

Predicting Role of Love Attitudes and Satisfaction with Love  
Life for Relationship Quality among University Students



BY

Sundas Malik

*Dr. Muhammad Ajmal*

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF PSYCHOLOGY

Center of Excellence

Quaid-I-Azam University Islamabad

2018

# **Predicting Role of Love Attitudes and Satisfaction of Love Life with Relationship Quality among University Students**

A Research Report submitted in

Partial fulfillment of the requirements of

The Degree of Masters of Science in Psychology

**By**

**Sundas Malik**

Dr. Muhammad Ajmal

**NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF PSYCHOLOGY**

Center of Excellence

**Quaid-I-Azam University Islamabad**

**2018**

**Predicting Role of Love Attitudes and Satisfaction with Love Life  
for Relationship Quality among University Students**

By

**Sundas Hafeez Malik**



Approved by

---

**(Ms. Arooj Mujeeb)**  
**Supervisor**

---

**(Dr. Uzma Masroor)**  
**External Examiner**

---

**(Prof. Dr. Anila Kamal)**  
**Director, NIP**

## CERTIFICATE

This is to certify the M.sc research report “**Predicting role of love attitudes and satisfaction with love life for relationship quality**” prepared by Ms. **Sundas Hafeez Malik** has been approved for submission to the National Institute of Psychology, Quaid-i-Azam University, Islamabad.



Ms. Arooj Mujeeb

(Supervisor)



## CONTENTS

List of Tables	i
List of Appendices	ii
Acknowledgement	iii
Abstract	iv
<b>CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION</b>	
Love Attitudes	2
Types of Love Attitudes	4
Gender Differences in Love Attitudes	5
Love Attitudes and Relationship Satisfaction	7
Theoretical Background	8
Attachment Theory	8
Erickson's Psychosocial Theory of Development and Intimacy	9
Colour Wheel Theory	10
The Triangular Theory of Love	10
Relationship Satisfaction	13
Relationship Quality	15
Interpersonal Approach	16
Intrapersonal Approach	16
Patterns of Change in Relationship Quality	18
Relationship Quality and Age	18
Relationship Between Love Attitudes, Relationship Satisfaction and Relationship Quality	19
Rationale of the Study	20
<b>CHAPTER 2: METHOD</b>	
Objectives	22
Hypotheses	22
Operational Definitions	22
Instruments	23
Sample	24
Procedure	25
<b>CHAPTER 3: RESULTS</b>	
Results	26



## **CHAPTER 4: DISCUSSION**

Discussion	37
Implications	40
Limitations and Suggestions	42
Conclusion	41
<b>References</b>	<b>43</b>
<b>Appendices</b>	

### List of Tables

<b>Table 1</b>	Frequency of Multiple Responses Demographic Variable ( $N = 230$ )	25
<b>Table 2</b>	Descriptive Statistics and Reliability Coefficients of Study Variables ( $N = 230$ )	27
<b>Table 3</b>	Correlation among Love Attitudes, Relationship Satisfaction and Relationship Quality ( $N = 230$ )	28
<b>Table 4</b>	Gender Differences on love Attitudes, Satisfaction of Love Life and Relationship Quality and their Subscales ( $N = 230$ )	29
<b>Table 5</b>	Simple Linear Regression Analysis Showing the Effects of Love Attitudes on Relationship Satisfaction ( $N = 230$ )	30
<b>Table 6</b>	Simple Linear Regression Analysis Showing the Effects of Love Attitudes on Positive Relationship Quality ( $N = 230$ )	31
<b>Table 7</b>	Simple Linear Regression Analysis Showing the Effects of Love Attitudes on Negative Relationship ( $N = 230$ )	32
<b>Table 8</b>	Simple Linear Regression Analysis Showing the Effects of Relationship Satisfaction on Positive Relationship Quality ( $N = 230$ )	33
<b>Table 9</b>	Simple Linear Regression Analysis Showing the Effects of Relationship Satisfaction on Negative Relationship Quality ( $N = 230$ )	34
<b>Table 10</b>	One-way ANOVA on Relationship Length among with Study Variables ( $N = 230$ )	35

## LIST OF APPENDICES

- Appendix A** Consent Form
- Appendix B** Demographic Information Sheet
- Appendix C** Love Attitude Scale
- Appendix D** Relationship Assessment Scale
- Appendix E** Positive Negative Relationship Quality Scale
- Appendix F** Author permission of using Love Attitude Scale
- Appendix G** Author Permission of using Relationship Assessment Scale
- Appendix H** Author Permission of using Positive Negative Relationship Quality Scale

## Acknowledgement

In the name of الله , the Most Merciful and the Most Beneficent. All the phrase to ALLAH ALMIGHTY who has always bestowed me far better and more than what I deserved, strived for, and for the blessing me with strength, perseverance, and respect.

I feel immensely indebted to my supervisor Miss Arooj Mujeeb for the unsurpassed guidance, courage, support, and valuable feedback throughout the research period. Her patience, encouragement, motivation, continuous support in every worse situation, kind and humble attitude helped me out to complete this research work. Thank you so much Ma'am for being so supportive, honest and kind to me.

I would like to thank my family members especially Mama and Papa, their love, support, encouragement, and care provides enthusiasm to complete this work. I was worthless without the support and love of my parents. I would like to say special thanks to my friends who were with me through my thick and thin. Thank you so much for resolving my problems over the phase of research work. Without their help I cannot complete my work.

Finally I would like to acknowledge the persons, who prayed for me and support me emotionally, who contributed or helped me in completing data, and also those whom who gave me the data. Thank you so Much.

*Sundas*

### Abstract

The present study attempted to explore the role of different love attitudes in relationship satisfaction and relationship quality. It was also intended to explore the role of various demographics (age, gender, and relationship length) in relation to major constructs of study. A purposive sample ( $N = 230$ ) comprised of male ( $n = 115$ ) and female ( $n = 115$ ) students of Quaid-i-Azam University who were currently in love relationship was taken. Love Attitude Scale (Hendrick & Hendrick, 1990), Relationship Assessment Scale (Hendrick, 1988), and Positive Negative Relationship Quality Scale (Fincham & Rogge, 2010) were used to assess different love attitudes, satisfaction in love life, and relationship quality. The results conclude that eros, mania, ludus, storge pragma were found to be positively related with relationship satisfaction. Results showed that eros, ludus, storge, and agape were negative predictor of relationship satisfaction and positive relationship quality whereas; Pragma and mania were found to be positive predictors of relationship satisfaction and positive relationship quality. Pragma and agape negatively predicted negative relationship quality whereas; eros, ludus, storge and mania positively predicted negative relationship quality. Furthermore; relationship satisfaction positively predicted positive relationship quality and negatively predicted negative relationship quality. Significant differences were found between males and females on ludus love attitude. The present study has theoretical and practical implications which have also been discussed.

## INTRODUCTION

## INTRODUCTION

During the course of life, human beings experience different kind of emotions. In these emotions, an intense feeling of attraction or passion for someone is known as love. People adopt different attitudes to express their feeling and emotions to other, which are known as love attitudes. Love varies from culture to culture and individual to individual, and is combination of firm and positive experiences which range between intense emotional intimacy to simple desires. At the same time, being satisfied with love life is a major concern for all the individuals who are in love relationships. An individual's satisfaction with love life largely depends on the attitudes and beliefs which he holds towards his love life and partner. Numerous of researches about love relationships indicated that commitment, intimacy and passion are related to relationship satisfaction. Likewise; researchers' interest in the topic of love has led to development of various theories over the period of time.

Nonetheless; just carrying the positive attitudes and beliefs towards love cannot result in absolute satisfaction with love life. Those people, whose desires are met within their relationship, are more satisfied in their relationships as compared to the people whose desires are not met and they face disappointments within their relationships.

According to Collins, West, and Aiken (2003), romantic relationships in early adulthood have been perceived as an important developing context that derives from past relationship and give basis to future ones. In addition, positive and negative effects in other life domains are, to some extent, related to these relationships. In industrialized countries, a large number of people experience emerging adulthood phase which is primarily characterized by experience of love relationships (Arnett, 2000). According to Masten et al. (2004), people from nineteen years to middle thirties experience specific difficulties and chances while they are experiencing love.



Beliefs and attitudes that people hold about relationship and future partners are shaped by how people are dealt by significant others in their early life, specifically during times of stress (Bowlby, 1982). Attitude in one's relationship is not only affected by others' treatment in early life rather adulthood also helps in shaping one's attitudes and responses towards love relationships. Psychosocial theory indicates that developing adults are confronted with intimacy versus isolation crisis which can be considered a milestone in making intimate partnership once the individual is successful in overcoming this crisis (Erickson, 1968).

Most of developing adults are not only involved in making and shaping personal relationships, but are also engaged in dealing with close relationships while setting up secure identities while looking for their expected roles in society and friendship (Havighurst, 1948). Developing adults consider their romantic partners and friends to be essential part inside their informal social network (Fraley & Davis, 1997). According to Collins and Laursen (2004), adults spend huge amount of time with their friends and romantic partners who has been related with satisfaction and happiness in their lives (Demir, 2008; Demir, & Weitekamp, 2006). According to Laursen and Bukowski (1997) both relationship are willful and temporary and individuals can easily start and end these affiliations. Furman and Buhrmester (1992) suggest that there are similarities in friendship and love relationship but they perform quite different functions. For example; friendship has a tendency to satisfy social needs of intimacy, friendship and feelings of worth whereas; romantic relationships tend to give emotional support and fulfill intimacy needs. Monck (1991) argues that after some time, some functions may change because of developmental needs of the individuals. In spite of distinctive functions, love relationship and friendship don't occur independently rather, they are connected inside a continuous social experience (Lefkowitz, Boone, & Shearer, 2004).

### **Love Attitudes**

The intense and deep feeling that grasps and fascinates the individuals in a relationship is titled as love. Love is a feeling that occurs in hierarchical form (simple to intense desires) and can be characterized as combination of different attitudes (Levy & Devis, 1998). That is the reason that different individual have different

attitudes toward love. However, Pistole (1994) argues that love is not sufficient in any case to influence a relationship to work. The concept of love is a study which has gotten impressive arguments and considerations.

Love is an effective key process of being honored, craving for, frequently representing and enjoying the company and comfort of beloved. Love is addressing the requirements of oneself. True love is characterized by showing off intimacy towards a partner which brings about positive consequences of love. Different individuals have different attitudes toward love. Those people, who are in romantic relationships, have mutual respect and gratitude toward their current relationship. Love attitudes then again indicates how people characterize the approach they have toward love (Moore & John, 1979).

In view of Hendrick and Hendrick (1986), attitudes that people hold on love are linked to their experiences and actions toward the people they love. Since the nineteenth century, literature started reporting that there is close connection between marriage and romantic relationships. Furthermore; Perez, Bosch, Navarro, Garcia, and Ramis (2009) indicated that the most ultimate reason for a person to be engaged in a relationship is falling in love towards an individual.

Hendrick (1986) suggested that different love attitudes are differentially identified with emotions and behavior during relationship development. Love attitudes are related with various kinds of demographics and personality variables and bring about different consequences regarding quality and satisfaction in love relationships (Aron & Westbay, 1996; Fricker & Moore, 2002; Hendrick, Hendrick, & Adler, 1988).

Though representation of love differs broadly but ideal model of the six love attitudes, also known as colors of love, is a distinctive way to deal with the psychology of love (Lee, 1973). These styles are characterized as having primary, secondary and tertiary combinations, even though findings has concentrated on the love attitudes as separate or independent of each other as supported by Neto (2007).

## Types of Love Attitudes

These love attitudes can also be regarded as usual part of experience and learning. A different approach or basic motivation to love relationship is represented by six colors (Jonason & Tost, 2010). These six love colors or attitudes consist of Eros (Passionate), Ludus (Game-playing), Storge (Friendship), Pragma (Practical), Mania (Possessive) and Agape (Altruistic) love. Eros partner can be described as a serious person who has a solid responsibility regarding their relation. Love is highly respected by this style and there is solid physical and passionate fascination. Game-playing with partners is part of ludic style. People with ludic style may enjoy company of many partners outside of the relationship because they are not intended in making sound commitment with only partner. They are careful about deep passionate bonding and cunning qualities can also be seen in this style (Jonason & Tost, 2010).

Love and friendship as equivalent partner are regarded by storge attitude. In this attitude, there is lack of romantic bonding and has no relationship with relationship satisfaction and quality. Sensible and realistic style of love is titled as pragma. Pragmatic love attitude concentrate, on some qualities of partner like goal directedness. Mania depends on insecurity of self as well as partner. People with manic styles are mostly jealous, possessive and dependent upon their partners being in a relationship (Jonason & Tost, 2010).

Lee (1973) found that agape love attitudes cannot be found in every individual. This style of love is all about non- requesting and sacrificing their own desires for partner's happiness. Hendrick and Hendrick (1986) developed a love attitude scale to quantify six love attitudes. In recent decades, there have been numerous researches of love emergence, to study close relationships. Some consistent findings are indicated by research literature, regarding the relationship between relationship experience and love attitudes which have been discussed further. Detail of each type of love attitude is as follow:

**Eros.** Researchers (Fricker & Moore, 2002; Morrow, Clark, & Brock, 1995; Woll, 1989) identified eros in term of romance, high commitment, liking, loving, having sense of responsibility, low costs, high rewards and being happy and satisfied with partner and relationship.



**Ludus.** According to researchers (Aron & Westbay, 1996; Fricker & Moore, 2002; Woll, 1989) ludic love style includes variety of partners outside the relationship, game- playing and ditching the partner. Individuals who score high on ludus attitude report high level of disappointment and dissatisfaction with the relationship as compared to their partner, significant possibility to end the relationship, low level of relational responsibility, low level of commitment and low level of loving and liking for their partners in the relationship.

**Storge.** Storge has been related with friendship. According to Woll (1989), storge includes moderately short-term friendships and easy ending of relations. Partners have no concern regarding length of their relationship and friendship relationship can be ended at any stage of relationship.

**Pragma.** Pragma is a practical love style in which partners decide to live with each other and sharing common goals. Relationships are based on getting benefits from each other. People who are high on pragma have generally maintained long term relationships (Richardson et al., 1988; Woll, 1989).

**Mania.** Mania tends to be dependent upon partner, low level of satisfaction, possessiveness, insecurity and worries about a partner's need to date other especially for females (Richardson et al., 1988; Woll, 1989).

**Agape.** Agape is described as sacrificial, altruistic, non-requesting love attitude and is related with having sense of duty regarding the partner; being happy with relationship and sacrificing own happiness and desires for sake of partner. Partners with agape love attitude do not look outside of relationship for new partners (Hendrick, Hendrick, & Adler, 1988).

### **Gender Differences in Love Attitudes**

In study of love attitudes, it is seen that gender differences are found intertwined with social expectations, and furthermore with attitude and behavior. In love relations, there are stereotypes about gender. In love attitudes, gender has been studied in connection with time (Hendrick et al., 1988) and age (Risavy, 1995) because gender has been an important variable. It has been observed that romantic

partners mostly appear to show same patterns in love attitudes. However, males are constantly found to possess agape, ludic and erotic love attitudes, whereas; females are found to possess pragma, storgic love attitudes (Frazier & Esterly, 1990; Hendrick & Hendrick, 2006). In this study conflicting results were found for manic love attitude and did not considered as well. While in a relationship, males are more dominant which cause them to be emotionally strong. It is realistic to believe that ludic, agape and eros attitudes are male's general qualities. For females, it is believed that they are more friendship oriented in their relationships.

According to Sherman, Vries, and Lansford (2000), mutual activities are vital part of male's friendships and females considered closeness and emotional support important to relationship. It has been suggested that intimacy increases both of these characteristics of relationships for both genders during the time period of young adulthood (Reis, Bennett, & Nezelek, 1993).

A study found that males and females both vary in their love attitude in relationship. In 1986, a study was conducted by Hendrick and Hendrick that intimacy in romantic relationship was related with six love attitudes with different patterns. As demonstrated by research, females were found to have agape, storgic and pragmatic love in their relationship, whereas; males were found to be more prone to game-playing or ludic attitude in their relationships.

Similarly; Butler, Walker, Skowronski, and Shannon (1995) analyzed the relationship among variables of age, gender and different love attitudes. Results showed that males were inclined to hold ludus attitude and females were inclined to hold pragma and storge love attitudes. Results also showed that age factor was linked with different love attitudes differently. After analyzation of age factor with love, results showed that young participants were more inclined to hold eros love attitudes and as age increases participants become more inclined to hold pragmatic and storgic love styles in their relationship

Morrow et al. (1995) also found out the role of gender in love. Findings showed that females generally hold pragmatic love styles. On the other hand, males were more prone to adopt ludic and storgic love attitudes as well as permissive sexual attitudes. The pragmatic love attitude, which was generally adopted by females, was



likewise described by sociobiological approach as females more worried about contributing on their forthcoming.

Concept of love and the variation of love concept among different age groups and genders had also been explored (Perez et al., 2009). Results showed that most rejected love attitude was game-playing and most accepted love attitudes were agape, eros, pragma and storge while manic or dependent love attitude was not considered positively by both genders. However, early adult and young females rejected ludic love attitude and females from all ages generally showed acceptance to hold pragmatic love attitude, whereas; males from all ages were prone to adopt agape and eros love attitudes.

In validation of love attitudes, gender differences play an important role. The reason for this is because females score low on ludic love attitudes than do males, and males also consistently report low on pragma, storge and mania than do females. On agape and eros love attitudes, insignificant gender differences have been found (Davies, 2001; Frazier & Esterly, 1990; Morrow et al., 1995; Richardson et al., 1998).

According to Risavy (1995) both females and males were found more satisfied within relationship including agape, eros and storge or just eros. Gender differences in love attitudes can likewise foresee the degree to which people in a romantic dyad will become quiet about their own worries, fears and concern of the relationship, referred to as self-silencing as investigated by Collins, Cramel, and Singleton-Jackson, (2005). It has been reported by researchers (Jones, 1986, Sternberg & Barnes, 1985) that what partners believe about each other might be as vital as objective reality in influencing relationship satisfaction. Thus, it can be expected that partner's forecasts of each other's love attitudes would be as highly related to satisfaction as would the anticipated partner's actual love attitudes.

### **Love Attitudes and Relationship Satisfaction**

In investigating the relationship between relationship satisfaction and love attitudes, Hendrick et al. (1988) discovered that person's own relationship satisfaction was significantly related with the view of partner's love style. The person's relationship satisfaction is related and predictive of person's own love attitude. It had

also been observed that eros love and nonappearance of both mania and ludus love attitudes best anticipated relational satisfaction for females. On the other hand; eros and nonappearance of ludus best anticipated relational satisfaction for males.

Esterly (1990) carried out a study and demonstrated that eros is always observed to be positively related with relationship satisfaction and ludus is observed negatively related with relationship satisfaction. It was also found that ludus was negatively related with commitment and agape and eros were positively related with it. On the similar lines; Meeks, Hendrick, and Hendrick (1998) argued that relationship satisfaction is positively predicted by agape, eros and storge and negatively predicted by ludus and mania. Agape, eros and ludus were altogether observed to anticipate one's relationship satisfaction.

Similar kind of results had been found by Morrow et al. (1995) that relationship satisfaction was negatively correlated with ludus; whereas positively correlated with eros in both genders. Thus many studies described above, found that love attitudes included agape and eros were associated with satisfaction but reverse findings were showed by ludic love attitude.

### **Theoretical Background**

There are different theories that discuss love attitudes and their relationship with satisfaction and other love attitudes. These are as follow:

**Attachment theory.** As per attachment theory, emotion and behavior in early adulthood romantic relationship is influenced by relationship that are developed in childhood (Ainsworth, Blehar, & Waters, 1978; Bowlby, 1982). Brassard, Dupuy, Bergeron, and Shaver (2015) further expanded the notion and argued that when parental figures gives consistent care, child builds feelings of self -esteem, effective emotional functioning, enthusiasm and security.

According to Simpson, Rholes, and Nelligan (1992) there is specific significance of attachment representation in love relationships because it plays an important role in changing people behavior with their beloved. Bowlby's (1988) presented that attachment security level differs from individual to individual and

influences the approach with which an individual is going to relate with others in future. In nineteenth century, secure or insecure attachments were originally measured categorically, but in recent year's researchers start assessing adult attachment on dimensional basis (Creasey & Ladd, 2004).

Based on Brennan, Clark, and Shaver's, (1998) study, attachment anxiety and attachment avoidance are two distinct categories. Individual security level and attachment techniques are decided by combining these two measurements. Thus, being capable to approach love partner nearby in times of need and for love is represented by attachment security (Edelstein et al., 2004). On the other hand; attachment insecurity has been identified as having either higher level of attachment avoidance and/or attachment anxiety (Brennan et al., 1998). High level of attachment anxiety leads to being excessive sensitive to any signal indicating separation and excessive dependence to the partner. While high level of attachment avoidance leads to foundation of separation from the partner and dependence on self (Edeolstein et al., 2004).

Hypothetically, through the course of tense and traumatic life occasions, these attachment systems get triggered (Simpson, Rholes, & Phillips, 1996). For example, various types of problematic behaviors and conflicts can be developed through conflicting and anxiety provoking states (Kobak & Duemmler, 1994). It largely depends on the individual's attachment style, that how an individual would behaviorally and emotionally respond to the conflictual conditions (Pietromonaco, Greenwood, & Barret, 2004). In this way, individuals may start seeing their romantic relationship in negative way because of having insecure attachment style (Saavedra, Chapman, & Rogge, 2010) and therefore they have tendency to take part in negative and destructive practices in problematic circumstances (Simpson et al., 1996).

**Erickson's psychosocial theory of development and intimacy.** Theoretical and experimental work suggests that advancement in personality development and the accomplishment of criteria for adulthood might be related with emergence of some positive relationship qualities for both relations (friendship and love relationship). According to psychosocial theory of Erickson (1968, 1982) advancement on identity development (starting in pre-adulthood and proceeding into early adulthood) must



take into consideration for intimacy in every single relationship, not only in romantic relationships. Progress toward a well-developed personality and the capability of mature intimacy occur simultaneously as said by many researchers (Paul & White, 1990; Seginer & Noyman, 2005) and are developmental milestone of developing adults.

In romantic relationships, the connection between intimacy and identity has been anticipated in various researches (Dyk & Adams, 1990; Markstrom & Kalmanir, 2001; Matula, Huston, & Grotev, 1992; Montgomery, 2005). Therefore, it is said that in romantic relationships, intimacy is expected to be interlinked with development in adopting adult role, as adults are more secure and intimate while interacting with others (Paul & White, 1990; Arnett, 2003, 2004).

**Color wheel theory.** The fundamental theoretical idea in color wheel theory is related with each of the love attitudes as depicted by Lee (1973) and additionally improved by Hendrick and Hendrick, (1986). Lee (1973) initially proposed color of love which consists of agape, eros, ludus, mania, pragma and storge. They are considered as attitudinal not mutually exclusive within a person (Hendrick & Hendrick, 1997). In order to view individual variances in love, this multi-dimensional approach provides a comprehensive basis. Lee proposed different ways of loving (agape, eros, ludus, mania, pragma and storge and further defined them as primary, secondary and tertiary attitudes. Primary ways or style included eros, ludus and agape. Secondary ways are agape, mania and pragma. Tertiary ways are combination of six love attitudes and consist of one primary and one secondary attitude. Such as manic eros, manic storge, mania ludus, agapic eros, agapic ludus, agapic storge, pragmatic eros, pragmatic ludus and pragmatic storge. Although names of each of the tertiary types of love were developed but research never found enough evidence to distinguish them fully.

**The triangular theory of love.** The second theory in this research is triangular theory of love by Sternberg (1986). According to Sternberg (1986) love can be known as three elements that can be seen as vertices of triangle. He also suggested that connectedness is also part of intimacy and it contain feelings of experience, understanding and happiness within a partner and close terms with the friends and

family. Physical attraction, romance and sexual attraction are part of passion (Sternberg, 1986). Passionate love is also characterized by a blend of behavior, feelings and significant need to be with another (Hatfield, 1988). Sternberg (1988) suggested that commitment comprises of two components in brief choice to love somebody, and in the long term choice to keep up that love. This perspective incorporates the exclusivity and devotion. These two parts of perspective don't essentially to go together all the times. Because a person can decide to love someone without any commitment to that love.

Sternberg (1986) revealed the idea that entire love is portrayed as full mixture of three elements (intimacy, passion and commitment) and it is hard to maintain. Lee's love attitudes and triangular theory of love are diverse in nature, but can be a direction to think about concept of love and predict relationship satisfaction.

Sternberg (1986) has seen love as triangles which is framed by three elements and are related with satisfaction in relation and change with time and phase of relationship development (Acker & Davis, 1992; Gao, 2001). In the view of these theories, we can examine love from an alternate point of view and expand the concept of love. For example, romantic love is identified and described by passion and intimacy; it is additionally named erotic love. Love that developed by fellowship or friendship is named as storge love. Companionate love focuses on commitment and intimacy. As said by Hendrick et al. (1988), love attitudes are predictable as they have a tendency to be fixed over the period of time. Moreover, individuals may, all the while, hold distinctive love attitudes with two unique partners (Hendrick, 2006).

Triangular theory of love focus on communicating, commitment, intimacy and passion through activity keeping in mind to enhance happiness (Sternberg, 1986). Individual's practices are changing with relationship dynamic. It is supposed that there are relationship between how one's beliefs and how they react. It is supposed that for males, commitment has more vital part in intimate relationships. On the contrast, it is anticipated that commitment increase, when passion decrease over different stages of relationship and it also offers rise to companionate love which lead to increase in storgic love. In spite of the fact, love segments are supposed that extent across over relationship development (Hendrick et al., 1988).

There is not sufficient evidence that love attitudes can be changed over the period of time in a relationship, in spite of the fact that love elements are supposed to increase over relationship development. It is assumed that love styles have tendency to be stable across and over stages for both genders and are connected with personal attitudes (Hendrick & Hendrick, 1988).

In light of the previous literature, it is suggested that perfect love has no assurance that it will last forever because of changing in three triangular elements of love during various phases of relationship development. As indicated by Sternberg (1986, 1988) levels of components are anticipated with time course. As indicated by Sternberg's anticipations, if a relationship is to become a long-term one, level of commitment will be gradually increased and over the period of time. If the relationship keeps on over the long term and even it does not begin to fail, the amount of commitment will generally level off.

Moreover, intimacy decays as relationship progress after some time. Sternberg (1988) contends that apparent intimacy decays and latent intimacy keeps on developing in an effective and positive relationship. Though anticipations made by Sternberg was lack of time frame. It stops theoretic to tell how the span of relation is a sufficiently long to demonstrate a particular form he anticipated.

Partners in shorter relationships showed great behavior passion and intimacy than those with longer ones (Acker & Davis, 1992). Sternberg's (1988) idea of decrease in intimacy with relationship development is supported over here. They found that level of responsibility and commitment is greater for hitches partners, regardless of taking relationship length as estimation. Passion decreases after some time, however just among females and follow the anticipated patterns. Gao (2001) demonstrate changes in phase of love, he suggested that relationship length and relationship phases are important and essential elements in anticipating love. Moreover, his findings showed that relationships are strongly connected with commitment, intimacy and passion. \_

## Relationship Satisfaction

A relationship is described by a stable interaction between no less than two people (Asendorpf, Banse, & Mucke, 2000; Hinde, Tamplin, & Barrett, 1993). According to Locke and Wallace (1959), relationship satisfaction has been characterized as an adjustment, well-being (Acitelli, 1992) and functioning (Honeycutt, 1986) of two individuals.

It is also mentioned as the positive vs. negative influence in a relationship and is impacted by the degree to which a partner satisfies the person's most important needs. Many researchers have indicated that relationship satisfaction is deeply identified with a partner's view of their general well-being and relationship satisfaction (Butzer & Campbell, 2008; Brassard et al., 2015). Individuals spend much of their time in close relationship to others. Time spent with partners represent a core aspect of their social life. Such relations might be unhealthy, disappointed and weak, but may also be very supportive, inspirational, healthy and joyful. In romantic relationship research, relationship satisfaction is one of the most important factors (Fincham, 2013). Relationship satisfaction can be assessed through (one-dimensional model) general quality and (multidimensional model) specific variables.

Love commitment, communication, intimacy, trust and responsibility are specific variables that can contribute in appraisal of the relationship satisfaction. Relationship satisfaction was found interrelated in dealing with conflicts. Meeks et al. (1988) found that relationship satisfaction is also influenced by individual's conflict handling tactics such as sarcasm, anger, criticism and destructive statements. These tactics are negatively associated with relationship satisfaction. The more the individual is satisfied, the more positively he will resolve conflict. Similarly; Brassard et al. (2015) and Davis et al. (2006) have articulated that satisfaction in relationship can be developed by positive communication among couples, but how people develop this ability is hard to interpret. Satisfaction in relationship has been related to various partners and individual results, comprising general life satisfaction, physical well-being, psychological well-being, separation rates and treatment of both emotional and physical well-being (Proulx, Helms, & Buehler, 2007; Fincham & Beach, 2010). Relationship satisfaction has become most popular area of study because of its solid

anticipated relationship between these important life outcomes and relationship satisfaction.

In the study of Watson, Chudoba, & Crowstone, (2000), it is found that personality traits have different outcomes for relationship satisfaction. In dating, couples' agreeableness and conscientiousness are linked with high level of satisfaction in relationship whereas; neuroticism is associated with low level of relationship satisfaction (Karney & Bradbury, 1997).

Sternberg (1986) indicated that relationship satisfaction can be identified through triangle (commitment, intimacy, passion). The greater the individual area of triangle, the more prominent measure of satisfaction can be experienced. It can be comprehended as; more love is experienced through more support of the elements. Different elements that have been appeared to be significant indicator of relationship satisfaction are interpersonal interaction; positivity, task sharing, inspiration, assurances, and communication.

Researchers (Guerrero, Anderson, & Afifi, 2011) proposes that individuals gives an impression of being more satisfied within those relationship that contain greater level of prosaically support system and have a tendency to be committed and stable. According to Sacher and Fine (1996), when people experience satisfaction in relationship, commitment is enhanced and people put various and essential assets in their relationship. One such asset is the quantity of time that partners have given to the relationship. In a relationship between two people this lead to the excellence of communication.

The importance of communication within a relationship can be understood by the notion that there is no relationship without communication (Guerrero, Anderson, & Afifi, 2011). Thus, communication is also an essential indicator in deciding relationship satisfaction. Through relational security, satisfaction in relationships can be measured. Generally individuals do not like insecurity, and greater amount of insecurity causes disappointment in relationships. Therefore, security in relationships appeared to be valuable and lead to enhanced satisfaction in relationships. Relational security can be recognized through an individual role, and being satisfied in that role has significant positive impact on satisfaction. According to Simpson et al. (1992) in

determining people's behavior with their loved ones, attachment style has specific significant in love relationships.

Different love attitudes also predict relationship satisfaction in many different ways. Richardson et al. (1998) analyzed the association of relationship satisfaction with Lee's six love attitudes. They found that eros and agape were found to be significantly positively related with relationship satisfaction and mania and ludus were found to be negatively related with it. Pragma and storge were observed to be insignificant to relationship satisfaction. According to researchers (Hendrick et al., 1998; Morrow et al., 1995), previous discoveries showed that love partners are expected to show similarities in their love attitude. Both in males and females agape, eros and ludus are constantly observed to have a significant connection on anticipating relational quality and relational satisfaction.

According to Clark and Grote (2003) high quality relationships are those relations which foster the happiness, security and comfort. High quality relationship involves intimacy and friendship; whereas low quality relationships are portrayed by bitterness, hatred and conflict (Dush & Amato, 2005; Goleman, 2006). Satisfaction, trust, happiness and feelings of security are also included in relationship satisfaction. Clark, Mills, and Powell (1986) also include understanding, care, validation and forgivingness (McCullough, 2000) and expression of feelings (Feeney, 1999). Thus positive emotions and feelings that significantly affect the relationship are included in relationship satisfaction.

### **Relationship Quality**

Relationship quality is element of our daily lives, in spite of the fact it is not a part of our day by day vocabulary and we may not be acquainted with this term. Relationship quality is all about sound relations, how partner get on and how comfortable and cheerful they are being in relationship. As proposed by Sullivan (1953) in interpersonal theory, relationship quality is part of relation that makes it convincing to find individual's relationship quality (Neyer & Lenhart, 2006). In a relationship, relationship quality is referred as measure of relational quality between partners. . It measures how stronger and weaker the relationship is between the two partners.



Hardie and Lucas (2010) indicate that relationship quality is possibly including all objective and subjective measure of relation, and is a vague term. According to Morry, Reich, and Keito (2010) how individuals feel (positively or negatively) about relationship is referred as relationship quality. Relationship quality is assessment of person's relationship, which is contained on relational efforts of devotion and relationship mindfulness. Acitelli (2008) included some different elements in the definition of relationship quality by concluding that that relationship quality involves differences between people in a relationship, concentrating attention on interaction patterns and taking care of relationship as entity.

According to Johnson (1995) and Fincham and Beach (2010) there are shorter arguments around the meaning of relationship quality or the theory supporting it, it is an as often as possible considered part of relationship. More likely due to absence of arguments, different terms such as relational adjustment, relational happiness and relational satisfaction which are not even synonyms are frequently used with relationship quality. People use to take into account these terms as relationship quality because of lack of understanding with an actual term.

Roughly 20% to 25% of the general population is assessed to be in low quality relationships. High risks of negative consequences, for example poor physical and mental health and depression, have been seen in those couples who are in poor quality relationships. High quality relationships are related with constructive results for people and families (Reynolds, 2008). There are two methods that are used in understanding relationship quality. These methods or approaches are as follow:

**Interpersonal approach.** The main focus of this approach is to concentrate on interaction patterns between partners and focus at areas for example; how partners spend their time with each other, how partners communicate and their behaviors that cause conflicts.

**Intrapersonal approach.** Another point of view is that relationship is not about association and behavior within the relations, but it is about how couples rate their satisfaction and pleasure within the relationship. In this way; this approach is more subjective in nature. According to Fincham and Rogge (2010) this includes a subjective assessment of partner's relationship. Relationship quality measure can be

utilized for many other reasons, for example to distinguish partners that may get benefits by help or counseling, to evaluate the results of couple and family interventions and to give knowledge to couples regarding the relationship development program.

Literature reports that quality of one's relationship is a significant indicator of love life satisfaction, happiness and subjective well-being. Positive relationship between life satisfaction (global assessment of quality of life) and satisfaction with love life (global assessment of quality of love life) was demonstrated by Neto and Pinto (2015). Individuals, who commonly express their emotions, are more positive toward life because they experience satisfactory relations. In contrast, individuals who face unsatisfactory relationships usually met with pain and break-ups (Feres-carneiro, 2008). In other words individuals who are satisfied see the other context of their lives positively. Love life satisfaction is very important factor in our lives because it has great impact on predicting positive or negative quality of our relationships. Although it seemed that concept of relationship quality is removed from our lives but it is very important concept because quality of one's relationship influences an individual's other aspects of life such as personal, economic and social well-being.

Research indicates that quality of relationship is influenced by personality traits (Caspi, Roberts, & Shiner, 2005). Study has discovered that neuroticism (negative personality trait) is linked with low level of relationship quality (Karney & Bradbury, 1997). Positive personality traits and positive emotionality are associated with high level of relationship quality and low level of negative relationship outcomes such as abuse and conflict.

Interaction patterns also play an important role in depicting relationship quality. Perceptions of four different interactions were examined by Galliner, Welesh, Roostoky and Kawaguchi (2004). Findings indicated that boyfriend's perception of their own ability to accept influence and their own supportive behavior predicted better relationship quality. In contrast, girlfriend's perception of greater harmony and less conflict showed by their boyfriends were linked with better quality of relationships.



### **Patterns of Change in Relationship Quality**

Relationship quality may change after some time. Researchers (Birditt, Hope, Brown, & Orbuch, 2012, Lavner & Bradbury, 2010, Umberson, Williams, Powers, Chen, & Campbell, 2005) have recognized that relationship quality has diverse directions for various group of people, with a few members starting with considerably large amount of relationship satisfaction than others.

Researchers found that couples that start their relationship with high level of satisfaction, experience no decrease in relationship quality, whereas; couples who start their relationship with low level of satisfaction, experience faster decrease in satisfaction.

### **Relationship Quality and Age**

As well as varying with the length of the relationship as suggested by Umberson et al. (2005), there is consistent decrease in relationship quality interrelated to aging. Age and relationship length may show distinctive processes, inspite of the fact that both are interconnected thus, they affect relationship quality differently. For example people may develop over the period of time, might be mature at dealing with their emotional responses and adapt different ways to deal with their relationship problems.

According to Umberson et al. (2005), partners who have been together as one for long time may wind up sharing less interests and attempting to feel connected. In general development of relationship, relationship quality decrease but the speed varies from relation to relation. A few couples figure out how to maintain high amount of quality in relationship, while other begin with low relationship quality that keep on declining quickly until the point that relationship comes to an end.

However, to improve the probability that couples will experience low level of relationship quality, various factors have been combined that affect relational quality and these factor includes, how partners cope especially during problematic situation, the distressing life events, the experiences and identities that they share with a

relationship. It is seen that relationship quality may be enhanced through relationship support (Karney & Bradbury, 1997).

### **Relationship between Love Attitudes, Relationship Satisfaction, and Relationship Quality**

In psychology, satisfaction is very important and one of the main concepts in a relationship. In achieving satisfaction, love is the most important factor. According to Abdolmaleki (2008) despite of its romantic and sexual aspects, it also includes people's ability for accepting commitment to others. The most common reason of breakup and divorce among partners is lack of love (Risavy, 1995).

Love plays an important role in marriage, stability and satisfaction of a relationship as suggested by Ghomrani (2005). Individuals, who are hitched, adopt different attitudes to express their emotions. A research conducted by Moshak (2010) showed that there is a positive and significant association between satisfaction and love attitudes. Overbeak, Kemp, and Engles, (2007) discovered the same findings.

Inman-Amous, Hendrick, Hendrick, and Clyde, (1994) indicated that high scores in each love attitude showed a positive relation with the same love attitude in partners. It is also suggested by research that relationship satisfaction can be increased by increasing the level of eros love attitude and decreasing the level of ludus love attitude. A study carried out by Fricker and Moore (2002) showed the same findings.

Relationship satisfaction will be positively predicted by agape, eros, pragma and storge. Whereas; mania and ludus will negatively predict relationship satisfaction (Amanelahi et al., 2012). Meta-analysis of different researches also indicated that mania and ludus are negatively related with relationship satisfaction and eros, agape, pragma and storge are positively related with relationship satisfaction.

There is a positive relationship between high level of satisfaction and positive relationship qualities and a negative relationship between low level of satisfaction with negative relationship qualities. Researchers found that couples that start their relationship with a low level of satisfaction, experience a faster decrease in relationship quality whereas; couples who start their relationship with a high level of satisfaction,

experience no decrease in relationship quality. Studies showed that eros, agape and ludus are constantly observed to have significant connection on anticipating relationship quality (Hendrick et al. 1998; Moore & John, 1995).

### **Rationale of the Study**

The rationale of this study is to investigate the love attitudes in relationship and distinguish which attitudes enhance relationship quality and satisfaction in love life. Romantic relationships are predominant part of human experience. In this way, human beings experience different attitudes toward love which definitely have some different impact on relationships (friendships and romantic relationships). According to Rusbult and Buunk (1993) relationship satisfaction is characterized as appreciation for the relationship and relational assessment of positivity of feelings for one's partner. Kelley (1978) indicated that individuals need to limit their expenses and extend their prizes in a relationship. Individuals rationally characterize costs and rewards so they can assess the consequence of their relationship (positive or negative). At the point when result is positive, rewards exceed the costs; despite what might be expected, the result is negative when costs exceed the prizes. Thus, knowing that whether the relationship has a conflicting or constructive result isn't generally enough to satisfy individuals, as individuals frequently have earlier desires of what they expect the relationship must be like.

A few people expect exceptionally rewarding relationships, if they get desired rewards in relationship, they feel satisfied. This desire depends on the individual's past relationship experience and through individual perceptions of other individuals' relationships (Guerrero, Anderson, & Afifi, 2011).

Previous research on the theme of love attitudes or styles, relationship satisfaction and relationship quality has concentrated on different parts that have been appeared to be significant signs of relationship satisfaction. However in this study, it is examined which love attitude enhance relationship satisfaction and relationship quality and how love attitude and relationship satisfaction influence relationship quality. In this study, it is likewise considered that how relationship length or time

those partners spend with each other at each phase of love leads to quality of relationship and satisfaction between two individuals in relationship.

Another reason behind this research is shortage of indigenous researches on six love attitudes. In Pakistan there are lack of published researches on this topic, mostly published researches are about general concept of love and marital relationships. Recent research is conducted on love attitudes, relationship satisfaction and relationship quality to fill the indigenous gap.

Young adults face different difficulties and chances when they get in a situation where they have to develop intimacy with opposite gender (Erickson, 1968). At that stage, it is important to learn about their love attitudes because adapting positive love attitudes will be helpful in enhancing other positive aspects of their lives further.

## METHOD

## Method

### Objectives

This study has been conducted to investigate the following objectives.

1. To investigate the relationship between love attitude (eros, ludus, pragma, storge, mania and agape), relationship quality and relationship satisfaction.
2. To find out the predicting role of love attitude on satisfaction of love life and relationship quality.
3. To examine the relationship of age, socioeconomic status, relationship length and qualification with study variables.

### Hypotheses

Various hypotheses were designed to accomplish the above target objectives in this study. These are under here.

1. Eros, agape, pragma and storge will positively predict relationship satisfaction and relationship quality.
2. Ludus and mania will negatively predict relationship satisfaction and relationship quality.
3. Relationship satisfaction will positively predict positive relationship quality.
4. Relationship satisfaction will negatively predict negative relationship quality.
5. Males will be higher on ludic and eros love attitudes as compared to females.
6. Females will be higher on, agape, storge, pragma and mania love attitudes as compared to males.

### Operational Definitions

**Love attitude.** The intense and deep feeling that grasps and fascinates the individuals in a relationship is titled as love. Love is a feeling that occurs in hierarchical form and can be characterized as combination of different attitudes (Levy

& Devis, 1998). Love attitudes are defined by scores on love attitudes scale; high score on each dimension demonstrate high level of attitude.

**Relationship satisfaction.** Relationship satisfaction is a construct which involves an assessment of the overall relationship between partners. Satisfaction in love relationship is characterized as practical experience (happiness) and subjective behavior (contentment) in the assessment of one's relationship. Satisfaction is a constructive outcome because of the great process of the relations between partners (Hendrick, 1988). High scores on relationship assessment scale show high level of relationship quality.

**Relationship quality.** Relationship quality is a measure of the quality of a connection between partners. Relationship quality is about positive and negative evaluations of relationship by partners during the course of relationship. It measures how solid the relationship and how satisfied the individual is with his or her partner. Relationship quality is combination of two constructs, satisfaction and trust (Fincham & Rogge, 2010). High scores on positive relationship quality scale shows positive quality of relationship whereas high scores on negative relationship quality shows high level of negative qualities of relation.

## **Instruments**

**Love attitude scale.** Hendrick and Hendrick (1986) developed a love scale for a comprehensive study of love and love attitudes among undergraduates' students. The scale was constructed on the base of Lasswell and Lasswell's (1976) past work. Love attitude scale was used to measure different love attitudes. Scale is comprised of 42 items with different subscales (each with 7 items) that measures six different love styles (Eros, Pragma, Ludus, Agape, Storge and Mania). Updated and shortened version of this scale was used in present study which was also developed by Hendrick and Hendrick in (1990) which comprised of 18 items and each subscale of 7 items shrinks to 3 items. Respondents answer each item utilizing 5 point Likert scale ranging from (1=strongly agree to 5= strongly disagree). Item number 4 is reverse coded ranging from (1= Strongly Disagree to 5= strongly agree). Alpha reliability of love attitude scale was found to be .80 and inter reliability of dimensions were found to be .71, .75, .84, .82, .71, and .84 for eros, ludus, storge, pragma, mania and agape.

**Relationship assessment scale.** Relationship assessment scale was developed by Hendrick in 1998. Relationship assessment scale was intended to quantify general relationship satisfaction. It is 7 items scale. Respondents will have to answer utilizing 5 point Likert scale score ranging from (1= low satisfaction, 5= high satisfaction). Item number 4 and 7 are reverse coded with score ranging from (1= high satisfaction, 5= low satisfaction). Alpha reliability of this scale was found .75.

**Positive and negative relationship quality scale.** Positive and negative measure of relationship quality was developed by (Fincham & Rogge, 2010). This scale is consisting of 16 items. Numerous positive and negative qualities are given in this scale. Item number 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8 depicts positive qualities. Item number 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15 and 16 are consisting of negative qualities of relationship. Respondents have to rate their positive relationship qualities while ignoring negative qualities of relationship and then rate negative qualities while ignoring positive ones. Alpha reliability of positive and negative relationship quality scale was found .86.

### **Sample**

A combination of purposive sampling and snow balling technique was used in this study. The sample consists of 115 females and 115 males with age range from 19-25 (early adulthood). Only criterion to participate in this study is to be in love relationship. Data was collected from Quaid-i-Azam University.



**Table 1***Frequency of Multiple Response Demographic Variable (N = 230)*

<i>Characteristics</i>	<i>f</i>	<i>%</i>
<b>Gender</b>		
Male	115	50
Female	115	50
<b>Relationship Length</b>		
6 Months	28	12.2
1 Year	114	49.6
More Than 2 Years	88	38.3
<b>Qualification</b>		
B.S	40	17.4
Masters	183	79.6
M.Phil.	7	3.0

Table 1 illustrates about frequency and percentage of different demographic variables such as age, gender (male and female), socio-economic status (below average, average, and above average), relationship length (6 months, 1 year and more than 2 years) and qualification (B.s, Master and M.phil.).

### **Procedure**

Students of Quaid-i-Azam University were approached with inform consent. Students of different departments were approached individually and were informed about purpose of present study.

Participant's age, gender, socio economic status and relationship length were asked in demographic sheet along with questionnaire used in research and asked to fill accurately. Participants were asked to mark each statement of item and not leave any statement unanswered. Participants were given right to withdraw at any stage of questionnaire administration. Questionnaires were filled in approximately 20 minutes.

## RESULTS

**Chapter III****RESULTS**

The main purpose to conduct this study was to explore the effects of love attitudes on relationship quality and relationship assessment. In this study differences among study variable, correlation and regression was explored. To establish the psychometrics properties of the variables, mean, standard deviation, reliability, range, skewness, and kurtosis were tabulated. Correlation (Pearson product moment) was conducted to find out relationship among study variables (love attitudes, relationship quality and relationship assessment). One-way ANOVA, simple linear regression and independent sample *t*-test was conducted to determine the group differences across, gender and relationship length. Results were conducted by analyzing the different hypotheses.

## RESULTS

Table 2

*Descriptive Statistics and Reliability Coefficients of Study Variables (N = 230)*

Variables	No. of items	$\alpha$	$M$	$SD$	Range		Skew.	Kurt.
					Actual	Potential		
LAS	18	.76	46.3	8.56	20-75	18-90	.34	.91
Eros	3	.78	6.62	2.66	3-15	3-15	1.03	1.10
Ludus	3	.62	9.08	2.60	3-15	3-15	-0.93	-.29
Storge	3	.88	7.06	2.68	3-15	3-15	.39	-.029
Pragma	3	.86	9.61	2.86	3-15	3-15	.26	-.37
Mania	3	.37	7.53	2.08	3-13	3-15	.20	-.21
Agape	3	.64	6.48	2.23	3-15	3-15	.36	.49
RSS	7	.75	25.1	4.23	14-35	7-35	-.08	-.20
PRQS	8	.92	37.0	8.00	9-48	8-48	-1.39	1.64
NRQS	8	.94	14.4	7.40	8-40	8-48	1.32	1.24

*Note.* LAS = Love Attitude Scale, RSS = Relationship Satisfaction Scale, PRQS = Positive Relationship Quality Scale, NRQS = Negative Relationship Quality Scale

Table 2 illustrates descriptive statistics, skewness and kurtosis for love attitudes its subscales, relationship assessment scale and relationship quality scale. Alpha coefficients are indicated by reliability analysis. Reliability analysis shows that coefficients of all scale are high. Eros, storge, pragma are subscales of love attitude scale and above .70 which is acceptable reliability. Reliability of relationship satisfaction scale is also above .70. Positive relationship quality and negative relationship quality subscales are highly reliable with reliability above .90. The means, standard deviations, actual range and potential range were also given in this recent study. Actual range show possible high and low score on each scale and potential range show low and high score obtain in this recent study. Skewness and kurtosis values show the normality of obtained data.



**Table 3**

*Correlation among Love Attitudes, Relationship Assessment and Relationship Quality (N = 230)*

Variables	Eros	Ludus	Storge	Pragma	Mania	Agape	RS	PRQ	NRQ
Eros	-	.35**	.35**	.12	.21**	-.31**	-.31**	-.31**	.42**
Ludus		-	.05	.070	.06	.08	-.10	-.19**	.17**
Storge			-	.47**	.19**	.07	-.3**	-.38**	.31**
Pragma				-	.15*	-.13*	.03	-.02	-.061
Mania					-	.37**	-.11	-.07	.13*
Agape						-	-.31**	-.12	.10
RSS							-	.67**	-.60**
PRQS								-	-.68**
NRQS									-

*Note.* RSS = Relationship Satisfaction Scale, PRQS = Positive Relationship Quality Scale, NRQS = Negative Relationship Quality Scale, \* $p < .05$  and \*\* $p < .01$

Table 3 displays correlation for subscales of love attitudes, relationship assessment and relationship quality. Eros, storge, and agape are negatively correlated with relationship assessment and positive relationship quality. The association between pragma and agape are also found to be negative. Ludus and mania are also found to be negatively correlated with relationship quality and relationship satisfaction. There is positive significant relationship between positive relationship qualities and negative significant relationship between negative relationship qualities.

**Table 4**

*Gender Differences on Love Attitudes, Satisfaction of love Life and Relationship Quality and their Subscales (N = 230)*

Variables	Male (n = 115)		Female (n = 115)		t	p	95% CI		Cohen's d
	M	SD	M	SD			LL	UL	
Eros	7.34	2.83	5.89	2.27	4.28	.00	.78	2.11	0.56
Ludus	10.3	2.37	7.81	2.18	8.40	.00	1.93	3.12	0.94
Storge	7.01	2.91	7.10	2.44	-.245	.80	-.78	.61	-
Pragma	9.34	2.85	9.87	2.85	-1.40	.16	-1.27	.21	-
Mania	7.50	2.33	7.55	1.82	-.189	.85	-.59	.49	-
Agape	6.66	6.34	6.29	2.11	1.26	.20	-.20	.95	-
RSS	23.86	4.01	26.4	4.05	-4.87	.00	-3.63	-1.54	0.63
PRQS	33.78	8.96	40.3	5.14	-6.80	.00	-8.45	-4.65	0.89
NRQS	15.87	7.45	13.0	7.09	2.99	.003	.98	4.76	0.35

*Note.* RSS = Relationship Satisfaction Scale, PRQS = Positive Relationship Quality Scale, NRQS = Negative Relationship Quality Scale \* $p < .05$  and  $.01$

Table 4 illustrates the  $t$ -value, lower and upper limit,  $p$  value, means and standard deviation of sample. Table 4 also indicates the difference between males and females scores obtained on different scales and subscales. Female's score are high on storge, pragma and mania whereas male's scores are high on ludus eros and agape. Other than this, females scored high on relationship satisfaction as compared to males. Females also scored high on positive relationship quality as compared to males. Males are high on evaluation of negative relationship quality. Results are significant at  $p < .05$  and  $.01$ .

**Table 5**

*Simple Linear Regression Analysis Predicting Relationship Satisfaction through Love Attitudes (N = 230)*

Predictors	B	$\beta$	S.E	95% CI	
				LL	UL
Constant	30.70	-	1.43	27.97	33.62
Eros	-.21	-.13*	.10	-.42	-.009
Ludus	-.046	-.028*	0.99	-.24	.14
Storge	-.67	-.42*	.10	-.88	-.46
Pragma	.32	.22*	.098	.13	.52
Mania	.10	.051*	.12	-.14	.35
Agape	-.45	-.24*	.12	-.69	-.21
R <sup>2</sup>	.28				
$\Delta R^2$	.27				
F	15.14*				

Note. CI = Confidence Interval, \* $p < .05$

In the table 5 simple linear regressions was used with Love Attitudes as predictor variable and Relationship Satisfaction as outcome. Regression analysis shows that 28% of variance in outcome variable can be accounted to love attitudes ( $F = 15.14, p = < .05$ ). It is found that relationship satisfaction is negatively predicted by eros, agape, ludus and storge and positively predicted by pragma and mania.



**Table 6**

*Simple Linear Regression Analysis Predicting Positive Relationship Quality through Love Attitudes (N = 230)*

Predictors	B	$\beta$	S.E	95% CI	
				LL	UL
Constant	47.25	-	2.74	41.85	52.66
Eros	-.84	-.28*	.20	-1.23	-.44
Ludus	-.28	-.092*	.18	-.65	.090
Storge	-1.1	-.37*	.20	-1.53	-.72
Pragma	.52	.18*	.18	.15	.89
Mania	.13	.036*	.24	-.34	.61
Agape	-.031	-.009*	.23	-.48	.42
R <sup>2</sup>	.27				
$\Delta R^2$	.25				
F	14.07*				

*Note.* CI = Confidence Interval, LL = Lower Limit, UL = Upper Limit, \* $p < .05$

In the table 6 simple regression analyses was used with love Attitudes as predictor variable and positive relationship quality as outcome variable. Results show that 27% of variance in outcome variable can be accounted to love attitudes ( $F = 14.07$ ,  $p = < .05$ ). It is also found in results that positive relationship quality was negatively predicted by eros, ludus, storge and agape and positively predicted by pragma and mania.

**Table 7**

*Simple Linear Regression Analysis Predicting Negative Relationship Quality through Love Attitudes (N = 230)*

Predictors	B	$\beta$	S.E	95% CI	
				LL	UL
Constant	6.95	-	2.54	1.94	11.96
Eros	.88	.31*	.18	.51	1.25
Ludus	.19	.069*	.17	-.14	.54
Storge	.90	.32*	.19	.52	1.28
Pragma	-.73	-.28*	.17	-1.07	-.38
Mania	.25	0.72*	.22	-.18	.70
Agape	-.22	-.067*	.21	-.64	.20
R <sup>2</sup>	.27				
$\Delta R^2$	.25				
F	13.80*				

Note. CI = Confidence Interval, \* $p < .05$

Table 7 shows linear regression analysis used with Love Attitudes as predictor variable and Negative Relationship Quality as outcome. Results shows that 27% variance in outcome variable can be accounted to love attitudes ( $F=13.80, p = < .05$ ). Results also show that agape and pragma negatively predicted negative relationship quality and eros, ludus, storge and mania positively predict negative relationship quality.

**Table 8**

*Simple Linear Regression Analysis Predicting Positive Relationship Quality through Relationship Satisfaction (N = 230)*

Predictor	B	$\beta$	R <sup>2</sup>	$\Delta R^2$	F	S.E
Constant	4.80	-	.46	.45	193.87*	2.34
RSS	1.28	.67*	-	-	-	.092

*Note.* \* $p < .05$ . RSS = Relationship Satisfaction Scale

Table 8 shows simple linear regression with Relationship Satisfaction as predictor variable and Positive Relationship Quality as outcome variable. Results show that 46% of the variance in outcome variable can be accounted to Relationship Satisfaction ( $F = 193.87, p = <.05$ ). Results also show that Relationship Satisfaction ( $\beta = .67, p < .05$ ) positively predicted Positive Relationship Quality.

**Table 9**

*Simple Linear Regression Analysis Predicting Negative Relationship Quality through Relationship Satisfaction (N = 230)*

Predictor	B	$\beta$	R <sup>2</sup>	$\Delta R^2$	F	S.E
Constant	41.11	-	.36	.36	132.25*	2.35
RSS	-1.06	-.60*	-	-	-	.092

*Note.* . \* $p < .05$ . RSS = Relationship Satisfaction Scale

Table 9 shows simple linear regression with Relationship Satisfaction as predictor variable and Negative Relationship Quality as outcome variable. Results show that 36% of the variance in outcome variable can be accounted to Relationship Satisfaction ( $F = 132.25$ ,  $p = <.05$ ). Results also show that Relationship Satisfaction ( $\beta = -.60$ ,  $p = <.05$ ) negatively predicted Negative Relationship Quality.

**Table 10***One- way ANOVA on Relationship Length along with Study Variables (N =230)*

Variable	Group 1 6 Months (n = 28)		Group 2 1 Year (n = 114)		Group 3 More than 2 Year (n = 88)		F	p	i-j	D(i-j)	95% CI	
											LL	UL
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD						
Eros	6.78	2.14	6.65	2.88	6.52	2.53	.123	.884	-	-	-	-
Ludus	8.35	2.31	9.35	2.77	8.96	2.44	1.78	.169	-	-	-	-
Storge	6.39	1.57	7.43	2.80	6.78	2.75	2.49	.085	-	-	-	-
Pragma	7.75	2.67	9.93	2.53	9.78	3.12	7.19	.001	2>1 3>2	2.18 2.03	.770 .575	3.60 3.49
Mania	6.82	2.03	7.81	2.27	7.38	1.78	2.93	.055	-	-	-	-
Agape	6.60	2.51	6.16	2.17	6.85	2.19	2.40	.092	-	-	-	-
RSS	23.32	4.51	25.21	3.84	25.65	4.49	3.33	.037	3>1	2.33	.146	4.52
PRQS	34.39	7.54	36.97	8.96	38.02	6.57	2.23	.111	-	-	-	-
NRQS	15.60	5.88	14.39	8.28	14.12	6.62	.428	.653	-	-	-	-

*Note.* RSS = Relationship Satisfaction Scale, PRQS = Positive Relationship Quality Scale, NRQS = Negative Relationship Quality Scale

Table 10 represents mean differences among relationship length. Significant means differences were found in one year of relationship length, on subscales of ludus, storge, pragma and mania. Significant means differences were found on relationship satisfaction by more than 2 years of relationship. Slightly mean difference were found on positive negative relationship quality by group 3. Results also show mean differences on negative relationship quality by group 1.

## **DISCUSSION**



## DISCUSSION

The present study was conducted to study the relationship among different variable such as love attitudes, relationship satisfaction and relationship quality, that how different love attitudes affect relationship satisfaction and quality and how relationship satisfaction is related with relationship quality. Purposive sampling technique was used in this study to achieve target objectives. The respondents were 230 students of Quaid i Azam University. Instruments that were used in this study was Love Attitude Scale (Hendrick & Hendrick, 1990), Relationship Assessment Scale (Hendrick, 1998) and Positive Relationship Quality and Negative Relationship Quality Scale (Fincham & Rogge, 2010).

Results were analyzed to find out relationship among different study variables. Results showed that eros is negatively correlated with both relationship satisfaction and positive relationship quality but positively correlated with negative relationship quality. Ludus is negatively related with relationship satisfaction and positive relationship quality but positively related with negative relationship quality. Previous findings (Hendrick et al., 1998; Morrow et al., 1995) showed same pattern of ludus attitude. Storge is negatively related with both relationship satisfaction and positive relationship quality but positively related with negative relationship quality. Storge has no direct link with relationship satisfaction as it is suggested by (Jonason & Tost, 2010). Pragma was found positively correlated with relationship satisfaction but negatively correlated with positive relationship quality and negative relationship quality respectively. Mania was found negatively related with relationship satisfaction and positive relationship quality but positively related with negative relationship quality. Previous findings (Meeks et al., 1998; Morrow et al., 1995) are supported over here. Agape showed same patterns as eros showed.

Regression analysis was conducted to find out prediction. It has been assumed that eros, agape, pragma and storge will positively predict relationship satisfaction and relationship quality. Results showed that eros, ludus, storge and agape were negative predictor of relationship satisfaction and positive relationship quality. Pragma and mania were found positive predictor of relationship satisfaction and

positive relationship quality. Pragma and agape negatively predict negative relationship quality whereas; eros, ludus, storge and mania positively predict negative relationship quality.

In our society people have different attitudes in love. Eros love attitude consist of romance, physical attraction and fascination. In contrary to previous research (Hendrick et al., 1988) eros is negatively predicting relationship satisfaction and relationship quality in current research. One possible reason may be that eros had been measured in terms of partner's physical attraction. The term 'physical chemistry' is taken as sexual relationship with partner and individuals did not express their right responses because of misunderstanding, while being satisfied with their relationship.

Storge is based on friendship love; lack of romantic bonding which has no direct link with satisfaction and quality of relationship because in friendships, individuals have different partners to be committed and it is hard to be deeply committed with one individual, maintaining boundaries of friendship. Storge relationship can be ended easily at any stage of relationship. Some previous findings showed the same pattern that storge was not directly linked with relationship satisfaction (Jonason & Tost, 2010). Pragma is a kind of practical love and start with sharing common goals among partners. Pragma is positive predictor of relationship satisfaction and positive relationship quality. Previous studies showed same results (Amanelahi, 2012). Agape is sacrificial love, letting go their own desires for the sake of partner. In contrast to previous research (Risavy, 1995) agape love attitude negatively predicts relationship satisfaction and relationship quality in this present study. One possible reason might be that other partner has no sense of duty regarding relationship. In university life relationships, people are not as sacrificing as they should be in their relationship. They do not consider university life relationship long terms and show low level of commitment which leads to negative evaluation of relationship. As it is said by Lee (1973) that agape love attitude cannot be found in every individual. Thus, previous studies partially support our assumption.

It was assumed that mania and ludus love attitudes will have negative impact on relationship satisfaction and relationship quality. Results showed that ludus is negative predictor of relationship satisfaction and positive relationship quality but

positively predicts negative qualities of relationship. Ludus is based on game playing with love partners; due to ditch gaming with partner individual himself/herself feel insecurity of getting that responses in return which prompts low level of relational satisfaction and quality. Variety of many partners outside the relationship also gives rise to low satisfaction and poor quality. Literature supports these findings. According to reseachers (Aron & Westbay, 1996; Fricker & Moore, 2002; Hendrick & Hendrick, 1987; Hendrick et al. 1988; Morrow et al. 1995; Richardson et al. 1988; Woll, 1989) ludic love attitude negatively predict relationship satisfaction and quality. Meeks, Hendrick, & Hendrick (1998) also reported that in both genders relationship satisfaction is negatively predicted by ludus. Mania was found positive predictor of relationship satisfaction and quality in recent study. Previous findings had conflicting results of mania and it was not considered by researchers in many previous studies (Frazier & Esterly, 1990; Hendrick & Hendrick, 2006) thus, those researchers' discoveries support our assumption.

Relationship satisfaction plays an important role in relationships, and affects relationship quality. Another assumption was relationship satisfaction will positive predict positive relationship quality and negatively predict negative relationship quality. Results indicating that relationship satisfaction positively predicted positive relationship quality and negatively predicted negative relationship quality. Research literature support this assumption (Lavner & Bradbury, 2010, Birditt et al, 2012, Umberson et al., 2005).

There are many differences in males and females, holding different love attitudes. To analyze the difference between males and females attitude, *t*- test was conducted. It has been assumed that males show high scores on eros and ludic love attitudes. Results showed males are significantly high on holding ludic and erotic love styles as compared to females who scored low than males. Findings by (Davies, 2001; Frazier & Esterly; 1990, Morrow et al. 1995, Richardson et al. 1998) indicated that males will high on game playing attitudes as compared to females and thus support this assumption clearly. This assumption is also supported by discoveries (Hendrick & Hendrick, 1986, 2006).

Females are more friendship oriented and tendency to have a practical approach to life. Due to which it was assumed that females will hold pragmatic, storgic, manic and agape love attitudes. Results showed that no significant differences were seen among females and males on storge, pragma, mania and agape love attitudes. Results indicate that with minor differences females were high on storge, pragma and mania love attitudes and males were high on agape love attitudes with same minor difference. Researchers (Davies, 2001; Frazier & Esterly, 1990; Hendrick & Hendrick, 2006; Morrow et al. 1995, Richardson et al. 1998) studies supports this assumption that female will reliably score high on pragma, storge, and mania, and they have found insignificant gender difference in their studies regarded eros and agape. Perez et al. 2009 study indicated that males from all ages were prone to adopt eros and agape love attitudes. In this way it also supports our results. In our society, males' most dominant role is as bread-earner. Females are dependent upon males, in this way males are more sacrificial than females.

Relationship length may also affect love attitudes, satisfaction and quality of relationship. Mean differences of couples who spend more than two years with their partner found more satisfied and with high quality relationship. They also scored high on agape love attitudes and low on rest of other variables. Couples who spend one year with each other have scored low on relationship quality and satisfaction. Moreover, they scored high on eros, ludus, storge, pragma, and mania. Thus, the time couples spend with each other plays an important role in evaluation of one's relationship. In contrast of previous studies, Acker and Davis (1992) findings showed that partners in shorter relationships showed great intimacy and passion than longer ones. However, it is said by Sternberg (1988) that responsibilities and commitment is greater for hitches partners regardless of taking relationship length as estimation.

### **Implication**

In this study, different love attitudes have positive and negative association, through which positive and negative satisfaction of relationship can be measured. Relationship satisfaction further impact on relationship quality through which, a relationship can be evaluated as positive or negative. Through love attitudes, attachment security level and childhood attachment style can be highlighted and

understood, because these attitudes (love attitudes) are influenced by childhood child raising practices. Early adulthood emotional needs can also be satisfied by understanding different love attitudes. Level of security, commitment and stability in daily life relations (love relations and friendship) are influenced by love attitudes that individual hold, so pattern of their behavior can be justified.

### **Limitations and Suggestion**

The present study has some sort of suggestions and limitations as well. The present study was based on quantitative approach; however qualitative approach can also be used for the purpose of in-depth study. In present study, self-report measures were used, which may increase biasness in responding.

In future researches, comparison of love partners and married couples can be generated because in our society, many couples generally do not talk about their love and do not show correct responses. Many other demographics (social economic status, number of relationship, number of partners) were not the part of study because this study was carried out in limited time. These demographic variables can be used in future researches. In future study we can study different love attitudes through minimizing and maximizing the number of partner. Moreover, the study can be conducted on those couples who spend two or more than two years with same partner in order to attain valid perception of their love attitude toward their partner. Longitudinal study can be conducted in order to study the evolution of love attitudes.

### **Conclusion**

The current study revealed the love attitudes on relationship satisfaction and relationship quality. Survey method was used in study. The results conclude that eros is negatively correlated with both relationship satisfaction and positive relationship quality. Ludus is negatively related with relationship satisfaction and positive relationship quality. Storge is negatively related with both relationship satisfaction and positive relationship quality but positively related with negative relationship quality. Pragma was found positively correlated with relationship satisfaction but negatively correlated with positive relationship and negative relationship quality. Mania was found negatively related with relationship satisfaction and positive relationship quality but positively related with negative relationship quality.

relationship quality. Results showed that eros, ludus, storge and agape were negative predictor of relationship satisfaction and positive relationship quality. Pragma and mania were found positive predictor of relationship satisfaction and positive relationship quality. Pragma and agape negatively predict negative relationship quality whereas; eros, ludus, storge and mania positively predict negative relationship quality. Relationship satisfaction positively predicts positive relationship quality and negatively predicts negative relationship quality. Females are high on storge, pragma and mania attitudes. Males are high on eros, agape and ludus attitude. The present study has theoretical and practical implications.

## REFERENCES



## References

- Abdolmaleki, S. (2008). Disasters of broken love. *Mental Health Journal*, 26, 468-473.
- Acitelli, L. K. (1992). Gender differences in relationship awareness and marital satisfaction among young married couples. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 18(1), 102-110.
- Acitelli, L.A. (2008). Knowing when to shut up: Do relationship reflections help or hurt relationship satisfaction? In J.P. Forgas & J. Fitness (Eds.), *Social relationships: cognitive, affective, and motivational processes* (pp. 115–129). New York: Taylor and Francis Group.
- Acker, M., & Davis, M. H. (1992). Intimacy, passion and commitment in adult romantic relationships: A test of the triangular theory of love. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 9(1), 21-50.
- Ainsworth, M. D., Blehar, M. C., Waters, E., & Wall, S. (1978). *Patterns of attachment: A psychological study of the strange situation*. Oxford, UK: Erlbaum.
- Amanehlahi, Abbas., Aslani, Khaled., Tashakor, Hajar., Ghavabesh, Soad., Nekoie Somayeh.(2012). *The Relationship Between Romantic Attachment Style and Love with Marital Satisfaction*. *Woman's Social and Cognitive Journal*. 10(32), 67- 86.
- Aron, A., & Westbay, L. (1996). Dimensions of the prototype of love. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 70(3), 535-551.
- Arnett, J. J. (2000). Emerging adulthood: A theory of development from the late teens through the twenties. *American Psychologist*, 55(5), 469-480.
- Arnett, J. J. (2003). Conceptions of the transition to adulthood among emerging adults in American ethnic groups. In J. J. Arnett & N. L. Galambos (Eds.), *New directions in child and adolescent development: Exploring cultural*

- conceptions of the transition to adulthood* (Vol. 100, pp. 63–75). San Francisco: Wiley.
- Arnett, J. J. (2004). *Emerging adulthood: The winding road from the late teens through the twenties*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Asendorpf, J. B., Banse, R., & Mücke, D. (2002). Double dissociation between implicit and explicit personality self-concept: The case of shy behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 83(2), 380-388.
- Birditt, K., Hope, S., Brown, E. & Orbuch T., (2012). Developmental trajectories of marital happiness over 16 Years. *Research in Human Development*, 9(2), 126–144.
- Bowlby, J. (1982). *Attachment and loss*: New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Bowlby, J. (1988). *A secure base: Parent-child attachment and healthy human development*, New York: Basic Books.
- Brennan, K. A., Clark, C. L., & Shaver, P. R. (1998). Self-report measurement of adult attachment: An integrative overview. In J. A. Simpson & W. S. Rholes (Eds.), *Attachment theory and close relationships*, (pp. 46-76), New York: Guilford Press.
- Brassard, A., Dupuy, E., Bergeron, S., & Shaver, P. R. (2015). Attachment insecurities and women's sexual function and satisfaction: The mediating roles of sexual self-esteem, sexual anxiety, and sexual assertiveness. *The Journal of Sex Research*, 52(1), 110-119.
- Butler, R., Walker, R. W., Skowronski, J. J., & Shannon, L. (1995). Age and responses to the Love Attitude Scale: Consistency in structure, differences in scores. *International Journal of Aging and Human Development*, 40(4), 281-296.
- Butzer, B., & Campbell, L. (2008). Adult attachment, sexual satisfaction, and relationship satisfaction: A Study of married couples. *Personal Relationships*,

15(1), 141-154.

- Campbell, W. K., Foster, C. A., & Finkel, E. J. (2002). Does self-love lead to love for others? A story of narcissistic game playing. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 83(2), 340-354.
- Carbery, J., & Buhrmester, D. (1998). Friendship and need fulfillment during three phases of young adulthood. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 15(3), 393-409.
- Caspi, A., Roberts, B. W., & Shiner, R. L. (2005). Personality development: *Stability and Change*. *Psychology*, 56, 453-484.
- Clark, M. S., Mills, J., & Powell, M. C. (1986). Keeping track of needs in communal and exchange relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 51(2), 333-350.
- Clark, M. S., & Grote I. (2003). Understanding people's perceptions of relationships is crucial to understanding their emotional lives. *Blackwell Handbook of Social Psychology: Interpersonal Processes*, 7, 250-278.
- Collins, J., Cohen, P., West, S. G., & Aiken, L. S. (2003). *Applied multiple correlation/regression analysis for the behavioral sciences*. UK: Taylor & Francis.
- Collins, W. A., & Laursen, B. (2004). Changing relationships, changing youth: Interpersonal contexts of adolescent development. *The Journal of Early Adolescence*, 24(1), 55-62.
- Collins, K. A., Cramer, K. M., & Singleton-Jackson, J. A. (2005). Love Styles and Self-Silencing in Romantic Relationships. *Guidance & counseling*, 139-146.
- Creasey, G., & Ladd, A. (2004). Negative mood regulation expectancies and conflict behaviors in late adolescent college student romantic relationships: The moderating role of generalized attachment representations. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, 14(2), 235-255.

- Davies, M. F. (2001). Socially desirable responding and impression management in the endorsement of love styles. *Journal of Psychology, 135*, 562–570.
- Davis, D., Shaver, P. R., Widaman, K. F., Vernon, M. L., Follette, W. C., & Beitz, K. (2006). “I can’t get satisfaction”: Insecure attachment, inhibited sexual communication, and sexual dissatisfaction. *Personal Relationships, 13*, 465–483.
- Demir, M., & Weitekamp, L. A. (2006). I am so happy cause today I found my friend, Friendship and personality as predictors of happiness. *Journal of Happiness Studies, 8*(2), 181–211.
- Demir, M. (2008). Sweetheart, you really make me happy: Romantic relationship quality and personality as predictors of happiness among emerging adults. *Journal of Happiness Studies, 9*(2), 257–277.
- Diener, E., Lucas, R. E. (2006). Beyond the hedonic treadmill: revising the adaptation theory of well-being. *American Psychologist, 61*, 305–310.
- Dush, C. M. K., & Amato, P. R. (2005). Consequences of relationship status and quality for subjective well-being. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 22*(5), 607–627.
- Dyk, P. H., & Adams, G. R. (1990). Identity and intimacy: An initial investigation of three theoretical models using cross-lag panel correlations. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 19*, 91–110.
- Edelstein, R. S., Alexander, K. W., Shaver, P. R., Schaaf, J. M., Quas, J. A., Lovas, G. S., & Goodman, G. S. (2004). Adult attachment style and parental responsiveness during a stressful event. *Attachment & Human Development, 6*, 31–52.
- Erikson, E. H. (1968). *Identity: Youth and crisis*. New York: Norton.
- Erikson, E. H. (1982). *The life cycle completed: A review*. New York: Norton.
- Esterly, E. (1990). Correlates of relationship beliefs: Gender, relationship experience

- and relationship satisfaction. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 7(3), 331-352.
- Feeney, J. A. (1999). Adult Attachment, emotional control and marital satisfaction. *Personal Relationships*, 169-185.
- Féres-Carneiro, T. (2008). Sobre a família: com a palavra, a comunidade. *Estudos e Pesquisas Em Psicologia*, 8(2), 223-235.
- Fincham, F. & Beach, S., (2010). Marriage in the new millennium: A decade in review. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 72, 630-649.
- Fincham, F. & Rogge, R., (2010). Understanding relationship quality: Theoretical challenges and new tools for assessment. *Journal of Family Theory and Review*, 2, 227- 242.
- Fincham, F. D. (Eds.). (2013). *Cognition in close relationships*. Psychology Press.
- Fraley, R. C., & Davis, K. E. (1997). Attachment formation and transfer in young adults' close friendships and romantic relationships. *Personal relationships*, 131- 144.
- Frazier, P. A., & Esterly, E. (1990). Correlates of relationship beliefs: Gender, relationship experience, and relationship satisfaction. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 7, 331-352.
- Fricke, J., & Moore, S. (2002). Relationship satisfaction: The role of love styles and attachment styles. *Current research in social psychology*, 7(11). Retrieved from <http://www.uiowa.edu/~grpproc/crisp/crisp.7.11.htm>.
- Furman, W., & Buhrmester, D. (1992). Age and sex differences in perceptions of networks of personal relationships. *Child Development*, 63(1), 103-115.
- Gao, G. (2001). Intimacy, passion, and commitment in Chinese and US American Romantic relationships. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 25(3), 329-342.

- Gallagher, R.V., Welsh, D.P., Rostosky, S.S., & Kawaguchi, M.C. (2004). Interaction and relationship quality in late adolescent romantic couples. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 21*(2), 203–216.
- G. A. (2005) Study the romantic relationship of Iranian couples and its relationship with marital satisfaction (Unpublished M.s. thesis). Shahed University.
- Ginsberg, D., & Gottman, J. M. (1986). Conversations of college roommates: Similarities and differences in male and female friendship. In J. M. Gottman & J.C.Parker (Eds), *Conversation of friendship* (pp. 241-291). Cambridge. M. A: University Press.
- Goleman, D. (2006). The socially intelligent. *Educational leadership, 64*(1), 76-81.
- Guerrero, L. K., Andersen, P. A., & Afifi, W. A. (2011). Communicating closeness: affection, immediacy, and Social Support. *Close Encounters Communication in Relationships, 125- 150*.
- Havighurst, R. J. (1948). Developmental tasks and education. *The Scientific Monthly, 301-316*.
- Hatfield, E. (1988). Passionate and companionate love. Hendricks, J. J., Hendrick, R. L., Wilson, C. A., Mitchell, R. J., Pecot, S. D., & Guo, D. (2006). Assessing the patterns and controls of fine root dynamics: an empirical test and methodological review. *Journal of Ecology, 94*(1), 40-57.
- Hardie, J.H., & Lucas, A. (2010). Economic factors and relationship quality among young couples: Comparing cohabitation and marriage. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 72*, 1141–1154.
- Hendrick, C., & Hendrick, S. (1986). A theory and method of love. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 50*(2), 392-402.
- Hendrick, S. S., & Hendrick, C. (1987). Love and sexual attitudes, self-disclosure, and sensation seeking. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 4*, 281– 297.
- Hendrick, S. S. (1998). A generic measure of relationship satisfaction. *Journal of*

*Marriage and the Family*, 6(1), 93-98.

Hendrick, S. S., Hendrick, C., & Adler, N. L. (1988). Romantic relationships: Love, satisfaction, and staying together. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 54(6), 980-988.

Hendrick, S., & Hendrick, C. (1990). *Liking, loving and relating*. Brooks/Cole Pub.

Hendrick, C., & Hendrick, S. S (1997). Love and Satisfaction. In R.J. Sternberg & M. Hajjat (Eds.), *Satisfaction in close relationships* (pp.55-78), New York: Guilford Press.

Hendrick, C. & Hendrick, S. S (2006). Styles of Romantic Love. In R. J. Sternberg & K. Weis (Eds.), *The new psychology of love* (pp.149-170). New Haven: Yale University Press.

Hinde, R. A., Tamplin, A., & Barrett, J. (1993). A comparative study of relationship structure. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 32(3), 191-207.

Honeycutt, J. M. (1986). A model of marital functioning based on an attraction paradigm and social-penetration dimensions. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 48, 651-659.

Inman-Amos, Jill. Hendrick, Susan S. henderick, Clyde. (1994). Love attitudes, similarities between parents and children, *Journal of Family Relation*, 43(4), 456-461.

Jonason, P. K., & Tost, J. (2010). I just cannot control myself: The Dark Triad and self-control. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 49(6), 611-615.

Jones, E.E. (1986). Self and interpersonal evaluations: Esteem theories versus consistency theories. *Psychological Bulletin*, 185-199.

Johnson, D., (1995). Assessing marital quality in longitudinal and life course studies. In J. Close Conoley & E. Buterick (Eds.) *Family Assessment Institute of Mental Measurements*, University of Nebraska-Lincoln.





- Karney, B. R., & Bradbury, T. N. (1997). Neuroticism, marital interaction, and the trajectory of marital satisfaction. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 72(5), 1075.
- Kelley, H. (1978). *Interpersonal relations: A Theory of Interdependence*. New York: Wiley-Interscience.
- Kobak, R., & Duemmler, S. (1994). Attachment process in adulthood. In K. Bartholomew, & D. Perlman (Eds). *Attachment and conversation: Toward a discourse analysis of adolescent and adult security*. (pp.121-149). London: Kingsley.
- Laursen, B., & Bukowski, W. M. (1997). A developmental guide to the organization of close relationships. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 21(4), 747-770.
- Lavner, J. & Bradbury, T., 2010. Patterns of change in marital satisfaction over the newlywed years. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 72(5), 1171–1187.
- Lee, J. A. (1973). *Colours of love: An exploration of the ways of loving*. New Press.
- Lefkowitz, E. S., Boone, T. L., & Shearer, C. L. (2004). Communication with best Friends about sex-related topics during emerging adulthood. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 33, 339–351.
- Levy, M. B., & Davis, K. E. (1998). Lovestyles and attachment styles compared: Their relations to each other and to various relationship characteristics. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 5(4), 439-471.
- Locke, H. J., & Wallace, K. M. (1959). Short marital-adjustment and prediction tests: Their reliability and validity. *Marriage and Family Living*, 21(3), 251-255.
- Masten, A. S., Burt, K. B., Roisman, G. I., Obradović, J., Long, J. D., & Tellegen, A.(2004). Resources and resilience in the transition to adulthood: Continuity and change. *Development and Psychopathology*, 1071-1094.
- Markstrom, C. A., & Kalmanir, H. M. (2001). Linkages between the psychosocial

- stages of identity and intimacy and the ego strengths of fidelity and love. *Identity, An International Journal of Theory and Research*, 1, 179–196.
- Matula, K. E., Huston, T. L., Grotevant, H. D., & Zamutt, A. (1992). Identity and dating commitment among women and men in college. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 21, 339–356.
- McCullough, M. E. (2000). Forgiveness as human strength: Theory, measurement, and links to well-being. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 19(1), 43–55.
- Meeks, B. S., Hendrick, S. S., & Hendrick, C. (1998). Communication, love and Relationship satisfaction. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 15(6), 755–773.
- Moore, John C. (1979). Courtly Love: A Problem of Terminology. *Journal of the History of Ideas*. 40: 621–632.
- Monck, E. (1991). Patterns of confiding relationships among adolescent girls. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 32(2), 333–345.
- Montgomery, M. J. (2005). Psychosocial intimacy and identity: From early adolescence to emerging adulthood. *Journal of Adolescent Research*, 20, 346–374.
- Morry, M.N., Reich, T., & Kito, M. (2010). How do I see you relative to myself? Relationship quality as a predictor of self and partner-enhancement within cross-sex friendships, dating relationships, and marriages. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 150(4), 369–392.
- Morrow, G. D., Clark, E. M., & Brock, K. F. (1995). Individual and partner love styles: Implications for the quality of romantic involvements. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 12(3), 363–387.
- Moshak, roya.(2010). The relationship between sexual self-esteem and love attitudes with marital satisfaction in women of Tehran. *Middle-East Journal of Scientific Research*, 21(3), 502–508.

- Neto, F. (2007). Love styles: A cross-cultural study of British, Indian, and Portuguese college students. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies*, 239-254.
- Neto, F., & da Conceição Pinto, M. (2015). Satisfaction with love life across the adult life span. *Applied Research in Quality of Life*, 10(2), 289-304.
- Neyer, F.J., & Lehnart, J. (2006). Personality, relationships, and health: A dynamic-transactional perspective. In M.E. Volrath (Eds.), *Handbook of personality and health* (pp.195-214). Sussex, UK : John Wiley & Sons.
- Overbeak, B., Kemp, B., & Engels, G. (2007). Two personalities, one relationship: Both partners, Rafienia P, Asghari, A.(2007). The relationship between various kinds love and well-being in love and in married students. *Family Research Journal* 3(9):491-501.
- Paul, E. L., & White, K. M. (1990). The development of intimate relationships in late adolescence. *Adolescence*, 25, 375-400.
- Perez, Ferer V. A., Bosch Fiol, E., Navarro Guzman, C., Garcia-Buades, E., & Ramis Palmer, M. C. (2009). The concept of love in Spain. *Psychology in Spain*, 13(1), 40-47.
- Pistole, C. M. (1994). Adult Attachment Styles: Some Thoughts on Closeness-Distance Struggles. *Family Process*, 33(2), 147-159.
- Pietromonaco, P. R., Greenwood, D., & Barrett, L. F. (2004). Conflict in adult close relationships: An attachment perspective. *Adult attachment: Theory, research, and clinical implications*, 267-299.
- Proulx, C. M., Helms, H. M., & Buehler, C. (2007). Marital quality and personal well-being: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 69(3), 576-593.
- Reynolds, J. & One PlusOne, 2008. *Supporting couple relationships: A sourcebook for practitioners*. London: One PlusOne.
- Reis, H. T., Lin, Y. C., Bennett, M. E., & Nezelek, J. B. (1993). Change and consistency in social participation during early adulthood. *Developmental*

*psychology*, 29(4), 633.

- Richardson, D. R., Medvin, N., & Hammock, G. (1988). Love styles, relationship experience, and sensation seeking: A test of validity. *Personality and individual differences*, 9(3), 645-651.
- Risavy, CF. (1995). *Effects of gender, age, social class and relationship satisfaction on love styles*. Saint Louis University Pub.
- Rusbult, C. E., & Buunk, B. P. (1993). Commitment processes in close relationships: An interdependence analysis. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 10(2), 175-204.
- Saavedra, M. C., Chapman, K. E., & Rogge, R. D. (2010). Clarifying links between attachment and relationship quality: hostile conflict and mindfulness as moderators. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 24(4), 380-390.
- Sacher, J. A., & Fine, M. A. (1996). Predicting relationship status and satisfaction after six months among dating couples. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 6, 21-32.
- Seginer, R., & Noyman, M. S. (2005). Future orientation, identity and intimacy: Their relations in emerging adulthood. *European Journal of Developmental Psychology*, 2, 17-37.
- Simpson, J. A., Rholes, W. S., & Nelligan, J. S. (1992). Support seeking and support giving within couples in an anxiety-provoking situation: The role of attachment styles. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 62(3), 434-446.
- Simpson, J. A., Rholes, W. S., & Phillips, D. (1996). Conflict in close relationships: an attachment perspective. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 71(5), 899-914.
- Sherman, A. M., De Vries, B., & Lansford, J. E. (2000). Friendship in childhood and adulthood: Lessons across the life span. *The International Journal of Aging*

*and Human Development*, 51(1), 31-51.

- Sternberg, R. J. (1986). A triangular theory of love. *Psychological Review*, 93(2), 119-135.
- Sternberg, R. J. (1988). *The Triangle of Love: Intimacy, Passion, Commitment*. Basic Books (AZ).
- Sternberg, R. J., & Barnes, M. L. (1985). Real and ideal others in romantic relationships: Is four a crowd? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 49(6), 1586-1608.
- Sullivan, H.S. (1953). *The Interpersonal theory of psychiatry*. New York: Norton.
- Umberson, D., Williams, K., Powers, A., Chen, M. & Campbell. A., 2005. As good as it gets? A life course perspective on marital quality. *Social forces*, 84 (1), 493-511.
- Watson-Manheim, M., Chudoba, K. M., & Crowston, K. (2002). Discontinuities and continuities: A new way to understand virtual work. *Information technology & people*, 15(3), 191-209.
- Woll, S. B. (1989). Personality and relationship correlates of loving styles. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 23(4), 480-505.

## APPENDICES

## Appendix A

### Informed Consent

I am Sundas Malik, M.Sc. research student at National Institute of Psychology, Quaid-e-Azam University, Islamabad. I am conducting a research which aims to study love attitudes and satisfaction of love life with relationship quality among university students.

I humbly request for your support and participation in my research project. I assure you that any personal information provided will be kept confidential and will only be used for research purpose. You have full right to withdraw at any stage of questionnaire administration. Please provide your consent through endorsing the signature in the prescribe space.

Your participation will be highly appreciated.

Thank you

Sundas Malik

[Sundas.hafeez.malik@gmail.com](mailto:Sundas.hafeez.malik@gmail.com)

Signatures

.....

**Demographic Information Sheet**

Age (years): .....

Gender: Male  Female

Socio Economic Status: Below Average  Average  Above Average

Relationship length: 6 months  1 year  2 years or more



Appendix C

Read Following statements carefully and answer each item using a 5-point scale, ranging from 1 (Strongly agree), 2 (Moderately agree), 3 (Neutral), 4 (Moderately disagree), 5 (Strongly disagree).

Statements	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Neutral	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
My partner and I have the right physical "chemistry" between us.					
I feel that my lover and I were meant for each other.					
My partner fits my ideal standards of physical beauty/handsomeness.					
I believe that what my partner doesn't know about me won't hurt him/her.					
I have sometimes had to stop my partner from finding out about other lovers.					
My partner would get upset if he/she knew of some of the things I've done with other people.					
Our love is the best kind because it grew out of a long friendship.					
Our friendship merged gradually into love over time.					
Our love relationship is the most satisfying because it developed from a good friendship.					
A main consideration in choosing my partner was how he/she would reflect on my family.					
An important factor in choosing my partner was whether or not he/she would be a good parent.					
One consideration in choosing my partner was how he/she would reflect on my career					
When my partner doesn't pay attention to me, I feel sick all over.					

I cannot relax if I suspect that my partner is with someone else.					
If my partner ignores me for a while, I sometimes do stupid things to try to get his/her attention Back.					
I would rather suffer myself than let my partner suffer.					
I cannot be happy unless I place my partner's happiness before my own.					
I am usually willing to sacrifice my own wishes to let my partner achieve his/hers.					

## Appendix D

Read given statements carefully and answer each item using range from 1 (Low satisfaction) to 5 (High satisfaction).

Statements	Low 1	2	3	4	High 5
How well does your partner meet your needs?	1	2	3	4	5
In general, how satisfied are you with your relationship?	1	2	3	4	5
How good is your relationship compared to most?	1	2	3	4	5
How often do you wish you hadn't gotten into this relationship?	1	2	3	4	5
To what extent has your relationship met your original expectations?	1	2	3	4	5
How much do you love your partner?	1	2	3	4	5
How many problems are there in your relationship?	1	2	3	4	5

Appendix E

Evaluate your relationship on the following qualities considering only the Positive Qualities of your relationship and IGNORING the negative ones:

Qualities	Not at all	A tiny bit	A little	Somewhat	Mostly	Extremely
Enjoyable						
Pleasant						
Strong						
Alive						
Fun						
Full						
Energizing						
Exciting						

Evaluate your relationship on the following qualities considering only the Negative Qualities of your relationship and IGNORING the positive one:

Qualities	Not at all	A tiny bit	A little	Somewhat	Mostly	Extremely
Bad						
Miserable						
Empty						
Lifeless						
Unpleasant						
Discouraging						
weak						
Dull						