING	-1.2769	0.90956	0.581	-3.8648	1.311
		FEARFUL	-1.1286	0.96583	0.714	-3.8766	1.6194
		SECURED	-0.1583	0.92964	0.999	-2.8034	2.4867
	SECURED	DISMISSING	-1.1186	0.9609	0.717	-3.8526	1.6154
		FEARFUL	-0.9702	1.01432	0.822	-3.8562	1.9157
		PREOCCUPIED	0.1583	0.92964	0.999	-2.4867	2.8034
SOCIAL	DISMISSING	FEARFUL	2.1447	1.15065	0.33	-1.1292	5.4185
		PREOCCUPIED	2.159	1.05085	0.245	-0.8309	5.1488
		SECURED	1.1923	1.11016	0.764	-1.9663	4.3509
	FEARFUL	DISMISSING	-2.1447	1.15065	0.33	-5.4185	1.1292
		PREOCCUPIED	0.0143	1.11585	1	-3.1605	3.1891
		SECURED	-0.9524	1.17188	0.882	-4.2866	2.3819
	PREOCCUPIED	DISMISSING	-2.159	1.05085	0.245	-5.1488	0.8309
		FEARFUL	-0.0143	1.11585	1	-3.1891	3.1605
		SECURED	-0.9667	1.07405	0.847	-4.0225	2.0892
	SECURED	DISMISSING	-1.1923	1.11016	0.764	-4.3509	1.9663
		FEARFUL	0.9524	1.17188	0.882	-2.3819	4.2866
		PREOCCUPIED	0.9667	1.07405	0.847	-2.0892	4.0225
SEXUAL	DISMISSING	FEARFUL	1.1337	0.99446	0.73	-1.6957	3.9631
		PREOCCUPIED	0.3385	0.9082	0.987	-2.2456	2.9225
		SECURED	0.8718	0.95946	0.843	-1.8581	3.6017
	FEARFUL	DISMISSING	-1.1337	0.99446	0.73	-3.9631	1.6957
		PREOCCUPIED	-0.7952	0.96438	0.878	-3.5391	1.9486

Influence of Attachment Styles on Intimacy and Love Styles

	PREOCCUPIED	SECURED	-0.2619	1.01281	0.995	-3.1435	2.6197
		DISMISSING	-0.3385	0.9082	0.987	-2.9225	2.2456
		FEARFUL	0.7952	0.96438	0.878	-1.9486	3.5391
	SECURED	SECURED	0.5333	0.92825	0.954	-2.1077	3.1744
		DISMISSING	-0.8718	0.95946	0.843	-3.6017	1.8581
		FEARFUL	0.2619	1.01281	0.995	-2.6197	3.1435
INTELLECTUAL	DISMISSING	PREOCCUPIED	-0.5333	0.92825	0.954	-3.1744	2.1077
		FEARFUL	1.2546	1.18916	0.774	-2.1288	4.638
		PREOCCUPIED	1.5641	1.08601	0.559	-1.5258	4.654
	FEARFUL	SECURED	1.7724	1.14731	0.499	-1.4919	5.0368
		DISMISSING	-1.2546	1.18916	0.774	-4.638	2.1288
		PREOCCUPIED	0.3095	1.15319	0.995	-2.9715	3.5906
	PREOCCUPIED	SECURED	0.5179	1.2111	0.98	-2.928	3.9637
		DISMISSING	-1.5641	1.08601	0.559	-4.654	1.5258
		FEARFUL	-0.3095	1.15319	0.995	-3.5906	2.9715
	SECURED	SECURED	0.2083	1.10999	0.998	-2.9498	3.3665
		DISMISSING	-1.7724	1.14731	0.499	-5.0368	1.4919
		FEARFUL	-0.5179	1.2111	0.98	-3.9637	2.928
RECREATIONAL	DISMISSING	PREOCCUPIED	-0.2083	1.10999	0.998	-3.3665	2.9498
		FEARFUL	1.7546	1.25353	0.583	-1.812	5.3211
		PREOCCUPIED	1.6974	1.14479	0.535	-1.5597	4.9546
	FEARFUL	SECURED	0.8974	1.20941	0.907	-2.5436	4.3385
		DISMISSING	-1.7546	1.25353	0.583	-5.3211	1.812
		PREOCCUPIED	-0.0571	1.21561	1	-3.5158	3.4015
	PREOCCUPIED	SECURED	-0.8571	1.27665	0.929	-4.4895	2.7752
		DISMISSING	-1.6974	1.14479	0.535	-4.9546	1.5597
		FEARFUL	0.0571	1.21561	1	-3.4015	3.5158
	SECURED	SECURED	-0.8	1.17007	0.926	-4.1291	2.5291
		DISMISSING	-0.8974	1.20941	0.907	-4.3385	2.5436
		FEARFUL	0.8571	1.27665	0.929	-2.7752	4.4895
		PREOCCUPIED	0.8	1.17007	0.926	-2.5291	4.1291

Based on observed means.

The error term is Mean Square(Error) = 18.254.

* The mean difference is significant at the .05 level.

DISCUSSION

The aim of this research was to investigate the influence of different attachment styles on intimacy and love styles among young adults. Utilizing a sample of 101 participants aged 18 to 35 who were currently or had previously been in a romantic relationship, data were collected through surveys administered both online and offline. The study utilized established assessment tools including the Relationship Style Questionnaire (RSQ), the Love Attitudes Scale (LAS), and the Personal Assessment of Intimacy in Relationships (PAIR). Basic demographics were also taken in a form and the collection was done using the convenience sampling method. The objectives of the study were (i) to investigate if there is any influence on the types of intimacy by the attachment styles and (ii) to investigate if each attachment style has a particular, fixed love style. To examine the same, data analysis was conducted

Influence of Attachment Styles on Intimacy and Love Styles

using SPSS, including correlation analysis and Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) to explore significant differences across groups.

Correlation was used to test the following hypotheses:

- There will be a significant relationship between dismissing avoidant attachment style and ludus love style. (Hypothesis 1)
- There will be a significant relationship between secure attachment style and agape love style. (Hypothesis 2)
- There will be a significant relationship between preoccupied attachment style and mania love style. (Hypothesis 3)

The first hypothesis is based on the objective to see if there is a relationship between ludus, the game playing/playful love and dismissing avoidant attachment individuals. The results of the correlation analysis showed that *there is a significant relationship between dismissing avoidant style and ludus love style* with a correlation coefficient of -0.403. Hence, proving the first hypothesis. The second hypothesis was also proved correct as it was found that *there is a significant relationship between secured attachment styles and agape love styles* with a correlation coefficient of -0.468 which indicates that individuals with higher scores. The *third hypothesis is rejected as there is no significant relationship between the preoccupied attachment style and mania love style*. It was hypothesized on the basis how individuals with a mania love style tend to exhibit obsessive and possessive behaviors in their romantic relationships, characterized by intense emotional highs and lows, jealousy, and a constant need for reassurance and validation from their partners. On the other hand, individuals with an anxious attachment style typically experience fear of abandonment and insecurity in their relationships, leading them to seek constant reassurance and validation from their partners. However, this study shows there is no significant relationship between them.

The findings of correlation analysis provides some more valuable insights into the dynamics of intimate relationships among the selected population that there is a significant relationship with the eros love style and secure attachment style with a correlation coefficient of -0.655 and significance level of 0.001 which indicates that individuals with higher scores on secured attachment styles tend to have lower scores on eros love styles. The eros love style, as defined by Lee (1973), is characterized by intense passion, physical attraction, and romantic idealism. Individuals who exhibit the eros love style prioritize physical attraction and sexual chemistry in their romantic relationships and are often driven by intense desires and infatuations for their partners, seeking intense emotional and physical connections. They may prioritize the thrill of romance and the pursuit of physical pleasure in their pursuit of love. Individuals with a more secure attachment style are less likely to prioritize intense passion, physical attraction, and romantic idealism in their relationships compared to those with less secure attachment styles. This negative correlation may indicate that individuals who feel more secure in their relationships may place greater emphasis on emotional intimacy, trust, and stability rather than purely physical or intense passionate romantic aspects of love.

Overall, the correlational analysis shows how the love styles eros, ludus and agape have a significant relationship with the secured and dismissing attachment styles. The significant effects of attachment styles on love styles underscore the importance of considering attachment patterns in understanding romantic relationship dynamics. These findings align with previous research highlighting the influence of attachment styles on relationship outcomes. However, there were no significant relationships between the intimacy types and

Influence of Attachment Styles on Intimacy and Love Styles

attachment styles. This may suggest that attachment styles primarily impact the emotional and behavioral aspects of love rather than the broader concept of intimacy.

The following hypotheses were tested using MANOVA:

- There will be a significant difference among the love styles in terms of attachment styles (Hypothesis 4)
- There will be a significant difference among the intimacy types/styles in terms of attachment styles (Hypothesis 5)
- There will be a significant difference in sexual intimacy scores between individuals with dismissing avoidant attachment style and those with other attachment styles. (Hypothesis 6)
- There will be a significant difference in emotional intimacy scores between individuals with dismissing avoidant attachment style and those with other attachment styles. (Hypothesis 7)

MANOVA revealed *significant differences in love styles across different attachment styles*, supporting hypothesis 4. Specifically, significant differences were observed in eros, ludus, agape and mania love styles. This underscores the influence of attachment orientations on romantic relationship dynamics. However, the findings also suggest that attachment orientations may not significantly impact the expression of pragma and storge love styles within romantic relationships which could be attributed to various factors such as individual preferences and cultural influences, particularly in the context of Indian culture. In India, where arranged marriages are common, factors like socioeconomic status, religion, education, and family background often take precedence over romantic love. Consequently, pragma love style may be influenced by these factors regardless of attachment style. Similarly, storge love style, emphasizing friendship and companionship, may also be influenced by familial and societal structures in Indian culture. In terms of individual preferences, the individual may prefer companion love or practical love, regardless of the attachment style. Nevertheless, the significant differences identified in other love styles highlight the relevance of attachment theory in understanding variations in love styles in romantic relationships.

In multiple comparisons table, it is noted that there is a significant mean difference between: Dismissing and secured attachment styles in terms of Eros Love Style with the significant level of 0.042, Fearful and secured attachment styles in terms of Ludus type of love with the significance level of 0.007, Preoccupied and secured attachment styles in terms of Ludus type of love with the significance level of 0.039; Dismissing and secured attachment styles in terms of Agape Love Style with the significant level of 0.008; Preoccupied and secured attachment styles in terms of Agape type of love with the significance level of 0.015.

Overall, the findings suggest that individuals with different attachment styles may approach love relationships differently, with implications for relationship satisfaction and stability. It was found that *there are no significant differences in the intimacy types/styles in terms of attachment styles*, therefore, *hypotheses 5, 6 and 7 are rejected* (there is no significant difference in sexual intimacy scores between individuals with dismissing avoidant attachment style and those with other attachment styles. There is no significant difference in emotional intimacy scores between individuals with dismissing avoidant attachment style and those with other attachment styles.).

Influence of Attachment Styles on Intimacy and Love Styles

It appears that there is no fixed preferred intimacy type in the context of attachment styles. There is a possibility that due to certain social taboos, the participants might have not filed the sexual intimacy items sincerely. Every individual according to their cultural factors and preferences might express or feel intimacy. This also depends strongly on their partner and their partner's preferences, for example, a dismissing avoidant might be preferring sexual intimacy but their partner might not, hence, it cannot define the preferred intimacy style of attachment styles. Taking everything into account, it can be summarized that there is a significant role of attachment styles in romantic relationships in terms of their love styles. The objectives of the research are met as influence on the types of intimacy and love styles by the attachment styles were investigated and hypotheses 1, 2 and 4 are accepted.

There were certain limitations faced in the study, first, stratified sampling was considered but not feasible due to time and resource constraints. While the initial aim was to ensure representation from diverse regions across India, convenience sampling was ultimately used due to its practicality within the available resources. As a result, the population in the study predominantly comprises individuals from northern India. This may limit the generalizability of the findings to other regions. Second, the sample size is relatively small for getting the accuracy needed. This could affect the reliability of the results and the ability to detect small but meaningful effects. A larger sample size would have provided greater statistical power and precision in estimating population parameters. Additionally, the lengthiness of the survey, which included multiple measurement tools, may have contributed to participant fatigue and reduced engagement. This could have led to incomplete or inaccurate responses, particularly towards the end of the questionnaire. Self-report measures sometimes might also have certain limitations such as social desirability biases, where participants may provide responses that they perceive as socially acceptable rather than fully accurate. Moreover, discussing sexual activities is often considered taboo in Indian society, which could have led participants to withhold or provide incomplete responses to certain questions related to intimacy and sexual behaviour. This cultural context may have influenced participants' willingness to answer such questions sincerely, potentially impacting the validity and reliability of the data collected on these sensitive topics. Future research efforts may benefit from addressing these limitations to enhance the reliability and validity of findings.

For future implications, it is recommended to utilize stratified sampling to ensure coverage of a larger geographical area. Additionally, aiming for a larger sample size, ideally a minimum of 200 participants, would facilitate a more normal distribution of data and enhance the accuracy of statistical analysis. Longitudinal studies are also encouraged to investigate attachment styles and their associated intimacy patterns over time, providing insights into the stability and dynamics of these relationships. Furthermore, adopting a mixed-methods approach, combining quantitative analysis with qualitative inquiry can offer a more comprehensive understanding of the complexities involved in romantic relationships and attachment dynamics. While quantitative methods provide valuable numerical data, qualitative techniques such as interviews or focus groups can offer deeper insights into individuals' lived experiences and subjective perspectives on attachment and intimacy. On the whole, by incorporating these recommendations into future research designs, scholars can advance our understanding of attachment styles and their implications for romantic relationships in more comprehensive and nuanced ways.

CONCLUSION

The study was conducted with the aim to assess the influence of the four different attachment styles (secured, anxious/preoccupied, dismissing and fearful avoidant) on intimacy

Influence of Attachment Styles on Intimacy and Love Styles

(emotional, sexual, intellectual, social and recreational) and love styles (eros, ludus, mania, agape and pragma) among young adults. This study is based on the previous related literature reviews and revolves around the attachment theory, intimacy types (Schaefer & Olson, 1981) and Lee's love theory. The collection of data was done through a survey consisting of a basic demographics form and three established self-measure assessment tools: Relationship Style Questionnaire (RSQ), the Love Attitudes Scale (LAS), and the Personal Assessment of Intimacy in Relationships (PAIR) on the sample size of 101 participants, aged 18 to 35. There were 7 hypotheses generated out of which hypotheses 1, 2 and 4 were accepted which were related to the influence of attachment styles on love styles. The other 4 which were rejected were related to an influence on intimacy types by the attachment styles. With the help of correlation analysis and Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) it was found that there are significant negative relationships between certain attachment styles (secured and dismissing) and love styles (agape, eros and ludus). Additionally, significant mean differences in love styles across attachment styles were identified, which indicates that attachment styles do have an influence on the love styles. However, no significant relationships were found between intimacy types and attachment styles and no or significant mean differences in intimacy types across attachment styles were found. Apart from achieving the objectives, these findings provide an insight of certain limitations and future implications for the study. The study faced limitations including constraints in sampling methodology, small sample size, and potential biases in self-report measures. These limitations may have impacted the generalizability and reliability of the findings.

For future research, recommendations include utilizing stratified sampling to ensure broader representation, increasing sample size for more accurate analysis, and adopting mixed-methods approaches to gain deeper insights into attachment dynamics. Longitudinal studies are also encouraged to explore attachment styles and intimacy patterns over time.

REFERENCES

- 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. DOI 10.1037//0022-3514.61.2.226
- Bowlby, John. (1982). Attachment. Vol. 1 of Attachment and loss. New York: Basic.
- Brazelton, T. Berry. 1969. Infants and mothers: Differences in development. New York: Dell Publishing Company.
- Hendrick, C., & Hendrick, S. (1986). Love Attitudes Scale--Revised [Database record]. APA PsycTests. DOI 10.1037/t02319-000
- Jannini, E & Giraldi, A & Vignesh, S. (2024). (078) Double Pause: Understanding Couple Intimacy – A Quantitative Survey. *The Journal of Sexual Medicine*. 21. 10.1093/jsxmed/qdae002.070.
- Kamp Dush, C. M., Taylor, M. G., & Kroeger, R. A. (2008). Marital happiness and psychological well-being across the life course. *Family Relations*, 57(2), 211–226 DOI 10.1111/j.1741-3729.2008.00495.x
- Kansky, J. (2018). What's Love Got to Do with It? Romantic Relationships and Well-Being. In E. Diener, S. Oishi, & L. Tay (Eds.), *Handbook of Well-Being* (pp. 1-24). DEF Publishers.
- Kelly, M. (2005). *The Seven Levels of Intimacy: The Art of Loving and the Joy of Being Loved*. Simon & Schuster.
- Laurenceau, J.P., Feldman Barrett, L., & Pietromonaco, P.R. (1998). Intimacy as an interpersonal process: the importance of self-disclosure, partner disclosure, and

Influence of Attachment Styles on Intimacy and Love Styles

- perceived partner responsiveness in interpersonal exchanges. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 74, 1238-1251.
- Lavner, J. A., Karney, B. R., & Bradbury, T. N. (2014). Relationship problems over the early years of marriage: Stability or change? *Journal of Family Psychology*, 28(6), 979–985. DOI 10.1037/a0037752.
- Lee, J. A. (1973). *The colors of love: An exploration of the ways of loving*. Don Mills, Ontario: New Press.
- Mikulincer, M., & Shaver, P. R. (2016). *Attachment in adulthood: Structure, dynamics, and change*. Guilford Press.
- Mooney, C. G. (2009). *Theories of Attachment: An Introduction to Bowlby, Ainsworth, Gerber, Brazelton, Kennell, and Klaus*. United States: Redleaf Press.
- O’Leary, K.D., Acevedo, B.P., Aron, A., Huddy, L., & Mashek, D. (2012). Is Long-Term Love More than a Rare Phenomenon? If So, What Are Its Correlates? *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, 3, 241-249. DOI 10.1177/1948550611417015
- Raffagnino, Rosalba & Puddu, Luisa. (2018). Love Styles in Couple Relationships: A Literature Review. *Open Journal of Social Sciences*. 06. 307-330. 10.4236/jss.2018.612027.
- Schaefer, M. T., & Olson, D. H. (1981). Assessing Intimacy: The Pair Inventory. *Journal of marital and family therapy*, 7(1), 47-60. 10.1111/j.1752-0606.1981.tb01351.x
- Stoimenovska Mantova, Katica. (2023). Examining The Link Between Attachment Style and Preferred Love Language. 40th International Scientific Conference - Knowledge Without Borders. *KNOWLEDGE – International Journal Vol57.5*
- Trifonova, Irina & Tokarev, Albert & Levenkova, Anna. (2023). Creating a supportive learning environment: The impact of dominant love styles on students’ motivation. *Science for Education Today*. 13. 31-50. 10.15293/2658-6762.2305.02.
- Wang, Hainuo. (2023). The Influence of Parenting Styles on Attachment Styles and Parental Influence on Children’s Cognitive Development. *SHS Web of Conferences*. 180. 10.1051/shsconf/202318002026.
- Whisman, M. A., Sheldon, C. T., & Goering, P. (2000). Psychiatric disorders and dissatisfaction with social relationships: Does type of relationship matter? *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 109, 803–808.
- Xian, Ng & Choi, Lee & Shminan, Ahmad. (2023). Love Relationship Satisfaction, Love Styles and Suicidal Ideation Among University Students. *Journal of Cognitive Sciences and Human Development*. 9. 140-158. 10.33736/jcshd.5430.2023.
- Zarei, K., Shahbazi, M., & Koraei, A. (2022). Association of Emotional and Cognitive Intimacy with Promiscuous Married Men Through Mediating Role of Attitude Towards Infidelity. *Hormozgan Medical Journal*.

Acknowledgment

To the Amity Institute of Psychology and Allied Sciences and its director, Dr. Ranjana Bhatia, I express my sincere gratitude for providing the platform and resources necessary for conducting this research. I extend my heartfelt appreciation to my supervisor, Dr. Shivani Bhambri, for her invaluable guidance, encouragement, and support throughout this research endeavor. A sincere thank you to the participants of this study for their time, cooperation, and contribution, which made this research project a reality. I am also grateful to all my teachers and peers whose constant encouragement and belief in my abilities have been instrumental in my academic journey. Finally, I wish to express my deepest gratitude to God and my parents for their unwavering support, encouragement, and understanding during the course of this

Influence of Attachment Styles on Intimacy and Love Styles

research. Their moral and emotional support have been indispensable in completing this project. I am truly grateful to them.

Conflict of Interest

The author(s) declared no conflict of interest.

How to cite this article: Katyayani, K. (2024). Influence of Attachment Styles on Intimacy and Love Styles. *International Journal of Indian Psychology*, 12(2), 1212-1227. DIP:18.01.107.20241202, DOI:10.25215/1202.107