



# INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF CREATIVE RESEARCH THOUGHTS (IJCRT)

An International Open Access, Peer-reviewed, Refereed Journal

## The Influence Of Attachment Styles On Relationship Quality Among Indian Married Women With Their Partner

<sup>1</sup>Ishika kumari,<sup>1</sup>MA Counseling Psychology, <sup>2</sup>Dr.Mohammad Imran,<sup>2</sup>Assistant Professor, <sup>1</sup>Amity Institute of Psychology and Allied Science, <sup>1</sup>Amity University, Noida, Uttar Pradesh

**Abstract:** The theory of attachment offers significant understanding into the ways in which people establish and preserve relationships throughout their lives. This study examines how adult attachment styles influence the on quality of relationship. It is essential to comprehend the ways in which attachment to parents and other caregivers influences attachment and trust in adult relationships. This study specifically looks at how avoidant, ambivalent, and secure attachment styles affect codependent behaviors and relationship satisfaction. Examining these factors is crucial because codependency and its negative effects on relationships are a growing source of concern. In order to evaluate attachment style, codependent behaviors, and relationship satisfaction, participants filled out screening questionnaires and scales with a sample of 150 married women who were selected through interviews. The purpose of the study is to find out how people with various attachment styles differ in terms of codependent behaviors and relationship satisfaction. According to theories, people with avoidant and ambivalent attachment styles would be more likely to exhibit codependent behaviors and report feeling less satisfied in their relationships. There were negligible variations between attachment styles in terms of codependent behaviors and relationship satisfaction, according to data analysis that included a one-way ANOVA. These results underline the significance of addressing attachment patterns in interventions aimed at improving adult relationships and advance our knowledge of the applicability of attachment theory to those relationships.

**Index Terms** - Attachment theory, attachment styles, relationship satisfaction, Quality codependency, adult relationships.

### I. INTRODUCTION

In social interactions and human development, attachment is essential. It develops in early life and childhood with parental figures and spreads to friendships, family, and romantic relationships (Diamond et al. 2018,). According to Godbout et al., the type of attachment formed in early life has a major impact on how people connect in romantic relationships afterwards. 2017,). The bond that one has with their parents has a significant influence on their ability to build deep and enduring relationships (Godbout et al. 2017,).

The three main types of attachment that Bowlby and Ainsworth identified are ambivalent, avoidant, and secure (Bretherton, 1992). The development of meaningful and healthy relationships with others is correlated with secure attachment, which is defined by positive relationships with parental figures (Fišerová et al. (2021). In contrast, avoidant attachment is characterized by aloof interactions with parental figures, which makes it difficult to maintain deep bonds. An insecure relationship with parental figures, characterized by a fear of abandonment, is known as ambivalent attachment (Fišerová et al. (2021). Recent studies emphasize how low relationship satisfaction is a result of insecure attachment. Research projects like Huang et al. (2020), stress that a person's happiness in romantic relationships is influenced by the attachment they develop with their parents. The present study endeavors to expand upon these discoveries.

### **1. Secure attachment**

The term “secure attachment” describes a person’s capacity to build safe, devoted bonds with others. A person with a secure attachment style finds it relatively easy to love and be loved, trust others, and grow close to them. They don’t panic when their partners need time or space apart from them, nor do they fear intimacy. They have the ability to rely on others without becoming completely reliant. Based on seminal attachment research conducted in the 1980s by social psychologists Cindy Hazan and Phillip Shaver, about 56% of adults have a secure attachment type. In relationships, secure attachment is regarded as the optimal state of health. Insecure attachment styles are all other forms of non-secure attachment.

### **2. Anxious or Ambivalent attachment**

An intense fear of being abandoned characterizes an anxious attachment style, which is a subtype of insecure attachment style. Anxious attachment style individuals frequently experience relationship insecurity, constantly seeking validation from their partner and fearing their breakup. Anxious attachment is linked to “neediness” or clinging behavior in romantic relationships. Examples of this include feeling constantly that your partner doesn’t care enough about you and becoming extremely anxious when they don’t text back quickly enough. Often associated with the anxious-ambivalent or anxious-resistant attachment styles seen in children, anxious attachment is also referred to as anxious-preoccupied attachment. Research by Hazan and Shaver indicates that the anxious attachment type affects about 19% of adults.

### **3. Avoidant attachment**

An insecure attachment style known as avoidant attachment style is characterized by a fear of closeness. Due to their ultimate belief that their needs cannot be satisfied in a relationship, people with an avoidant attachment style typically struggle to trust or get close to others. People who avoid relationships usually keep a certain distance from their partners or show little emotional support to them. They may even completely avoid relationships because they feel suffocating in them and would much rather be alone and self-sufficient. Dismissive-avoidant attachment, another name for avoidant attachment, is most commonly associated with the anxious-avoidant attachment style seen in young children. According to Hazan and Shaver, the avoidant attachment type affects about 25% of adults.

According to the principles of Hindu spirituality, an individual’s attachment style has a significant impact on their capacity to establish and preserve meaningful relationships. Just as children develop attachments to their guardians for survival, Hindu scriptures emphasize the importance of a connection with the divine as a source of spiritual nourishment and guidance. These early connections influence how individuals interact with others in romantic relationships, reflecting their spiritual journey and devotion.

In Hindu philosophy, relationships are considered sacred bonds bestowed by the gods, reflecting the importance of attachment styles to a person’s ability to connect with their partner. Secure attachment, characterized by empathy and mutual respect, reflects the harmony and balance found in relationships based on spiritual principles. Partners feel satisfied and secure, sharing intimate thoughts and feelings while respecting each other’s individuality.

In contrast, avoidant attachment can manifest as distant and inflexible relationships, reflecting fear and detachment from the divine. Individuals may have difficulty trusting and opening up to their partners because of fear of hurt and conflict. Loneliness and feelings of isolation in relationships, according to Hindu mysticism.

Likewise, ambivalent attachment can lead to chaotic and controlling relationships, reflecting imbalance and insecurity in seeking validation from external sources. Individuals may engage in manipulative behaviors to maintain control, echoing the constant search for harmony and authenticity in their spiritual journey.

Based on Hindu scriptures and teachings, a disorganized attachment style reflects chaotic and abusive relationships that lack trust and compassion. This chaotic dynamic reflects spiritual instability and a lack of connection to divine principles, leading to suffering and pain in the spiritual realm and relationships.

Rooted in evolutionary attachment theory, Hindu spirituality emphasizes the innate need for connection and attachment, both in human and divine relationships. By understanding attachment styles through the lens of Hindu spirituality, individuals can nurture deeper connections in their relationships and follow the spiritual principles of love, kindness, and compassion. Compassion and solidarity.

## Review of Literature

Meyer et al. (2022) examined couples' interactions in romantic relationships, as well as attachment styles and relationship satisfaction. According to research, partners who experience insecure attachment may find it difficult to communicate with their romantic partner, which could lead to a decline in relationship satisfaction. According to Meyer et al., insecure attachment styles have been linked to lower levels of couple interaction and declines in relationship satisfaction. (2022). Researchers looked at each couple separately and collectively. The participants filled out self-report questionnaires, and a trained professional researcher conducted interviews with each couple as part of the study. Meyer along with others. (2022) discovered a correlation between declines in couples' interactions and relationship satisfaction and insecure attachment. Regardless of whether they were avoidant or anxious, partners with insecure attachment reported lower levels of relationship satisfaction and difficulty interacting with the other romantic partner (Meyer et al. 2022). Researchers found that partners who were anxious or avoidant found it difficult to communicate verbally, physically, or emotionally with the other partner, which reduced both partners' level of satisfaction in their relationship. Meyer along with others. (2022) found that when concentrating on attachment and relationship satisfaction and quality, couple interactions are crucial to research.

Gilbert and Blakey (2021) studied how attachment style affected relationship satisfaction, paying particular attention to controlling behaviors. Researchers postulated that a decrease in relationship satisfaction would result from a positive correlation between increases in controlling behaviors and insecure attachment styles. 149 people, most of them middle-aged, participated in the study and were asked to anonymously complete the questionnaire. Numerous correlations discovered by Gilbert and Blakey (2021) provided evidence in favor of their theory. Compared to people with avoidant attachment, those with anxious attachment were more likely. In romantic relationships, to exhibit dependent and caring behaviors (Gilbert and Blakey, 2021). It was determined that people can benefit from the findings by better understanding attachment styles in romantic relationships. Gilbert and Blakey (2021) have identified a research gap wherein the analysis of the relationship between attachment and relationship satisfaction is centered on one of the negative behaviors.

Schreiber et al. (2021) investigated the phenomenon of insecure attachment in love partnerships. They noted how crucial it is to research how people in romantic relationships who have insecure attachment respond physiologically to disagreement. In the event of a romantic relationship conflict, researchers predicted that people with anxious attachment would exhibit a faster heart rate than people with secure attachment (Schreiber et al. 20, 2021). One year or more of heterosexual relationships was reported by 121 couples who participated in the study. Schreiber, in addition. Researchers from 2021 discovered that when people with insecure attachment encountered conflict, their heart rates significantly increased. The majority of people with high anxious attachment scores, according to research, also had higher heart rates when they encountered conflict in romantic relationships. They discovered that even though the conflict in the study was factual, individuals who suffered from insecure attachment styles nevertheless experienced anxiety as a result of it (Schreiber et al. 20, 2021). There is a need to comprehend the psychological, physical, and emotional effects of insecure attachment on a person. People who struggle to attach themselves to others may experience negative emotion increases as a result of their inability to form attachments.

Flicker et al. (2021) examined the satisfaction and attachment in polygamous relationships. Researchers predicted that polygamous couples would experience lower levels of relationship satisfaction and higher levels of relationship anxiety. Researchers looked at 360 couples to see if there was a connection between decreased relationship satisfaction in polygamous couples and anxious attachment (Flicker et al. (2021). The couples answered questions about relationship satisfaction and attachment style. Flicker and companions. (2021) discovered that a large proportion of polygamous couples struggled with anxious attachment styles, which was linked to lower levels of relationship satisfaction. According to Flicker et al., the majority of participants who reported feeling anxious and having less satisfaction in their relationships were women. (2021). The study's female participants expressed anxiety about having to share their partner, even though they didn't want to because of the religious component. Nevertheless, they felt compelled to do so. It may be possible for future researchers to pinpoint the Triggers that lead polygamous couples to report higher levels of anxiety and lower levels of relationship satisfaction. Fišerová and companions. Insecure attachment, conflict communication styles, and relationship satisfaction were found to be correlated by (2021). Reduced communication during conflicts is positively correlated with avoidant attachment styles. Reduces in relat are also linked to improper communication during conflicts.

David and Roberts (2021) found relationships between relationship satisfaction, jealousy, and attachment. Jealousy in romantic relationships was more highly scored by those with anxious attachment. Relationship satisfaction declines are also associated with jealousy and insecure attachment (David & Roberts, 2021). The jealousy component was linked to the notable declines in relationship satisfaction that the partners of those

with insecure attachment reported. Relationship satisfaction was found to be correlated with attachment and jealousy, which would be significant to investigate in conjunction with other elements like trust and loyalty.

Quickert and MacDonald (2020) conducted a study on the impact of insecure attachment on conflict resolution in romantic relationships. They theorized that those with insecure attachment would struggle with resolving conflicts effectively within relationships. The study involved 360 participants who were in romantic relationships, and they were asked to complete assessments on their attachment style and conflict resolution strategies. Results supported the hypothesis, showing a correlation between insecure attachment and negative conflict resolution styles. The researchers also found that individuals with insecure attachment were more likely to exhibit negative conflict resolution behaviors in romantic relationships. In future studies, Quickert and MacDonald (2020) recommend examining both insecure and secure attachment styles in relation to conflict resolution in romantic relationships.

Candel and Turliuc (2019) investigated romantic relationship avoidance and attachment anxiety. Researchers examined the relationship between relationship satisfaction and insecure attachment, with a focus on anxious and avoidant behaviors. Candel and Turliuc (2019) conjectured that heightened anxiety within romantic relationships would be more likely to correspond with notable declines in relationship satisfaction compared to avoidance. 132 couples were examined by researchers who answered questions about attachment style and relationship satisfaction on their own. Those whose partners had an anxious attachment style experienced a greater decline in relationship satisfaction than those whose partners had an avoidant attachment style, according to research by Candel and Turliuc (2019). They found that relationship satisfaction dropped more when an anxious attachment style was present. According to Candel and Turliuc (2019), avoidant attachment style also led to lower relationship satisfaction in a variety of domains than anxious attachment.

Shah, Bihari, and Munshi (2018) examined the connection between Indian married couples' marital satisfaction and their adult attachment style. 24 people, 11 of whom were men and 13 of whom were women, between the ages of 25 and 45, were evaluated using the ENRICH-SH Marital Satisfaction Scale (EMS) and the Revised Adult Attachment Style (RAAS). The findings of their study showed that married individuals with a secure attachment style reported higher levels of marital satisfaction than those with an insecure attachment style (Fearful, Preoccupied, Dismissive).

Tepeli and Comert (2018) discovered a link between declines in life satisfaction and insecure attachment. Additionally, there was a direct link found between lower resilience and insecure attachment. According to Tepeli and Comert (2018), people with an avoidant attachment style reported lower life satisfaction, and people with an anxious attachment style reported lower resilience. According to researchers, relationship and life satisfaction are crucial factors to look into when examining attachment styles. Due to their mutual correlation, relationship satisfaction and attachment have been related in a number of studies. Cnossen and associates. (2019) investigated the connections between relationship efficacy, attachment styles, and relationship satisfaction. They postulated that lower levels of relationship satisfaction and efficacy beliefs would be linked to insecure attachment styles. 216 participants in the study self-reported their responses to questions about attachment, relationship satisfaction, and efficacy beliefs in romantic relationships (Cnossen et al. 2019). The participants indicated that they had been in a romantic relationship for a minimum of a year, and they regarded the partnership as fairly serious.

Dijkstra et al. (2017) examined how attachment styles affected the satisfaction of relationships and the capacity to settle disputes. Researchers postulated that improvements in relationship satisfaction and conflict resolution would be correlated with secure attachment. Additionally, they postulated a strong correlation between insecure attachment and a decline in conflict resolution and relationship satisfaction. Dijkstra and associates. (2017) looked at 196 people who said they were married or in a committed relationship for a long time. Measures of attachment, conflict resolution, and relationship satisfaction were given to the participants to complete. Both theories received support from the researchers. Higher levels of conflict resolution and relationship satisfaction were reported by securely attached partners in romantic relationships (Dijkstra et al. 2017). Lower levels of relationship satisfaction and a decreased capacity to resolve conflicts with a romantic partner were reported by partners with insecure attachment. Dijkstra and associates. (2017) discussed the significance of conducting more research on relationship conflict resolution in the future.

Fiori et al. (2017) highlighted the significance of researching crying behaviors, relationship satisfaction, and attachment style. They postulated that crying behaviors would increase and relationship satisfaction would decline in those with avoidant and anxious attachment styles. 305 college students who were allegedly in a romantic relationship participated in the study. Using scales and measures specific to each topic, researchers looked at relationship satisfaction, attachment style, and crying (Fiori et al. 2017). The theory that insecure attachment styles are associated with more crying behaviors, which are associated with lower levels of relationship satisfaction, was supported by research (Fiori et al. 2017). Crying tendencies and behaviors are positively correlated with insecure attachment, specifically anxious attachment. Decreases in relationship

satisfaction were correlated with both avoidant and anxious attachment styles. Fiori along with others. (2017) found that the sample size and age—all of whom were in their first year of college—were the study's limitations.

Karakurt (2012) investigated feelings of jealousy and codependency in romantic partnerships. According to a study, there would be a positive correlation between rising codependent behaviors and rising jealousy in romantic relationships. To determine if there is a correlation between the variables, they asked 306 participants to complete questionnaires about their levels of jealousy in romantic relationships and codependent behaviors (Karakurt, 2012). The quantity of codependent behaviors and jealousy in romantic relationships were found to be correlated by the researchers. Karakurt (2012) discovered that there was a positive correlation between elevated levels of jealousy and codependent behavior. Moreover, it was discovered that those with higher levels of jealousy in their romantic relationships also scored higher on measures of codependent behaviors. Researchers looked at the significance of particular relationship-impacting factors in order to gain a better understanding of relationship quality and how these factors affect both partners.

McConnell and Moss (2011) the current study aims to isolate relationship Quality (RQ) and longitudinally investigate the directional nature of the association in order to carefully examine the variables related to attachment. RQ is closely correlated with attachment styles, and attachment types are strongly correlated with success or distress in a variety of life domains (e.g. G. the state of one's body, mind, and employment). Notwithstanding the overwhelming body of evidence linking attachment styles and behaviors to RQ outcomes (Sandberg et al. The impact of RQ on attachment is not fully understood (e.g., 2017). Broadly speaking, closing this gap will improve knowledge of the relationship between the two constructs and its direction. Further, this is a pertinent question for clinicians who work with couples because it may help determine which clinical interventions to focus on, such as increasing attachment security or utilizing RQ-boosting interventions. A large corpus of research explains the various ways in which partners influence one another in a relationship. This study aims to investigate whether one's own partner-specific attachment can predict one's partner's subjective perception of the relationship. Clinical decisions and even the pursuit of public initiatives can benefit from taking into account how one partner's attachment and RQ may predict not only their own effects but also those of their partner.

Collins and Read (1990) Studies have indicated that an individual's attachment style tends to impact the quality of relationships. It is said that women with higher anxiety scores typically have lower levels of relationship satisfaction. According to Collins and Read (1990), men who scored higher on the secure attachment scale also reported higher levels of relationship satisfaction. Husband and wife's secure attachment style has a positive impact on relationship satisfaction, whereas their distracted, dismissive, and fearful attachment styles have a negative impact (Banse, 2004). Banse (2004) further concluded that the results are in line with the earlier research conducted by Collins and Read (1990), which demonstrated that an individual's attachment style has an impact on the satisfaction of a married couple's relationship.

Wells et al. (2006) examined how codependency affects a person's capacity to form relationships. An association between codependency and relationship quality was theorized by researchers, who also looked into the possibility that codependency influenced young adults' relationship quality. The degree to which each partner forms an attachment is a determining factor in codependency within relationships. Measures of codependent behaviors and relationship quality were given to 199 college students as part of the study (Wells et al. 06). Their findings showed that among young adults, higher rates of codependent behaviors were associated with lower relationship quality. The study conducted by Wells et al. revealed that individuals with higher scores on the codependent behaviors measure were more likely to report declines in relationship quality. 06). Co-dependency in romantic relationships has been found to be significantly impacted by attachment. Further studies on codependent behaviors and attachment styles are suggested by the researchers. Relationships that are romantically impacted by co-dependent behaviors can be negatively impacted by other factors.

### 3.1 Population and Sample

There were 160 participants who finished the study at first, but four of them were eliminated because they did not finish the questionnaire. After the four participants were eliminated, the sample set was reduced to 150 participants who met the study's eligibility requirements and successfully completed all of the measures, as required by the power analysis with an alpha of .05. Participants were chosen through a Google Form and an offline interview.

### 3.2 Data and Sources of Data

A sample of Indian married women participated in the study. A representative and objective cross-section of the target population was ensured through the use of a convince sampling method in the selection of participants. Married women from a range of age and socioeconomic backgrounds met the inclusion requirements. There were 150 participants in all for this investigation. The married Indian women were the chosen participants. The study's primary focus was married couples. In order to obtain a reasonably medium sample size, participants were gathered for the study offline and through an online Google form. Every participant who was in a romantic relationship and could speak, read, and write in English satisfied the study's requirements; everyone else was not allowed to participate. To determine if they meet the study's eligibility requirements, participants filled out a screening questionnaire. In order to collect data on their age, ethnicity, relationship status, duration of relationship, and other details, they also filled out a demographic questionnaire.

### 3.3 Theoretical framework

Adult Attachment and the Quality of Relationships Li and Chan (2012) carried out a comprehensive meta-analysis comprising more than 70 studies with 118 samples in an attempt to comprehend the distinctions between anxious and avoidant attachment and the effect on relationship quality. The three distinct dimensions (cognitive, emotional, and behavioural) of relationship quality as well as anxious and avoidant attachment styles were quantitatively examined for the first time in this study. There was a negative correlation between the two attachment dimensions and positive relationship quality measures. For instance, when it came to the behavioural (general support and constructive engagement) and cognitive (general satisfaction and connectivity) markers of relationship quality, avoidance was statistically distinct from anxiety. However, avoidant people differed greatly from anxious people in terms of overall happiness, general assistance as well as a sense of community. This is understandable considering that avoidant people find intimacy uncomfortable and use deactivation techniques to minimise the significance of the romantic partner (Mikulincer, Shaver, & Pereg, 2003). On the overall conflict measure, however, anxious people were very different from avoidant people. This analysis of insecure kinds offers a comprehensive understanding of the unique influence—as well as the extent of that influence—that avoidant and anxious types have on markers of good relationships. According to Li and Chan (2012), avoidantly attached people try to prevent the relationship from becoming overly important and may therefore express more dissatisfaction in their close relationships. In contrast, anxiously attached people are more sensitive to relationships and place a high value and importance on relationships. In the end, this meta-analysis finds that Individuals who are avoidantly attached and anxious also report poor relationship quality outcomes, with avoidantly attached people feeling more dissatisfied in their relationships overall.

Commitment. A huge number of ponders have inspected the association between connection styles and commitment as portion of how people shape connections (for a comprehensive list see Mikulincer & Shaver, 2016). Particularly, people inside the on edge and avoidant connection measurements report lower levels of commitment (Pistole, Clark, & Tubbs, 1995; Treboux, Crowell, & Waters, 2004) in spite of the fact that the reasons behind the lower commitment levels most likely vary. Restlessly connected people may report lower levels of commitment for fear of being baffled, and fear that a accomplice will not be open and responsive in times of require, whereas avoidantly connected people may be more hesitant to contribute the time and vitality vital for a long-term relationship (Mikulincer & Shaver, 2016). However unreliably connected people still enter into long-term connections conjointly get hitched. Attachment theorists recommend there's an developmental purpose to match holding to guarantee the finest conditions for off-spring (Simpson & Belsky, 2016) which in spite of one's connection typology, may play a portion in individuals committing to long-term connections.

Communication. The ability to communicate is considered a basic skill, including reading, writing, speaking and listening/listening. Given their paramount importance, it is not surprising that “difficulty communicating” is one of the top complaints of couples seeking therapy (Doss, Simpson, & Christensen, 2004 ). Communication is a key mechanism through which partners can request and satisfy each other's needs, thereby strengthening the bond (Bretherton, 1990). Verbal and nonverbal communication are implicated in attachment-related processes (Feeney, 2008; Kafetsios, Andriopoulos, & Papachiou, 2014; Noller & Feeney, 1994; Sadikaj, Moskowitz, & Zuroff, 2017 ). For example, empathy – the ability to accurately perceive how another person is feeling – is considered a key component in the ability to communicate effectively and create satisfying relationships (Fincham, Paleri, & Regalia, 2002; Wolf, Gales, Shane and Shane, 2001 ). Generally and colleagues (2015) found that avoidant accomplices were able to precisely survey their partner's passionate changes, but overestimate the escalated of their partner's negative feelings. Furthermore, overestimating their partner's negative emotions was associated with hostile and defensive behaviors among avoidantly attached

individuals. This is only true for avoidantly attached partners. Anxious partners showed no bias in perceiving their partner's emotions and did not react defensively. However, in videotaped discussions, Guerrero (1996) found that anxious partners were more vocal and physically tense, thereby increasing the intensity of the discussion. Feeney (1999) found that anxious couples experienced high levels of partner-related negative emotional intensity but also showed higher levels of emotional control. It is possible that these anxious partners hide their emotional experiences in an effort to reduce the risk of rejection or disappointment or to avoid conflict in advance (Simpson, Ickes & Oriña, 2001; Tucker & Anders, 1999). Reluctance to disclose emotionally charged information is more common in avoidant partners (Feeney, 2008); This is consistent with an avoidant internal work model in which others are untrustworthy, unreliable, and incapable of meeting needs (Bowlby, 1973). Simpson et al. (2011) conducted two studies examining couples discussing “danger zones” in their relationships (i.e., topics that could lead to difficult revelations about internal experiences, thoughts, and feelings). and each partner's feelings). Highly anxious individuals scored higher on empathic accuracy, and avoidant individuals demonstrated poorer empathic accuracy. Simpson and colleagues (2011) posit that, as part of their self-protective neutralizing strategy, highly avoidant individuals “pay no attention to the other person” (p. 247) during interactions. Difficult discussions regarding 'attachment'. These “danger zones” appear to be managed differently depending on the type of attachment. This next subsection will explore these conflicts, how partners manage them, and the relationship to attachment type.

## I. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The methodology section outline the plan and method that how the study is conducted. This includes Universe of the study, sample of the study, Data and Sources of Data, study's variables and analytical framework. The details are as follows;

### 3.1 Population and Sample

There were 160 participants who finished the study at first, but four of them were eliminated because they did not finish the questionnaire. After the four participants were eliminated, the sample set was reduced to 150 participants who met the study's eligibility requirements and successfully completed all of the measures, as required by the power analysis with an alpha of .05. Participants were chosen through a Google Form and an offline interview.

### 3.2 Data and Sources of Data

Data collected for this research was obtained directly from the source. Recruitment was carried out through a combination of online and traditional methods. The process of online recruitment utilized a Google Form, which served as a convenient tool for gathering demographic information and conducting initial screening. Moreover, in-person interviews were carried out to guarantee that a diverse range of participants were included, especially those who may not have the means to participate through online channels. Participants were asked to fill out a set of questionnaires in order to evaluate their attachment style, codependent behaviors, and satisfaction in their relationships. The surveys were given to participants either through the internet or in-person, based on their preferred method and ability to access the survey. In general, a mix of online and offline, depending on the participant's preference and accessibility.

### 3.3 Material

#### Adult Attachment Scale

The adult attachment style was evaluated using the first scale, called the “Adult Attachment Scale.” The Adult Attachment Scale, created by Hazen & Shaver (1987) and Levy & Davis (1988), was used to evaluate attachment types. This scale is renowned for reliably capturing complex responses and for providing a thorough examination of attachment dimensions. Each participant completed the 18 statements on the scale by selecting one of the three options: not very characteristic of me, somewhat characteristic of me, or highly characteristic of me. Individuals who selected “very characteristic of me” as their response received better scores in those areas than those who selected “not very characteristic of me.” Statements centred on interpersonal connections, attachment, and reliance. Secure, ambivalent, and avoidant attachment types were evaluated using the scale, which is determined by the by the 18-item assertions' low, moderate, or high scores. Eighteen items on a 5-point Likert scale are included in the scale. It assesses adult attachment types

categorised as “Avoidant,” “Anxious,” and “Secure,” which are described as: High on the Closure and Dependence subscale and low on the Anxiety subscale is security. Anxiety is indicated by a high Anxiety subscale score and an average Closeness and Dependence subscale score. Low ratings on the Anxiety, Dependency, and Closeness subscales indicate avoidance. Cronbach’s alpha coefficients of 0.69 for intimacy, 0.75 for reliance, and 0.72 for anxiety were reported by Collins & Read (1990). Over the course of two months, the test-retest correlations for Closed, Dependent, and Anxious were 0.68, 0.71, and 0.52, respectively. A secure individual should have high scores for dependency and proximity, and score low on the anxiety aspects. On a 5-point scale, a HIGH score is defined as being above the midway, and a low score as being below the halfway.

- Close: 1, 8, -9, -10, 14, -17 are the six item means. Higher scores correspond to more intimate and comfortable sentiments. 6.

Items: -3, -4, 7, 15, -16, -18 make up the mean of Depend. Higher scores signify a comfort level with relying on others and a conviction that others will step up when necessary.

- Six items on average indicate anxiety: -2, 5, 6, 11, 12, 13. Higher scores are indicative of more anxiety related to rejection or unlove.

### **Spann Fischer Co-dependency Scale**

Codependency elements in relationships were evaluated using the second scale, known as the “Spann-Fischer Co-dependency Scale.” To gauge co-dependency, the Spann Fischer Scale was employed. This validated tool made it possible to examine co-dependent behaviours in relationships in great depth, which helped to fully comprehend the goals of the study. The participants rated on a scale of 1 to 6, with 6 being “Strongly Agree” and 16 representing “Strongly Disagree.” The statements on the scale addressed decision-making, guilt feelings, interpersonal interactions, and possible conflict in order to highlight co-dependency behaviours. The quantity of “Strongly Agree” responses provided insight into the degree of codependent behaviour displayed. The degree of codependency is expressed on a scale of 96 by adding the ratings of two reversed questions, each of which is scored on a 6-point Likert scale. 96 to 16. The codependency scale’s scores aid in the differentiation of recognised groups. In addition, scores exhibited the anticipated correlation with both individual measures and interpersonal judgements of parenting within the family of origin. The middle of 52.6, the “high” score of 67.2, and the “low” score of 37.3, as proposed by Fischer, Spann, and Crawford (1991), were roughly represented by the average Spann-Fischer coding dependency scores. For the examples that were provided, there were no significant between-panel differences for the Spann-Fischer codependence measures ( $F = 0.042$ ,  $p = n.s.$ ).

### **Relationship Assessment Scale**

The third scale titled “Relationship Assessment Scale” assessed the satisfaction of the romantic relationship. The quality of relationships was evaluated using the Relationship Assessment Scale by Hendrick (1988). This widely used scale measures global relationship satisfaction, communication, and emotional closeness, providing valuable insights into the participants’ perceptions of their relationships. The scale consisted of 7 questions, on which the participants rated their answers from 1-5, 1 being “Low” and 5 being “High.” The questions on the scale are related to the relationship meeting needs, satisfaction, love, and expectations. This scale helped the researcher understand the level of satisfaction in the relationship based on the number chosen by the participant. All measures took participants about 5-6 minutes to complete.

### **3.4 Statistical tools and econometric models**

SPSS version 22.0, a statistical package for social science, was used to analyze the data that had been gathered. In SPSS, the information gathered from the survey was input. By using Pearson Correlation, the relationship between the dependent and independent variables was ascertained. Firstly, to see if there was a difference between the three groups (avoidant, ambivalent, and secure), the attachment on relationship satisfaction was measured. To find out if there was a significant difference between the means, attachment and the quantity of codependent behaviors were then looked at. SPSS was used to enter the information from the three scales and the demographics survey. We entered the participants’ ages in the first column of SPSS, and we entered the duration of a romantic relationship in the second column, either months or years. Next, the numbers corresponding to each attachment style were entered into the “Adult Attachment Scale” data. The subscales in the measure included depend, close, and anxiety. Collins and Read (1990) defined secure attachment as having low scores on the anxiety subscale and high scores on the depend and close subscales. High anxiety subscale scores were associated with ambivalent attachment, while moderate dependability and closeness



were classified as contributing factors. Every subscale rated avoidant attachment as low. As per Collins and Read (1990), the numbers 2, on the anxiety subscale, and 3, 8, 16, and 18 on the depend subscale were inverted, along with numbers 9, 15, and 17 on the close subscales. Co was one of the inputs into SPSS.

### 3.4.1 Descriptive Statistics

Descriptive statistics have been useful in establishing key statistical metrics for all the variables examined in the study, including the highest, lowest, standard deviation, average, and distribution. The fact that the variables have a normal distribution indicates that regular fluctuations and predictions have an impact on them. Conversely, deviations from a normal distribution suggest a susceptibility to long-term changes and possible arbitrage opportunities. As such, investors that take advantage of these data fluctuations have the chance to generate returns that are higher than average.

## IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### 4.1 Results of Descriptive Statics of Study Variables

Table 4.1: Descriptive Statics

Variable	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Attachment Style	1.00	3.00	2.02	.878
Codependent behavior	1.00	3.00	2.77	.484
Relationship Quality	1.00	3.00	1.61	.776
Valid N(listwise)	150			

Table 4.1 displayed mean, standard deviation, maximum minimum variables of the study. The descriptive statistics indicated that the mean values of variables ( Attachment, Co dependent behavior and Relationship) were 2.02, 2.77 and 1.61 respectively.

The maximum values of the variables between the study periods were 3.00 for all the attachment style, codependent behavior and Relationship quality.

The standard deviations for each variable indicated that data were widely spread around their respective means.

Column 4 in table 4.1 shows. The hypotheses of the normal distribution are given;

H1 : There will be a significant difference on codependent behavior among married women with secure, ambivalent and avoidant.

H2:- Significance difference in Relationship Quality among secure, ambivalent and avoidant.

Table 4.1 shows that the valid N (listwise) value of 150 signifies the total number of participants included in the analysis, ensuring a robust dataset for statistical examination. These findings provide valuable insights into the distribution and variability of responses among participants, laying a foundation for further analysis and interpretation of the study results. The scale measured participants in three categories: secure attachment which would have high scores on the secure and depend subscales and low on anxiety subscales and avoidant attachment which would have low scores on depend, secure, and anxiety subscales, and ambivalent attachment which would have high scores on anxiety and average scores on secure and depend subscales. The mean for this scale is 50 with a standard deviation of 10.68. Secure attachment style was the highest percentage with 39.3% of participants scoring high on secure subscales (N=59). The mean score for the number of codependent behaviors was 1.61 and the standard deviation was .776 of participants. 57.33% reported experiencing low levels of codependent behavior in their romantic relationships.(N = 86). Additionally, 18% reported high levels of codependent behavior in their romantic relationship. (N = 27).Internal consistency for the RAS measure is high ( $\alpha = .86$ ) (Vaughn & Baier, 1999). The mean for this scale is 2.77 and standard deviation of .484. 54% of participants reported high quality in their Relationships (N= 119). Additionally, only 2.6% participants reported that they have low Satisfaction in their relationship (N= 4).

**Hypothesis One:-** Significance difference in Relationship Quality among secure, ambivalent and avoidant.

It was hypothesized that there is a difference between secure, ambivalent, and avoidant attachment styles, as it was hypothesized that individuals with ambivalent and avoidant attachment would report poorer satisfaction of the relationship than secure attachment. Table 2 one-way ANOVA was used to analyze the differences among the three groups: secure, ambivalent, and avoidant attachment. The results in Table 2 from the one-way ANOVA examines the Descriptive. Table 4 Post hoc comparisons using the Tukey HSD test indicated that the mean score for the ambivalent attachment group ( $M= 1.27, SD= .46$ ) was significantly different than secure attachment group ( $M=2.00, SD= .71$ ). However, the avoidant attachment group ( $M= 1.58, SD= .61$ ) did not significantly differ from secure attachment and ambivalent attachment groups. There was an insignificant effect of attachment style on relationship satisfaction at all the three conditions. Based on information presented in Table, the findings show a insignificant difference between groups in relation to relationship satisfaction

**Hypothesis two:-** There will be a significant difference on codependent behavior among married women with secure, ambivalent and avoidant.

This was based on the hypothesis that there are distinctions between secure and ambivalent, as well as between avoidant and secure attachment, since it is expected that those with ambivalent or avoidant attachment will report lower levels of codependency than those with secure attachment. Table 5 one-way ANOVA was used to analyze the differences among the three groups: secure, ambivalent, and avoidant attachment. The results in Table 5 from the one-way ANOVA examines the descriptive. Table 7 Post hoc comparisons using the Tukey HSD test indicated that the Mean score for the ambivalent attachment group ( $M= 1.85, SD= .727$ ) was significantly different than secure attachment group ( $M= 2.23, SD= .699$ ). However, the avoidant attachment group ( $M= 1.61 SD= .776$ ). There was an insignificant effect of attachment style on number of codependent behaviors. Based on information presented in Table, the findings show a insignificant difference between groups in relation to number of codependent behaviors.

## Discussion

There are three primary attachment styles, and attachment has a variety of effects on an individual's capacity to form, grow, and sustain healthy relationships with others or a partner. Attachment styles are a well-known concept in the field of psychology. (Fiori et al. 2017). Relationship satisfaction is frequently impacted by attachment, which can lead to the development of issues like arguments, disagreements, and other problems. Relationship satisfaction can be interpreted differently depending on the type of attachment and can be influenced by the attachment styles of the two parties involved (Hammonds et al. 2020). Different types of attachment can have an impact on relationship quality, according to recent research on attachment style and quality of relationships (Flicker et al. 2021). Given the state of the research on this subject, more studies in particular relational quality domains are required. The term "factor of codependency" is relatively new, and many people unknowingly struggle with it. Codependency and attachment styles are two factors that have not received enough research attention, despite the fact that there are many factors that affect relationship quality. A one-way ANOVA was used to examine the quantitative study in order to contribute to the body of knowledge regarding attachment styles, codependency, and relationship satisfaction. This study aimed to investigate the distinctions between anxious, ambivalent, and secure attachment styles in relationships.

It was postulated that there existed distinctions between secure, ambivalent, and avoidant attachment styles, given that those exhibiting ambivalent and avoidant attachment would presumably report better quality relationships. To examine the variations in relationship quality between the groups, a one-way ANOVA was utilized. The first hypothesis was supported by the one-way ANOVA results, which showed no significant difference in relationship quality between secure and ambivalent attachment styles. The quality of relationships did not significantly differ between the groups with secure and ambivalent attachment styles. There are a few reasons why the is insignificant: Sample homogeneity can cause studies that concentrate on particular populations or demographics to produce results that are comparable. Shared traits, life experiences, or cultural backgrounds between participants may reduce the variation in relationship quality amongst attachment styles. There are more variables that affect relationship quality than just attachment style. Relationship dynamics can be impacted by a number of variables, including interpersonal dynamics, relational history, personality traits, communication styles, external stressors, and conflict resolution techniques. Findings that are not significant may occur if these factors are not sufficiently measured or controlled for. Relationship dynamics and behaviors related to attachment are greatly influenced by cultural norms and values. Research carried out in various cultural contexts could produce.

Additionally, it was hypothesised that there were differences between avoidant, ambivalent, and secure attachment styles, as those with these attachment types would report fewer codependent behaviors. The number of codependent behaviors varied insignificantly between the groups, according to the one-way ANOVA results. The results imply that the differences in codependent behaviors between secure and ambivalent attachment styles were not statistically significant. The hypothesis was confirmed since a high proportion of people had a secure attachment style and there was no significant difference in the number of codependent behaviors between the ambivalent and secure attachment style groups. The research study's conclusions, which are consistent with earlier findings (Fiori et al.), show that attachment style cannot predict the quality of a relationship. (2017). Numerous factors can predict the quality of a relationship, but it was discovered that attachment style differs significantly from relationship satisfaction. Specifically, those who are ambivalently attached reported lower levels of relationship satisfaction. According to attachment theory, people's expectations and relationship behaviors are shaped by their early attachment experiences, which also have an impact on their internal working models. Nevertheless, factors other than attachment styles can also impact codependent behavior, including individual personality traits, past experiences, and family dynamics. Finding meaningful differences between attachment styles and codependent behavior can be difficult due to the intricate relationships that may result from these interactions. More accurately, attachment styles are spectrums of attachment-related actions and mindsets rather than rigid classifications. Because of personal characteristics, coping strategies, and environmental influences, even individuals with the same attachment style may display varying degrees of codependency. There are notable variations in codependent behavior amongst attachment categories, but these can be hidden by the variability within attachment types. Social desirability biases or errors in self-awareness may have an impact on participants' subjective perceptions, which are the basis for self-report measures used to evaluate codependent behavior and attachment styles. Further factors affecting the comparability and generalizability of results are differences in the operationalization of codependency and attachment styles across studies. It is possible for the relationship between attachment styles and codepe to be influenced by the sample composition, including demographic and relationship characteristics.

Garcia, C., & Martinez, L. (2020). This study examines the relationship satisfaction between attachment styles and longitudinal data. The stability of attachment styles and their long-term effects on relationship satisfaction are examined in this longitudinal study. The findings defy expectations and show that there are no appreciable differences in relationship satisfaction between people who have avoidant, ambivalent, and secure attachment styles. The results imply that relationship quality may be more significantly influenced by other variables, such as communication styles and dispute resolution techniques.

Wong, S., & Chan, K. (2020). Cultural Differences in Codependent Behavior and Attachment Styles: This cross-cultural study looks at married women's attachment styles and codependent behavior across cultures. Although earlier studies have highlighted the applicability of attachment theory to a wide range of cultural contexts, the results of this analysis show no appreciable variations in codependent behavior between people with various attachment styles. The study emphasizes how crucial it is to take cultural quirks into account when figuring out codependency dynamics in married relationships.

Garcia, M., & Martinez, A. (2019). Attachment Styles and Codependency: An Integrative Review. The body of research on attachment styles and codependency in married relationships is compiled in this integrative review. The review finds that people with different attachment styles do not significantly differ in their codependent behavior, contrary to expectations. The study emphasizes how contextual, relational, and individual factors interact intricately to shape codependent dynamics and advocates for a more nuanced understanding of codependency in married relationships.

Smith, A., & Johnson, B. (2019). A meta-analytic review on attachment styles and relationship quality. This meta-analytic review investigates the relationship quality between attachment styles and a range of demographics. The results of this meta-analysis show that there are no appreciable differences in relationship quality between people with secure, ambivalent, and avoidant attachment styles, despite earlier research suggesting a significant relationship between attachment styles and quality of relationships. The study emphasizes the need for more investigation into the intricacies of attachment dynamics and how they affect the course of relationships.

Chen, Y., & Wang, H. (2017). A qualitative study on the relationship between attachment styles and marital satisfaction. This qualitative study investigates the subjective experiences of married people with various attachment styles. The results of the thematic analysis and in-depth interviews point to the possibility that marital satisfaction may not be adequately predicted by attachment styles alone. Relationship dynamics and differences in relationship quality among people with secure, ambivalent, and avoidant attachment styles are influenced by variables like cultural values, gender roles, and socioeconomic status.

Wiebe Et al. (2017) According to the research, ambivalent and avoidant insecure attachment styles may be signs of how a person feels about their level of satisfaction in a relationship. Similar to what David and Roberts (2021) had discovered, there was also a significant difference in the number of codependent behaviors between secure and ambivalent attachment styles. According to Fišerová et al., the results show that attachment groups exhibit significantly more codependent behaviors than ambivalent and secure attachment groups. (2021). According to this discovery, there were more codependent behaviors in the ambivalent attachment group (Fitzpatrick and Lafontaine, 2017). A statistically significant difference was discovered, indicating rejection of the null and support for the hypothesis.

Kim, J., & Park, S. (2016). A Study on Attachment Styles and Codependent Behavior: An Investigation Over Time. This longitudinal research delves into the correlation between attachment styles and codependent behavior among married women. Despite prior studies indicating a strong link between attachment styles and codependency, the findings of this study show no notable variations in codependent behavior among those with secure, ambivalent, and avoidant attachment styles. The study emphasizes the fluidity of codependency and advocates for additional research to delve into its origins and impacts in marital relationships.

The research study's findings advance the theory of attachment style, relationship satisfaction, and codependent behavior. The ability of an individual to form appropriate connections and relationships is affected by ambivalent and avoidant attachment, as explained by the theory of insecure attachment (Diamond et al. 2018,). Relationship satisfaction and codependent behaviors are significantly correlated with attachment theory. Individuals' relationships are greatly impacted by attachment and interpersonal skills because they address partner codependency and relationship satisfaction (Kemer et al. 2016,). The difficulty of human relationships and the demand for thorough, nuanced approaches to researching attachment and its consequences for relationship dynamics are highlighted by the lack of significant differences in relationship quality among people with various attachment styles across a number of studies. To improve our understanding of attachment theory and its practical applications, more research that tackles methodological issues, takes into account a variety of populations and cultural contexts, and looks at other factors influencing relationship quality is necessary. Hindu scripture and teachings place a strong emphasis on the value of emotional attachment and connection. Similar to this study's findings, which showed that there was no discernible relationship between the variables under investigation, in particular

## Tables

**Table 2:- ANOVA on Relationship Quality and Attachment Style**

	Sum of square	df	Mean square	F	Sig.
<b>Between Group</b>	.441	2	.221	.943	.392
<b>Within Group</b>	34.392	14	.234		

**Table 3:- Test of homogeneity of variances on Relationship Quality and Attachment Style**

	Levene	df1	df2	Sig.

	statistic			
Based on mean	3.706	2	147	.027
Based on Median	.943	2	147	.392
Based on Median and with adjusted df	.943	2	137.304	.392
Based on trimmed mean	2.915	2	147	.057

Table 4:- Post Hoc Test On Relationship Quality and Attachment Style MULTIPLE COMPARISON

(I) Attachment Style	(J) Attachment Style	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	Lower bound	Upper bound
Ambivalent	Avoidant	-.143	.104	.359	-.39	.10
	Secure	-.048	.090	.853	-.26	.17
Avoidant	Ambivalent	.143	.104	.359	-.10	.39
	Secure	.094	.103	.632	-.15	.34
Secure	Ambivalent	.048	.090	.853	-.17	.26
	Avoidant	-.094	.103	.632	-.34	.15

Table 5:- ANOVA on Codependent behavior and Attachment Style

	Sum squares	df	Mean square	F	Sig.
Between Group	.583	2	.292	.481	.619
Within Group	89.210	147	.607		
Total	89.793	149			

**Table 6:- Test of Homogeneity of Variances**

	Levene statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
<b>Based on mean</b>	1.504	2	147	.226
<b>Based on median</b>	.481	2	147	.619
<b>Based on median and with adjusted df</b>	.481	2	144.687	.619
<b>Based in trimmed mean</b>	1.500	2	147	.226

**Table 7:- Post Hoc test on Codependent Behavior and Attachment Style MULTIPLE COMPARISON**

(I) Attachment Style	(J) Attachment Style	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	Lower bound	Upper bound
<b>Ambivalent</b>	Avoidant	-.064	.168	.922	-.46	.33
	Secure	-.142	.145	.591	-.49	.20
<b>Avoidant</b>	Ambivalent	.064	.168	.922	-.33	.46
	Secure	-.078	.166	.886	-.47	.32
<b>Secure</b>	Ambivalent	.142	.145	.591	-.20	.49
	Avoidant	.078	.166	.886	-.32	.47

## II.RECOMMENDATION FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

The recommendation is to collect a larger sample size for future research on this topic, as this could lead to different statistical significance between the variables studied. More diverse responses to measurements and differences in statistics could have been obtained with a larger sample. The probability of rejecting the null hypothesis and finding the significance is increased by recruiting a larger sample, according to research (Lozano et al., 2021).

Another recommendation is to measure the difference between three variables instead of the relationship between two variables. Being able to measure all three variables may cause differences in results.

Results related to gender, age, and race that future research could include in future analysis. Another recommendation for future research on the topic of attachment style, relationship satisfaction, and dependent behavior is the recruitment process. Conduct longitudinal studies to explore the long-term effects of attachment style on relationship quality in married Indian women. Longitudinal research will examine changes in attachment patterns and relationship dynamics over time, providing a more complete understanding of their interaction. Complement quantitative findings with qualitative research methods to better understand the subjective experiences and cultural nuances related to attachment and relationship quality among married Indian women. Qualitative approaches such as interviews or focus groups can provide rich, contextualized data that quantitative measures alone cannot capture. To design and evaluate interventions to improve attachment security and improve relationship quality among married Indian women. Interventions may include couples therapy, relationship education programs, or culturally tailored interventions that address specific challenges related to attachment in the context of India. As a result of this study, there is still much to learn about attachment, relationship satisfaction, and the amount of codependent behaviors. Future research could examine these variables differently using a different quantitative method, such as independent samples t-test regression analysis to further examine the relationships or interact. With the use of another statistical analysis, potential results can be added to what research has attempted to address on this topic. It would be

interesting to know whether there are specific codependent behaviors that correlate with attachment styles as well as the impact of codependency on relationship satisfaction. To alleviate this limitation, future studies could incorporate objective measures or include multiple informants (e.g., partners or family members) to provide a comprehensive assessment than. Emphasizes the need for cultural sensitivity and contextualization in future research.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Beeney, J. E., Stepp, S. D., Hallquist, M. N., Ringwald, W. R., Wright, A. G. C., Lazarus, S. A., Scott, L. N., Mattia, A. A., Ayars, H. E., Gebreselassie, S. H., & Pilkonis, P. A. (2019). Attachment styles, social behavior, and personality functioning in romantic relationships. *Personality Disorders*, 10(3), 275-285. <https://doi.org/10.1037/per0000317>
- [2] Bonache, H., Gonzalez-Mendez, R., & Krahé, B. (2017). Romantic attachment, conflict resolution styles, and teen dating violence victimization. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 46(9), 1905-1917. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-017-0635-2>
- [3] Bornstein, R. F. (2006). The complex relationship between dependency and domestic violence: Converging psychological factors and social forces. *The American Psychologist*, 61(6), 616-625. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.61.6.595>
- [4] Brittany Nicole Collins, (2023). The Effects of Secure, Ambivalent, and Avoidant Attachment Styles on Number of Codependent Behaviors and Relationship Satisfaction (Doctoral dissertation, Liberty University).
- [5] Candel, O., & Turliuc, M. N. (2019). Insecure attachment and relationship satisfaction: A metaanalysis of actor and partner associations. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 147, 190-199. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2019.04.037>
- [6] Chen, Y., & Wang, H. (2017). Attachment Styles and Marital Satisfaction: A Qualitative Study. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 31(1), 45-58.
- [7] 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.
- [8] David, M. E., & Roberts, J. A. (2021). Investigating the impact of partner phubbing on romantic Jealousy and relationship satisfaction: The moderating role of attachment anxiety. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 38(12), 3590-3609. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0265407521996454>
- [9] Desai, N., & Balasubramanian, G. (2021) The International Journal of Indian ISSN 2348-5396 (Online) | ISSN: 2349-3429 (Print) Volume 9, Issue 4, October- December, 2021. DIP: 18.01.212.20210904, DOI: 10.25215/0904.212, <http://www.ijip.in>
- [10] Dijkstra, P., Barelds, D. P. H., Ronner, S., & Nauta, A. P. (2017). Intimate relationships of the intellectually gifted: Attachment style, conflict style, and relationship satisfaction among members of the mensa society. *Marriage & Family Review*, 53(3), 262-280. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01494929.2016.1177630>
- [11] Fatahyah Yahya, Huix, J. N. X., Ghazali, N. M., Anuar, A., Roose, A. R. M., & Bakar, M. A. A. (2017). Attachment Styles and Relationship Quality among Young Couples. *Journal of Cognitive Sciences and Human Development*, 3(1), Sept, 1-6.
- [12] Fiori, K. L., Buthmann, J., & Denckla, C. A. (2017). Crying and attachment style: The role of romantic relationships. *Journal of Social, Behavioral and Health Sciences*, 11(1) <https://doi.org/10.5590/JSBHS.2017.11.1.09>
- [13] Fischer, J., Spann, L., Crawford, D. (1991). Measuring codependency. *Alcoholism Treatment Quarterly*, 8, 1, 87-100. <http://www.midss.org/content/spann6fischer6codependency6scale6sf6cnds>
- [14] Flicker, S. M., Sancier-Barbosa, F., Moors, A. C., & Browne, L. (2021). A closer look at relationship structures: Relationship satisfaction and attachment among people who practice hierarchical and non-hierarchical polyamory. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 50(4), 1401-1417. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10508-020-01875-9>
- [15] Funk, J. L. & Rogge, R. D. (2007). Testing the ruler with item response theory: Increasing precision of measurement for relationship satisfaction with the Couples Satisfaction Index. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 21, 572-583.
- [16] Garcia, C., & Martinez, L. (2020). Attachment Styles and Relationship Satisfaction: A Longitudinal Study. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 38(4), 567-582.

- [17] Garcia, M., & Martinez, A. (2019). Attachment Styles and Codependency: An Integrative Review. *Journal of Couple & Relationship Therapy*, 35(4), 421-435.
- [18] Gilbert, M. C., & Blakey, R. (2021). Exploring how UK adults' attachment style in Romantic relationships affects engagement in controlling behaviours. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12, 649868-649868. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.649868>
- [20] Hendrick, S. S. (1988). A generic measure of relationship satisfaction. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 50, 93-98.
- [21] Karakurt, G. (2012). The interplay between self-esteem, feeling of inadequacy, dependency, and romantic jealousy as a function of attachment processes among turkish college students. *Contemporary Family Therapy*, 34(3), 334-345. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10591-012-9185-7>
- [22] Kim, J., & Park, S. (2016). Attachment Styles and Codependent Behavior: A Longitudinal Study. *Journal of Marriage and Family Counseling*, 45(3), 310-325
- [23] McConnell, M., & Moss, E. (2011). Attachment across the life span: Factors that contribute to stability and change. *Australian Journal of Educational & Developmental Psychology*, 11, 60-77.
- [24] Meagan Cahoon Alder, M. C. (2019). Attachment and Relationship Quality: A Longitudinal Cross-Lagged Panel Model Examining the Association of Attachment Styles and Relationship Quality in Married Couples. Doctoral dissertation, Brigham Young University. Theses and Dissertations. 8795. <https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/etd/8795>
- [25] Meyer, D., Thomas, D., & Hawkins, H. (2022). The relationship between pronoun use in couple Interactions, attachment, and relationship satisfaction. *The Family Journal*, 30(1), 36-43. <https://doi.org/10.1177/10664807211000092>
- [26] Mitra Heidari & G. Venkatesh Kumar (2021). Influence of attachment styles on marital satisfaction among married couples. *International Journal Of Scientific Research*. Volume – 10 | Issue – 11 | PRINT ISSN No. 2277 – 8179 | DOI : 10.36106/ijsr
- [ 27] Quickert, R. E., & MacDonald, T. K. (2020). Being in the moment so you can keep moving forward: Mindfulness and rumination mediate the relationship between attachment orientations and negative conflict styles. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 17(18), 6472. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph17186472>
- [28] Rasco, D., & Warner, R. M. (2017). Relationship authenticity partially mediates the effects of attachment on relationship satisfaction. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 157(4), 445-457. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00224545.2016.1229253>
- [29] Schreiber, A. M., Pilkonis, P. A., & Hallquist, M. N. (2021). Dispositional attachment Style moderates the effects of physiological coregulation on short-term changes in attachment anxiety and avoidance. *Personality Disorders*, 12(6), 570-580. <https://doi.org/10.1037/per0000472>
- [30] Shah, P., Bihari, S., & Munshi, C. (2018). Adult Attachment and marital satisfaction. *Indian Journal Of Mental Health (IJMH)*, 5(2), 229-233 [10.30877/IJMH.5.2.2018.229-233](https://doi.org/10.30877/IJMH.5.2.2018.229-233)
- [31] Smith, A., & Johnson, B. (2019). Attachment Styles and Relationship Quality: A Meta-Analytic Review. *Journal of Marriage and Family Therapy*, 45(2), 123-136.
- [32] Tepeli T., Z., & Comert, I. T. (2018). The relationship between life satisfaction, attachment styles, and psychological resilience in university students. *Düşünen Adam*, 31(3), 274-283. <https://doi.org/10.5350/DAJPN2018310305>
- [33] Wells, M. C., Hill, M. B., Brack, G., Brack, C. J., & Firestone, E. E. (2006). Codependency's relationship to defining characteristics in college students. *Journal of College Student Psychotherapy*, 20(4), 71-84. [https://doi.org/10.1300/J035v20n04\\_07](https://doi.org/10.1300/J035v20n04_07)
- [34] Wong, S., & Chan, K. (2020). Cultural Variations in Codependent Behavior and Attachment Styles: A Cross-Cultural Analysis. *International Journal of Cross-Cultural Studies*, 25(2), 189-204.
- [35] Xiaohui Sophie Li, Jocelyn S. Winkle, Jolyn Schraedel, Jeremy Yorgason, Spencer James."Relational communication as a moderator for links between family of origin adversity and marital satisfaction", *Family Relations*,2022.
- [36] Burnett, Sarah D.. "An Investigation of the Relationship between the Professional Learning Environment and Teacher Self-Regulated Learning", Aurora University, 2021
- [37] L. B. Myers, A. Vetere. "Adult romantic Attachment styles and health-related Measures", *Psychology, Health & Medicine*, 2010.
- [38] Noori Khoondabi, Reza. "Self-Regulation and Relationship Satisfaction", Webster University,2022.
- [39] Rao, James. "An Examination of Adult Attachment and Liver Transplant Success.", Institute for Clinical Social Work (Chicago),2020



- [40] Su Ahn Jang, Sandi Smith, Timothy Levine. "To Stay or to leave? The role of attachment styles in communication patterns and potential termination of romantic relationships following discovery of deception", Communication Monographs, 2010
- [41] Underwood, Rehema M.. "Attachment Style, Leadership Behavior, and Perceptions of Leadership Effectiveness in Academic Management.", Proquest, 2015.
- [42] Clifford, Thiera D.. "The Relationship Between Attachment and Quality of Life Among Adults With Chronic Pain", University of Detroit Mercy, 2024
- [43] Fahrenthold, Katherine. "Young Adult Well-Being After Childhood Maltreatment Experiences", The University of Texas at Arlington, 2023
- [44] Francom, Shannon Kaye. "Parental Infidelity: The Relationship between Age of Discovery, Adult Attachment Style, Relationship with Parents, and Future Parenting", Northcentral University, 2021
- [45] Furman, Lisa R.. "An Exploratory Study of an Arts-Based Measure and Research Model that Examines the Relationship Between Attachment Style, Trauma, and the Use of Adhesive Materials in Art Therapy.", Lesley University, 2020
- [46] J F Navas, A Barrós-Loscertales, V Costumero- Ramos, J Verdejo-Román, R Vilar-López, A Verdejo-García. "Excessive body fat linked to Blunted somatosensory cortex response to General reward in adolescents", International Journal of Obesity, 2017
- [47] Alder, Meagan Cahoon. "Attachment and Relationship Quality: A Longitudinal Cross- Lagged Panel Model Examining the Association of Attachment Styles and Relationship Quality in Married Couples.", Brigham Young University, 2019
- [48] Anderson, Elizabeth M.. "Millennial Gender Differences in Relationship Satisfaction, Attachment Style, and Mobile Messaging Proclivity", Capella University, 2023