

Investigating the Relationship Between Attachment Styles and Types of Love in Married Employees

Somayeh Jalalitar

Family Counseling, University of Social Welfare and Rehabilitation Sciences

***Correspondence author**

Somayeh Jalalitar

Family Counseling

University of Social Welfare and Rehabilitation Sciences
Iran

Submitted : 28 Oct 2022 ; Published : 24 Nov 2022

Citation: Atefeh Ferdosipour(2022). Investigating the Relationship Between Attachment Styles and Types of Love in Married Employees. J Psychol Neurosci; 2022; 4(4):1-8.

Abstract

Purpose: In this research, have role of attachment styles in the types of love in married welfare workers of the city Tehran has been investigated.

Methodology: The current research method was quantitative and correlational. The statistical population of this research includes all married welfare employees of Tehran province and the research sample in this research concludes 300 married women and men who were employees of human welfare organization of Tehran. The sampling method was random sampling. Two questionnaires were used in this research. One of the questionnaires is the Love Attitude Questionnaire (LAS) (Hendrick & Hendrick, 1986) and the second questionnaire is the Adult Attachment Questionnaire (AAS) (Hazan & shaver, 1987). The obtained information was analyzed using SPSS statistical software and various statistical methods such as correlation coefficients, chi-square, analysis of variance F and gamma correlation coefficients, and multivariate regression.

Findings: The findings showed that there was no gender difference in the type of Eros love between women and men. The most kind of love Both in women and in men, is in Eros love. Ludu0s love can be explained by secure affectionate style. There is also a relationship between Storg's love and avoidant and anxious attachment styles. Pragma love cannot be predicted through attachment styles and gender, and the relationship between the two was not found. Anxious and insecure- ambivalent attached style can predict the love of Mania. The relationship between attachment styles and Agape love showed that the anxious- ambivalent insecure attachment style can predict agape love.

Conclusion: The results obtained from the findings of the current research on the relationship between attachment styles and agape love showed that the anxious- ambivalent insecure attachment style can predict agape love, so people who have an anxious- ambivalent attachment style are more likely to have a tendency to have agape love.

Keywords : attachment style, gender differences, types of love

Family, as the first center where a person is placed, is very important. The first environmental changes that a person receives from the family environment is the love and intimacy between couples on their life and their interactions has great changes and the stability of family is strengthened by the love and intimacy between the couples too (Farhadi Mohagheghi & Nesai Moghadam, 2020). Today, researchers and thinkers are trying to be able to understand concepts such as love, belonging, attachment as an affective agent in growth and continuity of families and marital relations. Family Psychologists and counselors and couple therapists have also tried to study the concept of lovers as an important dogma in close relationships (between family members, between husbands and wives, and intimate relationships before marriage). Because they think of it as an important agent in choosing a partner, strengthening

marital relationships and intimate relationships (Karami Mohsenzadeh & Zaharakar, 2021).

Attachment, from Balbi's point of view, is an emotional bond between a growing child and an external provider or caregiver, i.e. someone who the child directs towards him out of excitement (Gasiorowska Folwaeczny & Otterbring, 2022). Attachment in adults, i.e. attachment to everyone, a friend or a parent is not an immature and abnormal act but it is rather normal and this attachments can happen between two adults. In addition, it is common to take care and protect one's wife, friend and parent during stressful times of illness and old age (Hazan & Shaver, 1987). Children's attachment styles, which were classified by Ainsworth and colleagues (1986), were returned to the attachment patterns of adults. They described

safe, avoidant and anxious/ ambivalent, which is different from the patterns of parent-child relationships in their families (Güçlü et al., 2017).

In fact, romantic relationships are one of the most important relationships that people establish throughout their lives, and they expect that loving and being loved will satisfy their psychological needs. Some believe that the idea of romantic love still exists and everyone is looking for a spouse who, in their opinion, will fulfill the romantic ideal (Neto, 2021). Love and affection have a quality that can erase many tensions between couples and cover up their self-centeredness. One of the important aspects of marriage is examining emotional issues; What is referred to as love. One of the biggest problems of people is the inability to satisfy their need for love, and therefore they face all kinds of other problems. Lasting love does not happen by itself, but requires serious effort (Karami et al., 2021).

Most of the works that have been done in the field of attachment development are directly or indirectly based on Freud's psychoanalytic theory. Psychoanalysts believe that a child's first relationships form the basis of his personality. Erikson put attachment as the foundation of his theory in developmental psychology. He is one of the psychoanalysts who accepts Freud's stages of growth and development (Mansour & Dodastan, 2016). Sullivan believed that the need for love and kindness is the most basic human need, because it protects his survival. The effects of interpersonal relationships can show its importance in human life, because it protects his survival. The effects of interpersonal relationships can show its importance in human life. Satisfaction in work, play and even family life depends a lot on the quality and even on our love (Reizer, 2015).

In this research, emphasize is on "Lee's" theory, love is divided into six types, which include: Eros love, romantic and sensual love, Ludus love, fancy love and pragma love, practical, realistic and calculating love. In the end, mania love is possessive and dependent love, but agape love is defined as self-sacrificing love. According to Sternberg's view, people express love in seven ways (Collins & Read, 1990). Stenberg considers three components for love: intimacy, lust and commitment. He says that there is 7 type of love style: love that only has the component of intimacy without lust and commitment (befriending), love that only has the component of lust (infatuation), commitment to being alone without lust and intimacy (absurd love) and intimacy and lust without any commitment (romantic love) and intimacy and commitment without lust (sympathetic love) and lust and commitment without intimacy (stupid love) and love that has all three components together (ideal love) (Ventura León & Caycho Rodríguez, 2016).

Because of its inner and private nature, love is sometimes misapplied and experienced by different people. Therefore, it is necessary to examine love like other emotions in humans in order to examine its effect on people and their marital life

(Bakhtiari et al., 2019). Although the topic of love remained silent for a long time as a street and market topic and the permission to bring it up in official and public gatherings was prohibited, so that if the speaker intended to speak on this topic, he would not be given permission, but recently the topic is considered a mandatory topic in family and marriage topics, of course, everything has been taken into account sporadically. Also, the importance of this issue is felt more when most of our young people are confused and conflicted in their romantic relationships before marriage, and a large part of it is the lack of knowledge about such an important category, i.e. (love) and in its processes. It is hoped that the results obtained from this research and other similar researches can be of great help in family research and factors affecting the strengthening of interpersonal relationships, premarital counseling and communication skills in couples' relationships. The question that we seek to answer is whether the attachment style is related to the types of love of married employees or not.

Method

Research Design and Participants

The current research is a descriptive and correlational study. The statistical population of this research includes all married welfare employees of Tehran province. The participants were 300 people, and a list of all married employees, male and female, was prepared by the researcher, referring to the recruitment and selection unit of the Welfare Organization of Tehran province, and then from this list, 150 were male, and 150 were Female. Participants were selected (based on the entry and exit criteria). The criteria for entering the research included being an employee of the welfare office, marriage, easy access to the place of the research, and the satisfaction of the employees' families. Exclusion criteria included dropping out of the subject, not completing the questionnaires, and not being present at the research site.

Tools

In order to collect data, two questionnaires were used. One of the questionnaires is the Love Attitude Questionnaire (LAS) (Hendrick & Hendrick 1986) and the second questionnaire is the Adult Attachment Questionnaire (AAS) (Hazan & Shiver, 1986).

Love Attitudes Scale: LAS

This questionnaire was created by Hendrik and Hendrik based on Lee's model of love in 1986. Factor analysis has shown that the presented structure of Lee has the ability to be used in multiple cultures (Beto et al. 2000). The present questionnaire had 20 items at the beginning, and high reliability coefficients and suitable internal robot and evidence of content validity were also reported about it. This questionnaire can show the six dimensions of love quantitatively and continuously. Its options are specified as five options from strongly agree to strongly disagree. Questionnaire scoring method: The score that a person gets in each sub-scale indicates the level of attitude he has towards that sub-scale (Hendrick & Hendrick, 1986).

Adult Attachment Styles Questionnaire: AAS

This test, developed by Hazen and Shaver 1986, is a self-report tool adapted to adult relationships. Based on the assumption that similarities of nurturing-caring attachment styles can be found in adult relationships as well, this measurement tool carries a description of a person's feelings of closeness and intimacy in relationships. Each of these descriptions shows an attachment style (Hazan & Shaver, 1987) and has two parts. If the subject gets a higher score in each of the three statements, that statement represents his attachment style. In the second part, the subject should mark only one of the styles that has the most confusion with him, the reliability of this questionnaire is reported as 0.67, and in addition, the reliability coefficient of this questionnaire, which was calculated by Cronbach's alpha method, is 0.73, which indicates the acceptable and well-known reliability coefficient of the instrument's internal consistency, and the stability of secure-avoidant and ambivalent attachment styles was 0.80, 0.57, and 0.32, respectively.

Findings

The mean and standard deviation of men and women and the total in the variables of eros, ludus, sturge, pragma, mania and agape are presented in table 1. Average of subscales of love in men is related to Eros love with a value of 15.94 and a standard deviation of 2.49, and the lowest average is related to mania love with a value of 13.5 and a standard deviation of 2.87. The highest average of the subscales of love for women is related to love of Eros with a value of 16.37 and a standard deviation of 1.82, and the lowest average is related to love of Storg with a value of 11.45 and a standard deviation of 2.22. The highest standard deviation in men is related to Agape love scale and is equal to 3.31 and the lowest standard deviation is related to Ludus subscale. The highest standard deviation in women is related to the Pragma love subscale and is equal to 2.67 and the lowest standard deviation is related to the Eros love scale and is equal to 1.82.

Gender	Male		Female		Total	
	Average	Standard deviation	Average	Standard deviation	Average	Standard deviation
Eros	15.94	2.49	16.37	1.82	16.5	2.29
Ludus	14.13	2.45	12.67	2.42	13.40	2.54
Storg	14.05	3.01	11.45	2.22	12.75	2.94
Pragma	14.92	3.08	14.46	2.67	14.69	2.88
Mania	13.5	2.87	12.5	2.44	13	2.71
Agape	14.14	3.31	14.62	2.1	14.38	2.82

Table 1: mean and standard deviation of Eros, Ludos, Sturge, Pragma, Mania and Agape variables.

Table 2 shows the mean and standard deviation of attachment types in men and women and their total. Secure attachment style has the highest amount in men with an average of 5.64 and a standard deviation of 2.66. Safe attachment style in women has the highest amount of 6.15 and standard deviation of 2.04. And the ambivalent anxious attachment style in women has the lowest amount of 5.19 and standard deviation of 2.215. The highest standard deviation in men is related to secure attachment style subscale 2.66 and the lowest anxious-ambivalent standard deviation is 2.215 and the lowest is related to avoidant attachment 1.69.

Gender	Male		Female		Total	
	Average	Standard deviation	Average	Standard deviation	Average	Standard deviation
Secure attachment	5.64	2.66	6.15	2.04	5.89	2.38
Avoidant attachment	4.49	2.19	5.32	1.69	4.90	1.99
Anxious-ambivalent attachment	4.49	2.39	5.19	2.215	4.89	2.33

Table 2 : Average and standard deviation of attachment types in men, women and the total of both sexes

Independent t-test and multivariate regression were used to examine the difference and predict the types of love (Eros, Ludos, Sturge, Pragma, Mania and Agape) according to attachment (secure attachment, insecure avoidant attachment and anxious attachment - two-sided).

Statistical indicators	sum of squares	Degrees of freedom (Df)	Ratio	Significance level (Sig)
regression	31.66	4	1.66	0.16
left over	1101.53	231		
Total	113.39	235		

Table 3: Summary of regression calculations for predicting Eros love according to secure, avoidant, anxious, ambivalent attachment styles and gender

The calculated F value is equal to 1.66, which is not significant at the significance level of 0.05. Therefore, attachment styles and gender cannot predict Eros desire.

Statistical indicators	sum of squares	Degrees of freedom (Df)	Ratio	Significance level (Sig)
regression	55171	4	7.35	0.00
left over	1347.39	231		
Total	1518.94	235		

Table 4: Summary of regression calculations for predicting Ludus love according to attachment styles (secure, insecure, avoidant, and anxious, ambivalent)

According to the obtained p value (7.35) with a significance level of p greater than 0.05, Ludus love subscale can be predicted based on predictive variables (attachment styles and gender).

Variables	B	The standard error	Beta	t	Significance level	Dissociative correlation	R ²
Secure	-0.176	0.067	-0.165	-2.61	0.009	-0.162	
avoidable insecurity	2.35	0.082	0.019	0.287	0.774	0.018	0.113
Anxious-ambivalent	-4.88	0.068	-0.045	-0.712	0.477	-0.044	
gender	-1.35	0.32	-0.26	-4.11	0.00	-0.25	

Table 5: The coefficients obtained from the regression of the Ludus variable based on the predictive variables of attachment styles (secure, avoidant, anxious-ambivalent) and gender.

According to Table 5, the calculated T test ($t = 2.61$) for safe style is statistically significant at the level of less than 0.05, in addition, the t value obtained for gender is also statistically significant. As a result, it can be said that Ludus love type can only be predicted through secure attachment style and where the obtained beta coefficient is negative, this relationship is negative, that is, with the increase of secure attachment style, the tendency to Ludus love type decreases or vice versa. And in addition, the R² coefficient shows that nearly 12% of the variance of Ludus love style is determined through safe style.

In terms of gender differences, the correlation coefficient (alpha) between the two variables Ludus and secure attachment style is equal to (-0.162) in men and (-0.181) in women, according to the significance test of the difference of two correlation coefficients, The two variables of Ludus love and secure attachment style are equal in men and women.

Statistical indicators	sum of squares	Degrees of freedom (Df)	Ratio	Significance level (Sig)
regression	475.6	4	17.62	0.00
left over	1560.05	231		
Total	2035.74	235		

Table 6: Summary table of regression calculations for predicting Storg's love according to attachment styles and gender

According to Table 6, the calculated F value is (17.60 and p is less than 0.05), so it seems that Storg's love can be predicted through attachment styles and gender. But in order to check what kind of attachment style and to what extent it predicts Storg's love, beta factors and related characteristics were examined and the results are shown in Table 7.

Variables	B	The standard error	Beta	t	Significance level	Dissociative correlation	R ²
Secure	-2.87	0.072	-0.023	-0.39	0.69	0.23	
avoidable insecurity	-0.236	0.088	-0.160	-2.67	0.008	-0.154	0.234
Anxious-ambivalent	-0.169	0.074	-0.134	-2.29	0.023	-0.132	
gender	-2.26	0.354	0.385	-6.39	-0.00	-0.368	

Table 7: Coefficients resulting from the regression of the Storg variable with predictive variables (attachment styles and gender)

According to Table 7, the t-test calculated for predicting variables of avoidant attachment is equal to (-2.67) and ambivalent anxious attachment (-2.29) and gender (0.00) at the significance level of p is less than 0.05. It is inferred that avoidant insecure attachment style is more predictive for Storg's love with beta coefficient (-0.236). so, the insecure, anxious-ambivalent attachment style has the ability to predict love for Storg, and according to the beta coefficient (-0.169), this relationship is negative or inverse, that is, with the increase of the secure, anxious-ambivalent style, the tendency to love Storg decreases. Findings obtained according to the R² shows its value, 0.234, and approximately 23.4% of the variance of Storg's love can be predicted through

insecure-avoidant and anxious-ambivalent acquisition.

Looking at the statistical characteristics related to gender also shows that the correlation coefficient (alpha) between two storg love and avoidant attachment style is equal to (0.221) in men and equal to (-0.044) in women, which according to the test is significant, and therefore it can be concluded that the correlation coefficient in independent samples is significant at the significance level of P less than 0.05, and it can be concluded that the correlation between Storg's love and anxious-ambivalent style is more in men than in women.

Statistical indicators	sum of squares	Degrees of freedom (Df)	Ratio	Significance level (Sig)
regression	24.26	4	0.724	0.57
left over	1935.77	231		
Total	1960.03	235		

Table 8: Summary of Pragma Love Regression calculations based on predictive variables (attachment styles and gender)

According to Table 8, the calculated F value equal to (0.724) is not significant at the significance level (p smaller than 0.05). That is, pragma love cannot be predicted through attachment styles.

Statistical indicators	sum of squares	Ratio	Significance level (Sig)
regression	103.31	3.67	0.006
left over	1624.68		
Total	1725.0		

Table 9: Summary of the regression calculations of love mania variable based on predictor variables (attachment styles and gender)

According to Table 9, the calculated F value of 3.67 is significant at the significance level of 0.05.

Variables	B	The standard error	Beta	t	Significance level	Dissociative correlation	R ²
Secure	6.26	0.074	0.055	0.84	0.39	0.054	0.06
avoidable insecurity	-6.01	0.090	-0.044	-0.66	0.504	0.043	
Anxious-ambivalent	0.163	0.075	0.140	2.16	0.031	0.138	
gender	-1.09	0.36	-0.203	-3.03	0.003	-0.194	

Table 10: Coefficients obtained from the regression of love mania variable based on predictive variables (attachment styles and gender)

According to Table 10, the t value obtained for the insecure-anxious-ambiguous style and gender is significant according to the significance level of P less than 0.05. Therefore, anxious-ambivalent insecure attachment style can predict mania love, and according to the obtained beta coefficient (0.163), this relationship is positive, that is, with the increase of anxious-ambivalent insecure attachment style, the tendency towards mania love also increases. And according to the R2 obtained in Table 4-10, it seems that 0.6% of the variance of mania love can be explained through the anxious-ambivalent attachment style. Also, there is a significant relationship between mania love and gender, that is, gender can also be a predictor of this type of love, but according to the correlation obtained between the two variables of mania love and anxious-ambivalent attachment style in men, it is equal to (0.241) and In women, it is equal to (0.31) and at the significance level of p is less than 0.05, and according to the significance test, the difference between two correlation coefficients in two independent groups is significant. Therefore, it can be concluded that the correlation of mania with anxious-ambivalent attachment style is more in men than in women.

Statistical indicators	sum of squares	Ratio	Significance level (Sig)
regression	125.94	4.125	0.003
left over	1751.96		
Total	1877.91		

Table 11: Summary of the calculations resulting from the regression of the Agape variable with predictive variables (attachment styles and gender)

According to Table 11, the obtained F value equal to (4.125) is significant at the significance level of 0.003. That is, agape love can be predicted based on attachment styles and gender. Therefore, in order to check which of the styles and to what extent

determines agape love? The results are presented in Table 4-12.

Variables	B	The standard error	Beta	t	Significance level	Dissociative correlation	R ²
Secure	14.84	0.077	0.040	0.61	0.54	0.039	
avoidable insecurity	0.139	0.093	0.098	1.48	0.138	0.095	0.067
Anxious-ambivalent	0.282	0.078	0.233	3.61	0.00	0.23	
gender	0.145	0.375	0.028	0.387	0.699	0.025	

Table 12: coefficients obtained from the regression of agape love variable based on predictive variables (attachment styles and gender).

According to Table 12, the calculated t value (3.61) for the anxious variable is significant, thus the anxious-ambivalent variable can predict agape love, and according to the resulting beta coefficient (3.6), this relationship is positive and direct. And with the increase of anxious-ambivalent attachment style, Agape love also increases. And the R² value obtained shows that 6.7% of Agape variance is explained through anxious-ambivalent attachment style.

Conclusion

The main points of this discussion include examining the predictability of types of love with attachment styles in the case of married people and then examining the relationship between each of the three styles of attachment with 1 type of love (Eros, Ludus, Storg, Pragma, Mania, Agape) between those who are married men and women. The findings of this research showed that types of love can predict attachment styles. These findings are found in the research of (Hanri et al., 2014), (Gurbanpour et al., Joklo Av et al., (2017), (Ja Sioska et al., 2022), Nugent (2021), (Kyoka et al., 2020), (Arsaan et al., 2010), (Liu et al., 2020), (Saahin et al., Karan (2019), Bakhtyari et al., (2019), (Kasampour et al., 2020), (Levant et al., 2021) and Neto (2021).

(Arslan & Arı, 2010; Bakhtiari, Hosseini, Arefi, & Afsharinia, 2019b; Ciocca et al., 2020; Gasiorowska et al., 2022; Güçlü et al., 2017; Honari & Saremi, 2015; Levental, Yaffe, Noy, Sharabi, & Ben-Eli, 2021; Liu & Wei, 2020; Neto, 2021; Nugent, 2021; Pourmohseni-Koluri, 2016; Qorbanpoor Lafmejani, Dehqan, Karimi, & Rezaei, 2020; S. Şahin & Çoksan, 2020)

The most common type of love in both women and men is Eros love. No significant relationship was found between Eros love and attachment styles, which means that Eros love cannot be predicted through attachment styles in this research. The research findings are not aligned with the researches of Sahin (2019), (Joklao et al., (2017) and (Najarpourian et al., 2018). (Güçlü et al., 2017; Najarpourian, Samavi, & Sina, 2018; S. Şahin & Çoksan, 2020). (Sahin et al., 2019) found that participants who were securely attached to their romantic partners preferred eros and loved unconditionally, while participants with insecure attachment were more interested in romantic love. (S. Şahin & Çoksan, 2020)

Also, there was no gender difference in the type of Eros love between women and men. The findings are in line with the research of (Wang Pakaran, & colleagues 2012). (Wongpakaran, Wongpakaran, & Wedding, 2012). Similarly, with the research of Arslan and colleagues (2010), (Jolclau et al., 2017), (Safar et al., 2016), (Jasivusaka et al.) and Wei Heu (2020) is inconsistent. (Arslan & Arı, 2010; Ciocca et al., 2020; Gasiorowska et al., 2022; Güçlü et al., 2017; Nugent,

2021; Safdar & Zahrah, 2016).

Also, the results of this research show that Ludus love can be explained by secure attachment style. Therefore, people with a secure attachment style are less likely to experience Ludus love. And especially in men, this relationship has been seen more, that is, in men, with the increase in the secure attachment style, the tendency to love Ludus is more than in women. Also, comparing the difference between men and women in Ludus love, the result of the current research shows that men are more inclined to love than women.

Ludus love is the same as fancy love and with that, person simply goes from one relationship to another or is in more than one relationship at the same time and goes to another relationship or enters into more than one relationship at the same time. Ludus love type is related to Nayman's attachment style, because the characteristic of Ludus love type is to avoid commitment, which supports simultaneous relationships with more than one person. In the case of researches that have examined the relationship between love and attachment styles, it has been shown that people with a secure style are less likely to choose the Ludus love style, and in fact, people who are comfortable with close relationships and establishing intimacy are less likely to be the ones to choose Ludus love. The research findings are in line with the research of Sahin and colleagues (2019) and Ciocca and colleagues (2020). (Ciocca et al., 2020; S. M. Şahin & Çoksan, 2017.)

A result of this research showed that there is a significant relationship between love of Storg and avoidant and anxious attachment styles. Therefore, the higher the avoidant and anxious ambivalent attachment style in a person, the less likely he is to fall in love. Storg's love is based on empathy and friendship, this type of love is the main type among brothers and sisters and among marriages of the same age. And it grows gradually with comforting intimacy and mutual participation and self-disclosure. In this type of love, there is a belief that your spouse should also be your best friend. In Hendrick and Hendrick's 1989 research, they stated that secure attachment should be related to storg, this research is in line with the previous research results of (Pourmohseni Kalori, 2015), (Weds, 2016 ; Neto, 2021) (Neto, 2021; Pourmohseni Koluri,

The present study shows that it is not possible to predict the love of the pragma through attachment styles and gender, and no relationship was found between these two. Pragma love is logical, practical, calculating love, and those who want this type of love, first look for a partner with similar age, religion, profession, personality, and social class, and then in the next stages, interests, goals, and sexual roles, and after all these considered before considering emotions.

Ambivalent-anxious insecure attachment style can predict mania love, and the more the insecure anxious-ambivalent attachment style increases in a person, the more likely he is to tend to mania love. Mania love is a possessive love during which a person experiences emotional longing with jealousy and obsessive preoccupation and exclusivity and dependencies along with physical symptoms and illness. The results of this research are in line with the researches of (Jolcova et al., 2017), (Henry et al. (2014), (Kyoko et al., 2020), (Henry et al., 2014 ; Honari & Saremi, 2015). It is not aligned with the research of Sahin and colleagues (2019) (S. M. Şahin & Çoksan, 2017.)

The relationship between attachment styles and agape love showed that anxious-ambivalent insecure attachment style can predict agape love, so people who have anxious-ambivalent attachment style are more likely to have a tendency towards agape love. Of course, this result is completely contrary to the few researches that have been done in this regard. Agape love is an altruistic, (selfless) love, it is a kind of unconditional love with attention, and forgiveness. This type of love has been recommended and promoted by Christianity and especially by Christian writers such as Leoboskalia. It has also been talked about a lot in poems and novels. The findings of this research are in line with the researches of (Julkou et al., 2017), (Levant et al., 2021), (Arslan et al. al., 2019b; Güçlü et al., 2017; Levental et al., 2021; Qorbanpoor Lafmejani et al., 2020). It is inconsistent with the research of Sahin and colleagues (2019) (S. Şahin & Çoksan, 2020).

In fact, the nature of love among cultures is more complex than it was previously assumed, and since most of the abstract researches in the field of love with a cultural perspective have been done exclusively in North America and especially the United States. It is possible that Eros, Pragma, Mania, and Agape types of love in a culture different from the culture of the present research may be related to safe and anxious-ambivalent styles in a different way (Reizer, 2015). For example, in some cultures, they emphasize on the patient aspect of mania in relation to love, for example, in Caplatus, madness, insanity, is considered a disease of love and they consider it a sign of a changed personality. Psychologists' opinion about love is generally positive. In their opinion, people in love have a very active immune system and get sick less than normal people, feel happier and have more hope for life, and in fact, love gives people an excuse to survive and this the reason which may be related to the natural secure attachment style.

References

1. Arslan, E., & Ari, R. (2010). Analysis of ego identity process of adolescents in terms of attachment styles and gender. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 2(2), 744-750. DOI:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2010.03.095
2. Bakhtiari, E., Hosseini, S., Arefi, M., & Afsharina, K. (2019a). Causal Model of Extramarital Affairs Based on Attachment Styles and Early Maladaptive Schemas: Mediating Role of Marital Intimacy and Love Styles. *Iran-J-Health-Educ-Health-Promot*, 7(2), 245-258. DOI:10.30699/ijhehp.7.2.245
3. Bakhtiari, E., Hosseini, S., Arefi, M., & Afsharina, K. (2019b). Causal Model of Extramarital Affairs Based on Attachment Styles and Early Maladaptive Schemas: Mediating Role of Marital Intimacy and Love Styles. *nian Journal of Health Education and Health Promotion*, 7, 245-258. DOI:10.30699/ijhehp.7.2.245
4. Ciocca, G., Zauri, S., Limoncin, E., Mollaioli, D., D'Antuono, L., Carosa, E., . . . Jannini, E. A. (2020). Attachment Style, Sexual Orientation, and Biological Sex in their Relationships With Gender Role. *Sexual Medicine*, 8(1), 76-83. DOI:10.1016/j.esxm.2019.09.001
5. Collins, N. L., & Read, S. J. (1990). Adult attachment, working models, and relationship quality in dating couples. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 58(4), 644-663. DOI: 10.1037//0022-3514.58.4.644
6. Farhadi, M., Mohagheghi, H., & Nesai Moghadam, B. (2020). The relationship between attachment styles and student interpersonal problems: The role of mediating emotional intelligence. *RAZI JOURNAL OF MEDICAL SCIENCES (JOURNAL OF IRAN UNIVERSITY OF MEDICAL SCIENCES)*, 27(1 #AG0060), 73-84. Retrieved from https://rjms.iuims.ac.ir/browse.php?a_id=5660&sid=1&slc_lang=en
7. Gasiorowska, A., Folwarczny, M., & Otterbring, T. (2022). Anxious and status signaling: Examining the link between attachment style and status consumption and the mediating role of materialistic values. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 190, 111503. DOI:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2022.111503
8. Güçlü, O., Şenormancı, Ö., Şenormancı, G., & Köktürk, F. (2017). Gender differences in romantic jealousy and attachment styles. *Psychiatry and Clinical Psychopharmacology*, 27(4), 359-365. DOI:10.1080/24750573.2017.1367554
9. Hazan, C., & Shaver, P. (1987). Romantic love conceptualized as an attachment process. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 52(3), 511-524. DOI: 10.1037//0022-3514.52.3.511
10. Hendrick, C., & Hendrick, S. S. (1986). A Theory and Method of Love. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 50, 392-402. DOI: doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.50.2.392
11. Honari, B., & Saremi, A. A. (2015). The Study of Relationship between Attachment Styles and Obsessive Love Style. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 165, 152-159. DOI :https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.12.617

12. Karami, M., Mohsenzadeh, P. D. F., & Zaharakar, P. D. K. (2021). Prediction of Love Stories and Love Styles based on Early Maladaptive Schemas. *qjfr*, 18(2), 121-126.
13. Levental, O., Yaffe, Y., Noy, R., Sharabi, U., & Ben-Eli, M. (2021). Attachment style and men's patterns of sports fan devotion. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, 56, 102005. DOI:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychsport.2021.102005>
14. Liu, M., & Wei, H. (2020). The dark side of white lies: Parenting by lying in childhood and adolescent anxiety, the mediation of parent-child attachment and gender difference. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 119, 105635. DOI :<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chilyouth.2020.105635>
15. Mansour, M., & Dodastan, P. (2016). *Genetic Psychology 2* (from psychoanalysis to psychology). Tehran: Rushd.
16. Najarpourian, S., Samavi, A., & Sina, F. (2018). The Prediction of Marital Satisfaction Through Attachment Styles and Love Story. *Iranian Journal of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences*, In Press. doi:10.5812/ijpbs.62774
17. Neto, F. (2021). Gender Differences in Estimates of Love Styles for Self and Others. *Sexuality & Culture*, 25, 1-14. DOI:10.1007/s12119-021-09855-4
18. Nugent, S. (2021). Investigating Attachment Styles as a Predictor of Depressive Symptoms and Friendship Quality; Gender Differences. National College of Ireland. Dublin. Retrieved from <https://norma.ncirl.ie/4959/1/sophienugent.pdf>
19. Pourmohseni-Koluri, F. (2016). Gender Differences in Attachment Style and Personality Traits in Prediction of Love Styles in University Students. *Research in Cognitive and Behavioral Sciences*, 6(1), 17-32. DOI :10.22108/cbs.2016.20751
20. Pourmohseni Koluri, F. (2016). GENDER DIFFERENCES IN ATTACHMENT STYLE AND PERSONALITY TRAITS IN PREDICTION OF LOVE STYLES IN UNIVERSITY STUDENTS. *RESEARCH IN COGNITIVE AND BEHAVIORAL SCIENCES*, 6(1 (10) #M0033), 17-31.
21. QorbanpoorLafmejani, A., Dehqan, F., Karimi, F., & Rezaei, S. (2020). The Role of Attachment Styles, Love Styles and Emotional Expression in Predicting the Happiness of Married Teachers. *Positive Psychology Research*, 5(4), 15-34. DOI :10.22108/ppls.2020.116306.1699
22. Reizer, A. (2015). Influence of Employees' Attachment Styles on Their Life Satisfaction as Mediated by Job Satisfaction and Burnout. *The Journal of Psychology*, 149(4), 356-377. DOI :10.1080/00223980.2014.881312
23. Safdar, S., & Zahrah, S. M. (2016). Impact of Parenting Styles on the Intensity of Parental and Peer Attachment: Exploring the Gender Differences in Adolescents. *American Journal of Applied Psychology*, 4(1), 23-30. DOI :10.12691/ajap-4-2-1
24. Şahin, S., & Çoksan, S. (2020). The Relationship between Attachment Styles, Love Types, Emotional Expression and Life Satisfaction / Bağlanma Stilleri ile Aşk Tipleri, Duygusal Dışavurum ve Yaşam Doyumu Arasındaki İlişki. *Kalem Uluslararası Eğitim ve İnsan Bilimleri Dergisi*, 10, 597-619. doi:10.23863/kalem.2020.168
25. Şahin, S. M., & Çoksan, S. (2017). The Relationship Between Attachment Style in Romantic Relationship, Love Type, Emotional Expression and Life Satisfaction. 15th European Congress of Psychology, 11 - 14.
26. Vedes, A., Hilpert, P., Nussbeck, F., Randall, A., Bodenmann, G., & Lind, W. (2015). Love styles, coping and relationship satisfaction_A dyadic approach. *Personal Relationships*, 23. DOI:10.1111/pere.12112
27. Ventura León, J. L., & Caycho Rodríguez, T. (2016). Análisis exploratorio de la escala de amor de Sternberg en estudiantes universitarios peruanos. *Acta de Investigación Psicológica*, 6(2), 2430-2439. DOI:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aiprr.2016.06.006>
28. Wongpakaran, T., Wongpakaran, N., & Wedding, D. (2012). Gender differences, attachment styles, self-esteem and romantic relationships in Thailand. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 36(3), 409-417. DOI :<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijintrel.2011.12.001>.

Copyright: ©2022 Somayeh Jalalitar. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.