



**INVESTIGATING THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PERSONALITY TRAITS,
ATTACHMENT STYLES & RELATIONSHIP SATISFACTION IN ROMANTIC
RELATIONSHIPS OF COUPLES**

¹Jasika Kaur, Masters of Arts (Clinical Psychology, Amity Institute of Psychology and Allied Sciences, Noida, India

Jasika1305@gmail.com

²Dr. Siddharth Soni, Assistant Professor-I, Amity Institute of Psychology and Allied Science, Noida, India

siddharthsoni009@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Personality traits and attachment styles are important predictors of relationship satisfaction. The study was a cross-sectional study and included 77 heterogeneous couples ranging in age from 25-45 years. All participants completed three questionnaires including Adult Attachment Scale, Relationship Assessment Scale and NEO-FFI. The main analyses were based on Spearman's Rank Correlation & Mann-Whitney U test. Some general findings emerged in the study. Neuroticism was positively related with attachment anxiety and avoidance. Conscientiousness, extraversion and agreeableness were negatively correlated with attachment

anxiety and avoidance but positively correlated with Relationship satisfaction. Attachment anxiety and avoidance had negative correlation with Relationship satisfaction. Women scored higher than males on measures of neuroticism in personality. Males extraversion scores were considerably greater than women's. The present results contributed to the literature by showing that each perspective is essential for the understanding of the role of personality and attachment style for relationship satisfaction.

Keywords: Personality traits, Relationship satisfaction, Attachment Styles

INTRODUCTION

Personality Traits

Personality traits are attributes that contribute to one's individual identity. These tend to emerge during lifetime and may hold true in a variety of scenarios. Agreeableness, extroversion, conscientiousness, openness, and neuroticism are the five main personality qualities. Personality models aim to elucidate the processes by which personality develops, evolves, and influences behavior. Biological, behavioural, psychodynamic, humanist, and trait theories are the five primary concepts of personality.

Characteristics that set people apart from one other include relatively stable cognitive, mood, and behavior patterns. (McCrae & John, 1992) (Back et al., 2011; Caspi & Roberts, 2001) explain individual's usual perceptions of their cultural surroundings, their thoughts and feelings about other people and themselves in relation to them, and their responses towards their peers. Therefore, it is proposed that individual characteristics are crucial in the setting of close partnerships. McCrae and John (1992) described people in terms of reasonably stable

thought, feeling, and behavior patterns; these features can be statistically evaluated; and these attributes exhibit a certain level of cross-situational uniformity. Personal characteristics are innate underlying inclinations that make people dynamic (McCrae et al., 2000). MacDonald (1998) adopted an even more notable stance, contending that all five components are developed systems that address both societal as well as non-social issues. He connects extroversion for instance, to a behavioral mechanism that is geared toward encouraging species to explore opportunities for benefit (p. 125).

Attachment Style

Ainsworth (1963) stated that attachment provides a safe ground which allows one to discover, and this notion has persisted as a cornerstone of attachment theory ever since. According to Bowlby (1969,1982), attachment is the special bond that forms between a baby and their parent and serves as the basis for subsequent growth and development. According to Bowlby, the theory of attachment is a behavioural framework and innate biological reaction designed to meet fundamental human requirements (Flaherty & Sadler, 2011).

The term "attachment style" or "organization" refers to an individual's distinctive methods of providing and receiving care in close connections with "attachment figures," who are frequently a person's parents, kids, and significant others. It originates from John Bowlby's theory of attachment. The idea is that when one is in difficulty, they may utilize the figure of attachment as a place of safety where they can seek comfort, support, and protection, or as a solid platform from which they are able to discover the world around them (Kenneth, 2011). Three main types of attachment were found by Ainsworth; they have been named as avoidant, anxious-resistant or ambivalent, and secure (Ainsworth et al., 1978).

Bowlby (1969,1982) made the hypothesis that the connection of attachment formed during childhood is essentially the same as the one formed during later romantic relationships. Bowlby identified minimal differences between these types of connections, including those between a kid and parental figure, a spouse and companion, and an elderly parent and a grownup who is providing care. Ainsworth (1991) emphasized the secure-base effect as the crucial component and the role of the attachment behavioural framework in relationships between adults. When such warmth and safety are present, the person may confidently leave the safe haven that their spouse has created to participate in different pursuits.

The primary insecure patterns (“avoidant,” “ambivalent” or “resistant”) occurs when attachment activity is met with disapproval, discrepancy, or even fear from the figure of attachment, leaving the new-born “nervous” about the caregiver’s reaction. The new-born’s actions adjusts to match or enhance the behavior of the figure of attachment in order to lessen this fear; in other words, it is flexible and proactive within the framework of that connection. It may be maladaptive to provide care for the caregiver outside of that specific connection, as it undermines exploratory behaviour (Main, 1981).

Relationship Satisfaction

Relationship satisfaction is an “assessment of the emotions, ideas, and actions connected to a love partnership” (Hendrick, 1988). Romantic relationship satisfaction is a key index used to measure the quality of a romantic relationship. Romantic relationship satisfaction can be defined as a person’s internal evaluation of their partner’s positive feelings and the attractiveness of their relationship (Rusbult, 1983). Satisfied relationships are a valuable asset in maturity. Long-term intimate partners tend to be more joyful, sound, and live greater lifespans (Diamond, Fagundes, & Butterworth, 2010). Couples' contentment and

trustworthiness can grow in a fulfilling love partnership (Robles et al., 2014). Early romantic connections have a significant impact on an individual's and society's ability to promote individual wellness and provide a foundation for potential partnerships (Feldman, Gowen, & Fisher, 1998; Fox & Anderegg, 2014).

The need to belong theory postulates that people are universally driven to establish and preserve enduring, fulfilling, and essential connections. This must satisfy two requirements; first, it must be satisfied by regular, agreeable contacts with a limited group of individuals; secondly, such relationships require an emotional care for one another's welfare (Baumeister and Leary, 2017).

The theory of Relational Maintenance (Canary & Stafford, 1992) delineates particular behavioural patterns that partners employ to sustain their intimate relationships. There is a difference between proactive, deliberate efforts to keep the connection going and habitual tactics that could do so without realizing it (Stafford & Canary, 1991). The following behaviors- networks, sharing responsibilities, reassurance, positivism, and openness- classify maintenance procedures.

Relationship between Personality Traits and Relationship Satisfaction.

Studies have repeatedly shown a link between personality characteristics and marital happiness and satisfaction in partnerships (Dyrenforth, Kashy, Donnellan, & Lucas, 2010; Malouff, Thorsteinsson, Schutte, Bhullar, & Rooke, 2010; Roberts, Kuncel, Shiner, Caspi, & Goldberg, 2007). Personality characteristics describes how people generally see their social surroundings, how they respond to their communication partners, and how they make decisions about other people and how they perceive themselves in regard to others (Back et al., 2011;

Caspi & Roberts, 2001). Therefore, it is proposed that a person's personality plays a role in the setting of close connections.

One of the most important indicators of unhappy relationships and divorce is neuroticism (Robins, Caspi, & Moffitt, 2000, 2002; Karney & Bradbury, 1995; Roberts et al., 2007; Watson, Hubbard & Wiese, 2000a). Compared to emotionally secure people, neurotic people tend to report higher levels of negative influence, be more sensitive to unfavourable occurrences, and have fewer positive relationships with others (Hampson, 2012; Watson & Clark, 1984). It has been shown that conscientiousness and agreeableness have positive correlations with satisfaction in relationships (Decuyper, De Bolle, & De Fruyt, 2012; Dyrenforth et al., 2010; Heller, Watson, & Ilies, 2004; Malouff et al., 2010; Neyer & Voigt, 2004). Openness has been the subject of conflicting research, with some studies suggesting marginal either beneficial or adverse correlations with fulfilment in relationships (Karney & Bradbury, 1995; Malouff et al., 2010; Neyer & Voigt, 2004).

Relationship between Attachment Style and Relationship Satisfaction.

A companion may be a person's "safe haven"—a place of solace, security, and defence, when they are feeling ill, anxious, or frightened (Shaver et al., 1988). According to two previous systematic reviews (Hadden, Smith, & Webster, 2014; Li & Chan, 2012), people who exhibit higher levels of anxiety or avoidance exhibit lower levels of satisfaction in relationships, suggesting that both behaviours are harmful to relationship satisfaction.

An essential foundation for explaining how adults develop romantic relationships is provided by the attachment theory. Three attachment types were developed by Hazan and Shaver (1987) to characterize the dynamics between romantic partners in maturity. Highly secure individuals reciprocate their partner's emotional closeness and intimacy in return. The

traits of avoidance include distrust and lack of interest in the partner. And last, those who are apprehensive fear being duped and left behind (Shaver & Mikulincer, 2005).

Li and Chan (2012) came to the conclusion that there is a higher negative correlation between avoidance and gratification than there is between anxiety and contentment based on Mikulincer and Shaver's (2007) study. Even though these traits are harmful to relationship happiness anxious people often cherish their relationships and even find meaning in them when they feel valued by their partners. On the other hand, avoidant people make an effort to retain some distance from their relationships, which causes them to separate from them further. In longer-term partnerships, there is a stronger negative correlation between attachment avoidance, anxiety, and contentment (Hadden et al. 2014).

There is scientific proof (Fraley et al., 2013) that one's relationship is stable, although marriage can bring about modifications. After being married, self-assured individuals can have greater levels of happiness, whereas insecure people are more likely to engage in behaviours that harm relationships, like vocal arguments, anger, or threats of desertion (Crowell et al., 2002). According to prior research, married people exhibit better levels of relationship satisfaction, a correlation that is consistent across most cultures (Aarskaug Wiik, Keizer, & Lappegård, 2012; Tai, Baxter, & Hewitt, 2014).

Research revealed that the earliest relationships in the home context reinforce particular styles of attachment, and the avoiding and conflicted styles of attachment have an impact on individuals' interpersonal relationships as they get older. Relationships between people are far more impacted by attachment patterns than by lifestyle choices (Mohammadi, Samavi & Ghazavi, 2016).

Relationship between Personality traits and Attachment Style.

All attachment components have a substantial link between each of the Big Five attributes; however, the strength of these relationships varies, with some constructions having an adequate connection and others having a weak relationship. The most significant association between neuroticism and anxiety about attachment, whereas the most significant connection between agreeableness and avoidance anxiety was found. The two attachment dimensions have only weak correlations with openness and only somewhat strong correlations with extraversion, agreeableness, and conscientiousness. More than any of the Big Five, relationship status was a significant indicator of avoidance (Nofle & Shaver, 2006). It was discovered that a strong determinant of attachment was age. Relationship status and anxiety were shown to be substantial indicators of both attachment parameters: individuals in intimate relationships at the moment seemed to be more safely connected, while older persons are probably less worried (Nofle & Shaver, 2006).

Research Objectives

- To explore the relationship between attachment style and relationship satisfaction.
- To explore the relationship between personality traits and attachment style.
- To explore the relationship between personality traits and relationship satisfaction.
- To explore the relationship between extraversion and relationship satisfaction.
- To explore the relationship between agreeableness and relationship satisfaction.
- To explore the relationship between neuroticism and relationship satisfaction.
- To explore the relationship between openness and relationship satisfaction.
- To explore the relationship between conscientiousness and relationship satisfaction.
- To explore gender differences in personality traits.
- To explore gender differences in relationship satisfaction.

- To explore gender differences in attachment style.

Purpose

To study the correlation between personality traits, attachment style and relationship satisfaction between adult male and female couples in romantic relationships.

Hypothesis

- There will be a significant relationship between attachment style and relationship satisfaction.
- There will be a significant relationship between personality traits and attachment style.
- There will be a significant relationship between personality traits and relationship satisfaction.
- There will be a significant relationship between extraversion and relationship satisfaction.
- There will be a significant relationship between agreeableness and relationship satisfaction.
- There will be a significant relationship between neuroticism and relationship satisfaction.
- There will be a significant relationship between openness and relationship satisfaction.
- There will be a significant relationship between conscientiousness and relationship satisfaction.
- There will be significant gender differences in personality traits.
- There will be significant gender differences in relationship satisfaction.
- There will be significant gender differences in attachment style.

Methods

The following sample, measures and procedures were done to study the research objectives.

Sample

The overall sample consisted of 154 adults (82= Females, 72= Males). There were two age groups ranging from 25-35 years and 36-45 years. The Population consisted of couples both married and unmarried. We only included couples with relationship duration longer than 1 year in order to assure that partners know each other for a certain amount of time. The sampling method used is snowball and purposive sampling. There are three variables in the study: personality traits, attachment style and relationship satisfaction. Procedure Statistical Design used are Spearman's Rank Correlation & Mann-Whitney U test.

Inclusion Criteria

- Adults aged 25-45 years.
- Individuals currently in a heterosexual romantic relationship for at least 1 year.
- Fluent in English language.
- Participants with a range of personality traits, including openness, conscientiousness, extraversion, agreeableness, and neuroticism.
- Participants with diverse attachment styles, including secure, anxious, and avoidant attachment styles.

Exclusion criteria

- Individuals under the age of 18.
- Individuals not currently in a romantic relationship or in a relationship for less than 1 year.

- Participants with severe mental health disorders or cognitive impairments that may affect their ability to complete the assessment measures accurately.
- Participants who have undergone recent major life events that could significantly impact their relationship satisfaction.

Description of the Tools Employed

Attachment Style: Adult Attachment Scale (Collins & Read, 1990)

The Adult Attachment Scale was first developed by Nancy L. Collins and Stephen J. Read in 1990 and revised in 1996. This scale was based on attachment theory. It consists of 18 items. It was scored using a 5-point Likert scale. This questionnaire has two subscales: attachment avoidance and anxiety. Items 1, 2, 6, 7, 13, 14 are reverse scored. Finally, the subjects were divided into three groups based on the results: secure, anxious and avoidant attachment styles. The alpha reliability estimate was 0.95 and 0.68 using Cronbach's alpha. The score of construct-related validity was high.

Relationship Satisfaction: Relationship Assessment Scale (Hendrick, 1988)

The Relationship Assessment Scale (RAS) was developed by Susan S. Hendrick in 1988. It is a 7-item scale designed to measure global relationship satisfaction. Respondents answer each item using a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (low satisfaction) to 5 (high satisfaction). Items 4 and 7 are reverse-scored. Total score range from 7 to 35. Higher scores indicate greater relationship satisfaction. Internal consistency of the scale is high (alpha, $\alpha = .86$). The scale is a unifactorial measure of relationship satisfaction with a reported mean inter-item correlation of .49 and an α of .86. The alpha reliability estimate of the RAS was .91. The Relationship Assessment Scale (RAS) was developed to measure a single construct, namely

one's subjective evaluation of a close relationship. This measure is not limited to marriage relationships and has shown strong predictive validity with dating couples.

Personality Traits: NEO FFI (Costa & McCrae, 1992)

NEO – Five Factor Inventory (NEO- FFI) was developed by Paul Costa and Robert McCrae in 1992. The NEO-FFI consists of 60 items, with 12 items for each of the Big Five personality traits rated on a 5-point Likert scale (Strongly Disagree to Strongly Agree). It is designed to measure the five broad personality domains of Neuroticism, Extraversion, Openness to experience, Agreeableness and Conscientiousness. 27 items are reverse scored. Alpha reliability estimates were as follows: (Neuroticism) .94, (Extraversion) .87, (Openness) .90, (Agreeableness) .76, and (Conscientiousness) .85. Convergent, construct and criterion validity have been demonstrated in many studies using the NEO-FFI, with convergent validity correlations ranging from .56 to .62, and no correlation exceeding .20 for divergent validity (Costa and McCrae, 1992).

Procedure

The participants were informed about the purpose of the research and completed three standardized questionnaires. For this study, we selected all heterosexual couples. We only included couples with relationship duration longer than 1 year.

Analysis of Data

The data obtained was analysed quantitatively using the following statistical techniques: Mean, Standard Deviation, Spearman's Rank Correlation. & Mann Whitney- U test, Microsoft Excel & SPSS 21.0 were used for analysis purpose.

RESULTS**Table 1***Descriptive Statistics of Study Variables*

Variables	Mean	SD
Attachment Anxiety	2.14	.679
Attachment Avoidance	2.78	.623
Openness	25.90	5.338
Conscientiousness	33.86	5.624
Extraversion	29.51	5.049
Agreeableness	29.48	5.172
Neuroticism	20.60	6.811
Relationship Satisfaction	29.75	4.957

Table 2*Correlation between Attachment Styles and Personality Traits*

Variables	Openness	Conscientiousness	Extraversion	Agreeableness	Neuroticism
Attachment Anxiety	-.019	-.290**	-.278**	-.286**	.310**
Attachment Avoidance	-.204*	-.202*	-.365**	-.586**	.328**

--	--	--	--	--	--

* $p < 0.05$ (2-tailed)

** $p < 0.01$ (2-tailed)

Table 3

Correlation between Attachment Styles and Relationship Satisfaction

Variables	Relationship Satisfaction
Attachment Anxiety	-.430**
Attachment Avoidance	-.223**

** $p < 0.01$ (2-tailed)

Table 4

Correlation between Relationship Satisfaction and Personality Traits

Variables	Openness	Conscientiousness	Extraversion	Agreeableness	Neuroticism
Relationship Satisfaction	-.080	.362**	.163*	.245**	-.276**

* $p < 0.05$ (2-tailed)

** $p < 0.01$ (2-tailed)

Table 5

Descriptive Statistics and Difference in Study Variables between Male & Female Participants

	Males		Females		
Variables	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mann-Whitney U Test
Attachment Anxiety	2.0880	.62547	2.1852	.72457	.396
Attachment Avoidance	2.7014	.58186	2.8601	.65230	.075
Openness	25.5833	5.19954	26.1481	5.50480	.264
Conscientiousness	33.9722	5.32856	33.7407	5.93670	.890
Extraversion	30.7361	5.16214	28.4074	4.74283	.004*
Agreeableness	29.5556	4.73491	29.4568	5.57685	.611
Neuroticism	18.4444	6.27961	22.3704	6.66604	.001*
Relationship Satisfaction	29.9722	4.42774	29.6296	5.38155	.913

* $p < 0.05$ (2-tailed)

DISCUSSION

The study was aimed at exploring the relationship between personality traits, attachment styles and relationship satisfaction. Also, the gender differences in personality traits, attachment style and relationship satisfaction between male and female adult romantic relationships.

Adult Attachment Scale by Nancy L. Collins and Stephen J. Read (1996), Relationship Assessment Scale (RAS) by Susan S. Hendrick (1988) and NEO – Five Factor Inventory (NEO- FFI) by Paul Costa and Robert McCrae (1992) was used to measure attachment styles, relationship satisfaction and personality traits respectively.

Data was collected, scoring was done according to each scale and was then analyzed with the help of Spearman's Correlation & Mann-Whitney U test as the data was Nonparametric. To study the correlation between personality traits, attachment styles and relationship satisfaction- Spearman's Rank Correlation was used, to study the gender differences between males and females in terms of personality traits, attachment styles and relationship satisfaction- Mann-Whitney U test was employed for all the variables.

The first objective of the study was to explore the relationship between attachment style and relationship satisfaction in couples and the hypothesis was that there will be a significant relationship between them. Correlation results revealed a moderate negative relationship of anxiety attachment and weak negative relationship of avoidance attachment with relationship satisfaction.

The current finding can be upheld by a study conducted by Nofle and Shaver (2006) in which the results revealed that both Attachment Anxiety and Avoidance were negatively correlated with relationship satisfaction. Brennan and Shaver, (1995); Collins and Read, (1990); Simpson, (1990) showed that those with a secure attachment style expressed greater levels of satisfaction in relationships than either group of participants with an insecure

attachment type. Anxieties about whether one's partner truly loves or appreciates them, fears of abandonment, and feelings of rejection are linked to insecure attachment (Siebert, et al 1995). According to Kirkpatrick and Hazan (1994) and Simpson (1990), avoidant attachment is linked to emotional distance, mistrust of the partner, and less relationship satisfaction (Collins, Cooper, Albino, & Allard, 2002). According to Mikulincer, Florian, and Weller (1993) and Birnbaum, Orr, Mikulincer, & Florian (1997), anxious people use worse coping mechanisms. According to Campbell et al., (2005), anxious people see more conflict and an increase in disagreements in their connections on a regular schedule.

The second objective of the study was to discover the relationship between personality traits and attachment style. The hypothesis assumed a significant relationship between personality traits and attachment style. The analysis results revealed attachment anxiety having a weak negative relationship with openness, conscientiousness, extraversion, and agreeableness. A study conducted on West Coast Research University students revealed that attachment anxiety had no significant differences on the Openness to Experience, and correlated weakly (negative) to conscientiousness, extraversion and agreeableness (Nofle & Shaver, 2006); (Shaver & Brennan, 1992). As expected, Attachment Anxiety was moderately correlated with Neuroticism, whereas Avoidance was moderately correlated with Agreeableness (Nofle & Shaver, 2006). Thus, the hypothesis was accepted.

The attachment avoidance showed a weak negative relation with openness and conscientiousness; moderate negative relation with extraversion and agreeableness, whereas showed moderate positive relation with Neuroticism. There were very weak significant differences on the Openness to Experience and Conscientiousness scales (Shaver & Brennan, 1992). Brennan and Shaver (1990) found that avoidants are more liberal and indication of

openness to values. Extraversion and Agreeableness was correlated moderately negatively with avoidance (Nofle & Shaver 2006). Neuroticism was also modestly correlated with Avoidance (Nofle & Shaver, 2006). Thus, the hypothesis was accepted.

Overall, the results are largely in line with what we expected based on previous research. Attachment Anxiety was related to Neuroticism, Avoidance was related to both Agreeableness and Extraversion (Nofle & Shaver 2006).

The third purpose of the study was to explore the relationship between personality traits and relationship satisfaction. The hypothesis presumed a significant difference existing between the two. The analysis revealed that relationship satisfaction showed a weak positive relation with extraversion and agreeableness; weak negative relation with openness and neuroticism; and a moderate positive relation with conscientiousness.

Research on openness has had inconsistent results, with some studies indicating no correlation at all or just weak positive or negative relationships with relationship satisfaction (Karney & Bradbury, 1995; Malouff et al., 2010; Neyer & Voigt, 2004). A common desire to broaden one's life experiences is what defines open people (John & Srivastava, 1999). On the other hand, unstable relationships may be linked to the demand for experience (Karney & Bradbury, 1995).

Highly conscientious people are more adept at reining in their urges, conform to social norms and regulations, and focus more on tasks and goals (John & Srivastava, 1999). Nonetheless, a few researches (Dyrenforth et al., 2010; Malouff et al., 2010) discovered a modest but favourable correlation between extraversion and satisfaction in relationships. This may result from extraverted people's propensity for strong positive emotions (Fleeson, Malanos, & Achille, 2002; Lucas & Diener, 2001) as well as their propensity to be gregarious, animated, and joyous in social situations (John & Srivastava, 1999). Furthermore, extraverts

frequently employ more beneficial coping mechanisms including problem-solving (Carver & Connor-Smith, 2010).

People that are agreeable typically have good connections with other people and participate in social behaviors like forgiving that promote closeness (Branje, van Lieshout, & van Aken, 2005; Jensen-Campbell & Graziano, 2001; Steiner, Allemand, & McCullough, 2012).

Relationship satisfaction was negatively related to Neuroticism (Nofle & Shaver, 2006). According to several studies (Robins, Caspi, & Moffitt, 2000, 2002; Karney & Bradbury, 1995; Roberts et al., 2007; Watson, Hubbard, & Wiese, 2000a), neuroticism is one of the most important predictors of relationship discontent and divorce.

It was hypothesized that gender differences exist in personality traits. The results of Mann-Whitney U test were found to be insignificant in openness, conscientiousness, and agreeableness. The mean differences are almost similar, indicating that no distinct differences exist in openness, conscientiousness and agreeableness between males and females except extraversion and neuroticism. The results revealed a significant difference in extraversion and neuroticism in males & females & the mean differences showed increased extraversion in men and neuroticism in women.

Asian and African cultures often exhibit the lowest gender disparities in both self-report and other-report data (McCrae et al., 2005). According to Schmidt et al. (2008), gender inequalities seem to decrease as one travels from Western to non-Western civilizations. Early infancy (Else-Quest, Hyde, Goldsmith, & Van Hulle, 2006; Wilgenbusch & Merrell, 1999) is when gender differences in personality characteristics may be identified, and they mostly hold true throughout adulthood (Feingold, 1994; McCrae & Costa, 1984).

Men's extraversion scores were considerably greater than women's in just two situations, namely Malaysia and India. Conversely, men performed better across cultures when it came to the extraversion-related quality of assertiveness (Feingold, 1994). According to Feingold's (1994) research, women often scored higher than males on measures of neuroticism in personality. According to Nofle and Shaver (2006), men were less neurotic than women. The Neurotic scale showed high mean scores for women (Feeney & Noller, 1990). These results are consistent with other research demonstrating that gender differences in personality tend to be greater in contemporary and progressive civilizations than in more traditional cultures (Costa et al, 2001). Therefore, in traditional and less developed nations, an average man is more like an average woman in terms of his underlying psychological dispositions to feel, think, and act more like women—rather than in regards of his position in society or value choices (Schmitt et al., 2008).

It was hypothesized that significant gender difference exists in attachment style. The results of Mann-Whitney U test were found to be insignificant. The mean differences were almost similar, indicating that no distinct differences exist in attachment styles between males and females. Hazan and Shaver (1987) found that there was no relationship between both the attachment styles. Thus, the hypothesis is rejected.

The tenth objective of the study was to explore gender differences in relationship satisfaction. The hypothesis assumed a significant difference in relationship satisfaction in males & females. The results were found to be insignificant as the mean differences were almost similar, indicating that no distinct differences exist in relationship satisfaction between males and females. The study showed that men and women's implementation of conventional gender roles caused the incompatibility in their relationships (Ickes and Barnes, 1978). Thus, the hypothesis is rejected.

Conclusion

The findings of the current study lead to several conclusions. Considering the existing empirical literature, there are strong arguments in favour of our study. Women scored higher than males on measures of neuroticism in personality. Men's extraversion scores were considerably greater than women's. Neuroticism was positively related with attachment anxiety and avoidance. Conscientiousness, extraversion and agreeableness were negatively correlated with attachment anxiety and avoidance but positively correlated with Relationship satisfaction. Attachment anxiety and avoidance had negative correlation with Relationship satisfaction. The current findings add to the body of knowledge by demonstrating the importance of all viewpoints in comprehending how personality and attachment type affect relationship satisfaction.

Limitations

Relationship duration may have influenced relationship quality predictors, but we did not evaluate it. Another drawback is that our sample consisted of more women than males, and relationship quality was correlated with gender. Unlike Shaver and Brennan (1992) in their longitudinal study, we did not evaluate the predictive potential of attachment-style dimensions and the Big Five characteristics as indicators of relationship quality over time. It would be crucial for future research to employ various techniques and report formats in order to evaluate a more comprehensive picture of relationship satisfaction.

REFERENCES

- Aarskaug Wiik, K., Keizer, R., & Lappegård, T. (2012). Relationship quality in marital and cohabiting unions across Europe. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 74(3), 389–398.
- Ainsworth, M. D. (1963). The development of infant-mother interaction among the Ganda. In B. M. Foss (Ed.), *Determinants of infant behavior* (pp. 67-112). New York, NY: Wiley.
- Ainsworth, M. D. S., Wittig, B. A., & Foss, B. M. (1969). *Determinants of infant behavior*.
- Ainsworth, M. D. S., Blehar, M., Waters, E., & Wall, S. (1978). *Patterns of attachment: A psychological study of the Strange Situation*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Ainsworth, M.S., Blehar, M.C., Waters, E., & Wall, S. (1978). *Patterns of attachment: A psychological study of the strange situation*. Oxford, England: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Ainsworth, M. D. S. (1991). Attachments and other affectional bonds across the life cycle. In C. M. Parkes, J. Stevenson-Hinde, & P. Marris (Eds.), *Attachment across the life cycle* (pp. 33–51). London: Routledge.
- Allport, G. (1961). Pattern and Growth in Personality. *Holt Rinehart & Winston google schola*, 2, 289-296.
- Alexandrov, E. O., Cowan, P. A. & Cowan, C. P. (2005). Couple attachment and the quality of marital relationships: Method and concept in the validation for the new couple attachment interview and coding system. *Attachment and Human Development*, 7, 123-152.
- Antill, J.K. (1983). Sex role complementarity versus similarity in married couples. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 45, 145-155.
- Back, M. D., Baumert, A., Denissen, J. J. A., Hartung, F.-M., Penke, L., Schmukle, S. C., ... Wrzus, C. (2011). PERSOC: A unified framework for understanding the dynamic interplay of personality and social relationships. *European Journal of Personality*, 25, 90–107.

- Bartholomew, K. (1990). Avoidance of intimacy: An attachment perspective. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 7(2), 147–178.
- Bartholomew, K., & Horowitz, L. M. (1991). Attachment styles among young adults: a test of a four-category model. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 61, 226.
- Bartholomew, Kim; Horowitz, Leonard M. (1991). *Attachment styles among young adults: A test of a four-category model.. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 61(2), 226–244.
- Baumeister R. F., Leary M. R. (2017). “The need to belong: Desire for interpersonal attachments as a fundamental human motivation,” *Interpersonal Development. 1st edn.* Routledge. 57–89.
- Birnbaum, G. E., Orr, I., Mikulincer, M., & Florian, V. (1997). When marriage breaks up—Does attachment style contribute to coping and mental health. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 14, 643-654.
- Bowlby, J. (1969). *Attachment and loss* (No. 79). Random House.
- Bowlby, J. (1969/1982). *Attachment and loss: Vol. 1. Attachment* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Bowlby, J. (1969/1982). *Attachment and loss: Vol. 1. Attachment*. New York: Basic Books.
- Bowlby, J. (1977). The making and breaking of affectional bonds. *British Journal of Psychiatry*, 130, 201-21
- Branje, S. J. T., van Lieshout, C. F. M., & van Aken, M. A. G. (2005). Relations between agreeableness and perceived support in family relationships: Why nice people are not always supportive. *International Journal of Behavioural Development*, 29, 120–128.
- Brennan, K. A., & Shaver, P. R. (1990). Dimensions of adult attachment and dynamics of romantic relationship. Department of psychology, State University of New York at Buffalo.

- Brennan, K. A., & Shaver, P. R. (1995). Dimensions of adult attachment, affect regulation, and romantic relationship functioning. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 21, 267–283.
- Buss, D. M. (1996). Social adaptation and the five major factors of personality. In J. S. Wiggins (Ed.), *The five-factor model of personality* (pp. 180-207). New York: Guilford Press.
- Byers, E. S. (2005). Relationship satisfaction and sexual satisfaction: A longitudinal study of individuals in long-term relationships. *Journal of Sex Research*, 42, 113–118.
- Campbell, L., Simpson, J. A., Boldry, J., & Kashy, D. A. (2005). Perception of conflict and support in romantic relationships: The role of attachment anxiety. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 88, 510-531.
- Canary, D. J., & Stafford, L. (1992). Relational maintenance strategies and equity in marriage. *Communication Monographs*, 59, 243-267.
- Candel, Octav-Sorin; Turliuc, Maria Nicoleta (2019). *Insecure attachment and relationship satisfaction: A meta-analysis of actor and partner associations*. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 147(), 190–199.
- Carver, C. S., & Connor-Smith, J. (2010). Personality and coping. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 61, 679–704.
- Caspi, A., & Roberts, B. W. (2001). Personality development across the life course: The argument for change and continuity. *Psychological Inquiry*, 12, 49–66.
- Collins, N. L., & Read, S. J. (1990). Adult attachment, working models, and relationship quality in dating couples. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 58, 644-663.
- 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.

- Collins, N. L., Cooper, M. L., Albino, A. & Allard, L. (2002). Psychosocial vulnerability from adolescence to adulthood: A prospective study of attachment style differences in relationship functioning and partner choice. *Journal of Personality*, 70, 965-1008.
- Costa, P. T., & McCrae, R. R. (1999). A five-factor theory of personality. *The five-factor model of personality: Theoretical perspectives*, 2, 51-87.
- Costa, P. T., Terracciano, A., & McCrae, R. R. (2001). Gender differences in personality traits across cultures: Robust and surprising findings. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 81, 322–331.
- Critelli, J.W., Myers, E.J., & Loos, V.E. (1986). The components of love: Romantic attraction and sex- role orientation. *Journal of Personality*, 54, 354-370.
- Crowell, J. A., Treboux, D., & Waters, E. (2002). Stability of attachment representations: The transition to marriage. *Developmental Psychology*, 38(4), 467–479.
- Crowell, J. A., Treboux, D., Gao, Y., Fyffe, C., Pan, H., & Waters, E. (2002b). Assessing secure base behavior in adulthood: Development of a measure, links to adult attachment representations, and relations to couples' communication and reports of relationships, *Developmental Psychology*, 38, 679-93.
- Crowell, J., Fraley, R. C., & Shaver, P. R. (2008). Measures of individual differences in adolescent and adult attachment. In J. Cassidy & P. R. Shaver (Eds.), *Handbook of attachment: Theory, research, and clinical applications* (2nd Edition) (pp. 599-634). New York: Guilford Press.
- Decuyper, M., De Bolle, M., & De Fruyt, F. (2012). Personality similarity, perceptual accuracy, and relationship satisfaction in dating and married couples. *Personal Relationships*, 19, 128–145.

- Diamond, L. M., Fagundes, C. P., & Butterworth, M. R. (2010). Intimate relationships across the life span. In M. E. Lamb, A. M. Freund, & R. M. Lerner (Eds.), *Handbook of life-span development* (Vol. 2, pp. 379–433). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.
- Dyrenforth, P. S., Kashy, D. A., Donnellan, M. B., & Lucas, R. E. (2010). Predicting relationship and life satisfaction from personality in nationally representative samples from three countries: The relative importance of actor, partner, and similarity effects. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 99, 690–702.
- Eagly, A. H., & Wood, W. (1999). The origins of sex differences in human behaviour: Evolved dispositions versus social roles. *American Psychologist*, 54, 408–423.
- Edwards, J. N., & Booth, A. (1994). Sexuality, marriage, and well-being: The middle years. In A. S. Rossi (Ed.), *Sexuality across the life course* (pp. 233–259). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Else-Quest, N. M., Hyde, J. S., Goldsmith, H. H., & Van Hulle, C. A. (2006). Gender differences in temperament: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 132, 33–72.
- Erik E. Nofle; Phillip R. Shaver (2006). *Attachment dimensions and the big five personality traits: Associations and comparative ability to predict relationship quality.* , 40(2), 179–208.
- Fallis, E. E., Rehman, U. S., Woody, E. Z., & Purdon, C. (2016). The longitudinal association of relationship satisfaction and sexual satisfaction in long-term relationships. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 30(7), 822.
- Feeney, J. A., & Noller, P. (1990). Attachment style as a predictor of adult romantic relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 58, 281-291.
- Feingold, A. (1994). Gender differences in personality: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 116, 429–456.

- Feldman, S. S., Gowen, L. K., & Fisher, L. (1998). Family relationships and gender as predictors of romantic intimacy in young adults: A longitudinal study. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, 8, 263-286
- Finkel, D., & Matheny, A. (2000). Genetic and environmental influences on a measure of infant attachment security. *Twin Research*, 3, 242-250.
- Flaherty, S. C., & Sadler, L. S. (2011). A review of attachment theory in the context of adolescent parenting. *Journal of pediatric health care : official publication of National Association of Pediatric Nurse Associates & Practitioners*, 25(2), 114–121.
- Fleeson, W., Malanos, A. B., & Achille, N. M. (2002). An intraindividual process approach to the relationship between extraversion and positive affect: Is acting extraverted as “good” as being extraverted? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 83, 1409–1422.
- Fraley, R. C., Roisman, G. I., Booth-LaForce, C., Owen, M. T., & Holland, A. S. (2013). Interpersonal and genetic origins of adult attachment styles: A longitudinal study from infancy to early adulthood. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 104, 817–838.
- Furman, W., & Simon, V. A. (2006). Actor and partner effects of adolescents’ romantic working models and styles on interactions with romantic partners. *Child Development*, 77, 588-604.
- Gervai, J., Nemoda, Z., Lakatos, K., Ronai, Z., Toth, I., Ney, K., & Sasvari-Szekely, M. (2005). Transmission disequilibrium tests confirm the link between DRD4 gene polymorphism and infant attachment. *American Journal of Medical Genetics*, 132B, 126-130.
- Guerrero, L. K. (1996). Attachment-style differences in intimacy and involvement: A test of the four-category model. *Communication Monographs*, 63, 269-292.

- Hadden, B. W., Smith, C. V., & Webster, G. D. (2014). Relationship duration moderates associations between attachment and relationship quality: Meta-analytic support for the temporal adult romantic attachment model. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 18(1), 42–58.
- Hampson, S. E. (2012). Personality processes: Mechanisms by which personality traits “get outside the skin”. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 63, 315–339.
- Hazan, C., & Shaver, P. (1987). Romantic love conceptualized as an attachment process. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 52(3), 511–524.
- Heller, D., Watson, D., & Ilies, R. (2004). The role of person versus situation in life satisfaction: A critical examination. *Psychological Bulletin*, 130, 574–600.
- Hendrick, S. S. (1988). A generic measure of relationship satisfaction. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 93-98. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/352430>
- Ickes, W., & Barnes, R.D. (1978). Boys and girls together and alienated On enacting stereotyped sex roles in mixed sex dyads. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 36, 669-683.
- Ickes, W. (1984). Sex-role influences on compatibility in relationships. In W. Ickes (Ed.), *Compatible and incompatible relationships*. New York Springer- Verlag.
- Jacobson, N. S. (1985). The role of observational measurement in behavior therapy outcome research. *Behavioral Assessment*, 7, 297–308.
- Jensen-Campbell, L., & Graziano, W. (2001). Agreeableness as a moderator of interpersonal conflict. *Journal of Personality*, 69, 323–362.
- John, O. P., & Srivastava, S. (1999). The Big Five trait taxonomy: History, measurement, and theoretical perspectives. In L. A. Pervin, & O. P. John (Eds.), *Handbook of personality: Theory and research* (2nd edn, pp. 102–138). New York: Guilford Press.

- Jones, J. T., & Cunningham, J. D. (1996). Attachment styles and other predictors of relationship satisfaction in dating couples. *Personal Relationships*, 3(4), 387-399.
- Karney, B. R., & Bradbury, T. N. (1995). The longitudinal course of marital quality and stability: A review of theory, method, and research. *Psychological Bulletin*, 118, 3–34.
- Kenneth N. Levy; William D. Ellison; Lori N. Scott; Samantha L. Bernecker (2011). *Attachment style*. , 67(2), 193–203.
- Kirkpatrick, L. A. & Hazan, C. (1994). Attachment styles and close relationships: A four- year prospective study. *Personal Relationships*, 1, 123-142.
- Lakatos, K., Toth, I., Nemoda, Z., Ney, K., Sasvari-Szekely, M., & Gervai, J. (2000). Dopamine D4 receptor (DRD4) gene polymorphism is associated with attachment disorganization. *Molecular Psychiatry*, 5, 633-637.
- Li, T., & Chan, D. K. S. (2012). How anxious and avoidant attachment affect romantic relationship quality differently: A meta-analytic review. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 42(4), 406–419.
- Lucas, R. E., & Diener, E. (2001). Understanding extraverts' enjoyment of social situations: The importance of pleasantness. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 81, 343–356.
- MacDonald, K. (1998). Evolution, culture, and the five-factor model. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 29, 119-149.
- Madey, S. F., & Rodgers, L. (2009). The Effect of Attachment and Sternberg's Triangular Theory of Love on Relationship Satisfaction. *Individual Differences Research*, 7(2).
- Main, M. (1981). Avoidance in the service of attachment: A working paper. In K. Immelman, G. Barlow, M. Main, & L. Petrinovitch (Eds.), *Behavioral development: The Bielefeld interdisciplinary project* (pp. 651–693). New York: Cambridge University Press.

- Main, M. (1990). Cross-cultural studies of attachment organization: Recent studies, changing methodologies, and the concept of conditional strategies. *Human Development*, 33, 48–61.
- Malouff, J. M., Thorsteinsson, E. B., Schutte, N. S., Bhullar, N., & Rooke, S. E. (2010). The Five-Factor Model of personality and relationship satisfaction of intimate partners: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 44, 124–127.
- Mattson, R. E., Rogge, R. D., Johnson, M. D., Davidson, E. K., & Fincham, F. D. (2013). The positive and negative semantic dimensions of relationship satisfaction. *Personal Relationships*, 20(2), 328-355.
- McCrae, R. R., & Costa, P. T. (1984). *Emerging lives, enduring dispositions*. Scott Foresman.
- McCrae, R. R., & John, O. P. (1992). An introduction to the five- factor model and its applications. *Journal of Personality*, 60, 175–215.
- McCrae, R. R., Costa, P. T., Jr., Ostendorf, F., Angleitner, A., Hrebicková, M., Avia, M. D., et. al. (2000). Nature over nurture: Temperament, personality, and lifespan development. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 78, 173-186.
- McCrae, R. R., Terracciano, A., & 78 Members of the Personality Profiles of Cultures Project (2005). Universal features of personality traits from the observer's perspective: Data from 50 cultures. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 88, 547–561.
- Mikulincer, M., Florian, V., & Weller, A. (1993). Attachment styles, coping strategies, and posttraumatic psychological distress: The impact of the Gulf War in Israel. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 54, 817-826.
- Mikulincer, M., & Shaver, P. R. (2007). *Attachment in adulthood: Structure, dynamics, and change*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Miller, J., & Tedder, B. (2011). The discrepancy between expectations and reality: Satisfaction in romantic relationships. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 21, 572-583.

- Mohammadi, K., Samavi, A., & Ghazavi, Z. (2016). The relationship between attachment styles and lifestyle with marital satisfaction. *Iranian Red Crescent Medical Journal*, 18(4).
- Neyer, F. J., & Voigt, D. (2004). Personality and social network effects on romantic relationships: A dyadic approach. *European Journal of Personality*, 18, 279–299.
- Noftle, E. E., & Shaver, P. R. (2006). Attachment dimensions and the big five personality traits: Associations and comparative ability to predict relationship quality. *Journal of research in personality*, 40(2), 179-208.
- Owens, G., Crowell, J., Pan, H., Treboux, D., O'Connor, E., & Waters, E. (1995). The prototype hypothesis and the origins of attachment working models: Adult relationships with parents and romantic partners. In E. Waters, B. Vaughn, G. Posada, & K. Kondo-Ikemura (Eds.), *Caregiving, cultural, and cognitive perspectives on secure-base behavior and working models: New growing points of attachment theory and research. Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development*, 60(2–3, Serial No. 244), 216-233.
- Pielage, S. B., Luteijn, F., & Arrindell, W. A (2005). Adult attachment, intimacy, and psychological distress in a clinical and community sample. *Clinical Psychological Psychotherapy*, 12, 455-464.
- Roberts, B. W., Kuncel, N. R., Shiner, R., Caspi, A., & Goldberg, L. R. (2007). The power of personality. The comparative validity of personality traits, socioeconomic status, and cognitive ability for predicting important life outcomes. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 2, 313–345.
- Robins, R. W., Caspi, A., & Moffitt, T. E. (2000). Two personalities, one relationship: Both partner's personality traits shape the quality of their relationship. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 79, 251–259.

- Robins, R. W., Caspi, A., & Moffitt, T. E. (2002). It's not just who you're with, it's who you are: Personality and relationship experiences across multiple relationships. *Journal of Personality*, 70, 927–964.
- Robles, T. F., Slatcher, R. B., Trombello, J. M., & McGinn, M. M. (2014). Marital quality and health: a meta-analytic review. *Psychological bulletin*, 140(1), 140.
- Roisman, G. I., Collins, A. W., Sroufe, L. A., & Egeland, B. (2005). Predictors of young adults' representations of and behavior in their current romantic relationship: Prospective tests of the prototype hypothesis. *Attachment and Human Development*, 7, 105–121.
- Rosenzweig, J.M., & Dailey, D.M. (1989). Dyadic adjustment/sexual satisfaction in woman and men as a function of psychological sex role self-perception. . *Journal of Sex and Marital Therapy*, 15, 42-56.
- Rus, H. M., & Tiemensma, J. (2017). "It's complicated." A systematic review of associations between social network site use and romantic relationships. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 75, 684-703.
- Rusbult, C. E. (1983). A longitudinal test of the investment model: The development (and deterioration) of satisfaction and commitment in heterosexual involvements. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 45(1), 101.
- Schaffhuser, Kathrin; Allemand, Mathias; Martin, Mike (2014). *Personality Traits and Relationship Satisfaction in Intimate Couples: Three Perspectives on Personality*. *European Journal of Personality*, 28(2), 120–133.
- Schmitt, D. P., Realo, A., Voracek, M., & Allik, J. (2008). Why can't a man be more like a woman? Sex differences in Big Five personality traits across 55 cultures. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 94(1), 168.
- Schwartz, P., & Young, L. (2009). Sexual satisfaction in committed relationships. *Sexuality Research & Social Policy*, 6, 1–17.

- Siebert, R. J., Ward, T., & Hudson, S. (1995). The structure of romance: A factor-analytic examination of the Relationship Scales Questionnaire. *New Zealand Journal of Psychology*, 24, 13-20.
- Simpson, J. A. (1990). Influence of attachment styles on romantic relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 59, 971-980.
- Shaver, P. R., Hazan, C., & Bradshaw, D. (1988). Love as attachment: The integration of three behavioral systems. In R. J. Sternberg & M. L. Barnes (Eds.), *The psychology of love* (pp. 68–99). New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Shaver, P. R., & Brennan, K. A. (1992). Attachment styles and the "Big Five" personality traits: Their connections with each other and with romantic relationship outcomes. *Personality and social psychology bulletin*, 18(5), 536-545.
- Shaver, P. R., & Mikulincer, M. (2005). Attachment theory and research: Resurrection of the psychodynamic approach to personality. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 39, 22–45.
- Shi, L. (2003). The association between adult attachment styles and conflict resolution in romantic relationships. *The American Journal of Family Therapy*, 31, 143-157.
- Simpson, J. A. (1990). Influence of attachment styles on romantic relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 59, 971–980.
- Stackert, R. A., & Bursik, K. (2003). Why am I unsatisfied? Adult attachment style, gendered irrational relationship beliefs, and young adult romantic relationship satisfaction. *Personality and individual differences*, 34(8), 1419-1429.
- Stafford, L., & Canary, D. J. (1991). Maintenance strategies and romantic relationship type, gender and relational characteristics. *Journal of Social and Personal relationships*, 8, 217-242.

- Steiner, M., Allemand, M., & McCullough, M. E. (2012). Do agree- ableness and neuroticism explain age differences in the tendency to forgive others? *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 38, 441–453.
- Sternberg, R. J. (1986). A triangular theory of love. *Psychological Review*, 93, 119-13
- Sternberg, R. J. (1997). Construct validation of a triangular love scale. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 27, 313-335.
- Sternberg, R. J. (2006) A duplex theory of love. In R. J. Sternberg & K. Weis (Eds.), *The new psychology of love* (pp. 184-199). New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Tai, T. O., Baxter, J., & Hewitt, B. (2014). Do co-residence and intentions make a difference? Relationship satisfaction in married, cohabiting, and living apart together couples in four countries. *Demographic Research*, 31, 71–104.
- Treboux, D., Crowell, J., & Waters, E. (2004). When “new” meets “old”: Configurations of adult attachment representations and their implications for marital functioning. *Developmental Psychology*, 40, 295-314.
- Watson, D., & Clark, L. A. (1984). Negative affectivity: The disposition to experience aversive emotional states. *Psychological Bulletin*, 96, 465–490.
- Watson, D., Hubbard, B., & Wiese, D., (2000a). General traits of personality and affectivity as predictors of satisfaction in intimate relationships: Evidence from self- and partner-rating. *Journal of Personality*, 68, 413–449.
- Wilgenbusch, T., & Merrell, K. W. (1999). Gender differences in self- concept among children and adolescents: A meta-analysis of multidimensional studies. *School Psychology Quarterly*, 14, 101–120.
- Zhan, S., Shrestha, S., & Zhong, N. (2022). Romantic relationship satisfaction and phubbing: The role of loneliness and empathy. *Frontiers in psychology*, 13, 967339.