



The Influence of Relationship Status and Emotion Regulation on Self-Esteem and Relationship Anxiety

¹Meghna Singh, AIBAS, Amity University Haryana, M.Sc. Clinical Psychology

meghnasingh.1127@gmail.com

²Dr. Deepika Lohan, PhD Psychology, Panjab University

³Jaswant Singh, PhD Psychology Scholar, Panjab University

Abstract: This study examines the relationship between different relationship statuses such as being single, in a situational relationship, in a committed relationship, or married and a person's ability to regulate their emotions, as well as their self-esteem and relationship anxiety. A total of 268 individuals between the ages of 18 and 60 participated by completing an online survey using three well-established psychological scales: the Difficulties in Emotion Regulation Scale–Short Form (DERS-SF), the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale (RSES), and the Experiences in Close Relationships–Short Form (ECR-S). To understand patterns and differences, the data were analyzed using one-way ANOVA, Tukey's HSD post hoc test, and Pearson's correlation. The results showed that individuals in stable, committed relationships and those who reported better emotional regulation tended to have higher self-esteem. However, relationship status and emotional regulation did not significantly predict relationship anxiety, pointing to the possibility that other factors like personal coping styles or emotional closeness may be more critical.

Keywords: Attachment Style, Emotion Regulation, Relationship Anxiety, Relationship Status, Self-Esteem

1. Introduction

Love and intimate relationships play key roles in interpersonal situations where individuals develop and negotiate their subjectivities. The literature available has shown that secure integration into contented partnership comes with high self-esteem (Erol & Orth, 2014), and turbulent relationships or being single have been related to increased relationship-specific anxiety (Spielmann et al., 2013). Notably, the status of the relationship is not deterministic;

there is a broad variation among individuals in terms of how they perceive and emotionally cope with the relationship situation. According to recent models of socio-emotional functioning, emotion regulation—the strategic adjustment of feelings created by oneself—is an intrapersonal form of buffer that can either magnify or soften the influence of situational cues on psychology (Gross, 2015). As both emotion regulation and relationship status are paralleled with self-worth and anxiety, respectively, the interaction of these factors is not studied frequently.

By defining self-esteem as a sociometer of social acceptance (Leary, 1999), researchers believe that the lack of a romantic partner or the existence of a relationship crisis is an indication of devaluation in the relationships, thus shaping how an individual views himself/herself as well as creating a source of anxiousness in association. Those who consistently use adaptive regulation plans, such as cognitive reappraisal, are more likely to recode these cognitions in a less harmful way, thereby saving face. On the other hand, excessive use of suppression has the potential to aggravate the impact of anxiety. Along with the attachment theoretical views on the tendency of anxious individuals being more sensitive to the partner causing threats to the relationships, these results indicate the necessity to pay attention to structural relationships status (being unmarried, dating, living together, or married) and dispositional tendencies to regulate relationships, both of which are essential when predicting psychological adjustment.

Novaco (1976) In his classic article, he asserted that anger has both adaptive and maladaptive potential in an individual's psychology. The positive functioning can be noticed in its contribution to problem-solving and agency, whereas such adverse outcomes produce impaired impulse control and cognitive disturbance. Therefore, control over anger is essential to psychological health, and it depends on a person's appraisal and coping mechanisms, where relaxation methods and self-observation play a fundamental role. The insights hold significant importance for regulating emotions in dealing with stress and handling interpersonal and relational problems.

Scovel (1978) went even further, questioning the formulation of the concept of anxiety in educational environments and advocating for more distinct lines of demarcation. Scovel discovered the dualistic nature of anxiety, the ability of its facilitation, and the adverse outcomes. His review situates educational scenarios, including students and classroom settings,

alongside the realities of youth living in India, where anxieties play a significant role in academic performance and social interactions.

In a developmental model developed by Izard (1978), it is posited that core emotions are evident from infancy, specifically interest, joy, anger, and fear, and they gradually integrate with the developing cognitive abilities. Internalization resulting from this process facilitates the development of self-control and adaptive behavior. These are competencies that become especially important during adolescence when relationship anxiety and increased emotional complexity are the defining features of the developmental period.

In a sociological perspective, Kemper (1978) developed a model designed to distinguish emotions based on emerging issues of particular social circumstances, especially those involving changes in power, duty, and status. This framework posits that emotional states cannot be separated from the social situations in which they occur and are often accompanied by physiological displays. This model offers a relevant perspective on the extreme emotions and control issues that arise when there is a change in status or role within peer or romantic relationships, particularly among contemporary Indian youth who often learn to navigate hierarchies in their families and society.

The existing literature fosters a nuanced understanding of emotion control and its consequences. The results suggest that suppressing emotions damages the intimacy between romantic dyads (Juretić 2018). In contrast, the frequent negative emotions are indicative of low life satisfaction (Kuppens et al., 2007). Additionally, biometry suggests that the effect of suppression causes an increase in physiological arousal but effectively deactivates anxiety through cognitive reappraisal (Gross, 1998; Gross & John, 2003). Experimental studies on adolescent groups conclude that high rates of anxiety/depression symptoms are accompanied by an increase in the level of maladaptive regulation methods and a decrease in adaptive regulation strategies, which also enhances the need to implement dedicated interventions (Huppertz et al., 2013; Vollrath et al., 2017). Measurement tools, such as the Cognitive Emotion Regulation Questionnaire (Garnefski et al., 2001), have demonstrated exemplary performance in measuring the ability to regulate emotions differently. Putting all these findings together, the message is that it is critical to develop healthy adaptive emotion regulation skills, particularly during youth.

The sociological model formulated by Kemper (1978) can easily explain the phenomenon in the case of Indian adolescence when status and role-associated identities tend

to change quite quickly. Emotions, including nervousness, consequences, guilt, shame, and anger, are created in situations where individuals view the unfairness of social power or status. Such emotional reactions place significant regulatory pressures on young people who are in transition, particularly in terms of their relational or familial status, such as entering into or leaving romantic or peer relationships.

The present-day young adult Indians are presented with a unique structure of psychological factors, the preeminent ones being anger and anxiety, which largely shapes their developmental outlooks. These emotions serve both adaptive and maladaptive purposes, and as elucidated by Novaco (1976) and Scovel (1978), this is well within the daily context of adolescents who face academic needs and pressure, family-related needs and complexities, and the forces of peer relationships. Regulation of these emotions is thus critical, mediated through self-monitoring and coping skills, and influenced by social norms that prescribe behavioral control as the most acceptable response, as found in Indian society. As noted by Izard (1978), the development of core emotions and self-regulation is particularly relevant to adolescents, a stage characterized by quickly changing social status and an increase in relational anxiety among the youths in India. The sociological perspective of Kemper (1978) also observed that the dynamics of social power and status naturally change in growing friendships, romantic relationships, and family dynamics, which contribute to the increase in emotional control requirements. Overall, these theoretical models argue for the importance of developing adaptive emotion-regulation systems that would enable Indian youth to overcome the challenges of their developmental environment.

1.1 Objective

Based on the understanding developed through the theoretical framework and the previous papers and studies reviewed, the objectives of this study are to: (a) To examine the influence of relationship status on self-esteem and relationship anxiety. (b) To assess the impact of emotion regulation on self-esteem and relationship anxiety.

1.2 Hypotheses

H1: There will be a significant difference in self-esteem across different relationship statuses and levels of emotion regulation.

H2: There will be a significant difference in relationship anxiety across different relationship statuses and levels of emotion regulation.

2. Method

2.1 Participants

A total of 268 participants' responses were recorded. The majority of participants were female (N = 159) compared to male (N = 109). The inclusion criteria required participants to be adults aged between 18 and 60 years. Judgment sampling was employed to identify individuals who met specific inclusion criteria relevant to the study's objectives.

Table 1. *Sample Profile Distribution.*

Demographics	Value	Count
Gender	Female	159
	Male	109
Age Range	18-30	223
	30-45	31
	45-60	14

2.2 Scales

Participants self-reported their current relationship status. Relationship anxiety was measured using the anxiety subscale of the *Experiences in Close Relationships–Short Form (ECR-S)* developed by Wei et al. (2007).

The *Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale (RSE)* (Rosenberg, 1965) was used to assess self-esteem. This 10-item scale utilizes a 4-point Likert scale ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree.

Emotional regulation difficulties were assessed using the *Difficulties in Emotion Regulation Scale–Short Form (DERS-SF)* developed by Kaufman et al. (2015).

2.3 Data Analysis

Data were analysed using IBM SPSS Statistics software. Descriptive statistics were first computed to summarize the data. To examine group differences, a one-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was conducted. When significant differences were found, Tukey's Honestly Significant Difference (HSD) post hoc test was applied to identify specific group differences. Additionally, Pearson's correlation coefficient was computed to assess the relationships between key variables in the study.

3. Results

Table 2. Descriptive statistics of collected data for Relationship Status

Relationship Status	N	Mean	Standard Deviation
Single	138	3.6	9.4
Casual	9	3.6	9.5
Situationship	13	2.7	1.9
Relationship	65	2.6	1.9
Live-in	1	5.0	—
Married	39	2.7	2.0
Divorced	1	7.0	—
Separated	2	3.7	2.6

Table 3. Descriptive statistics of collected data for Emotional Regulation.

Emotional Regulation	N	Mean	Standard Deviation
Excellent	78	3.2	0.6
Moderate Difficulties	160	3.2	0.6
Significant Difficulties	28	3.2	0.6
Severe Difficulties	2	2.2	0.7

Table 4. Descriptive statistics of collected data for Self-Esteem and Relationship Anxiety.

Dimension	N	Mean	Standard Deviation
Self-Esteem	268	19.4	4.8
Relationship Anxiety	268	24.9	11.0

Table 5. One-Way ANOVA Summary Table for Self-Esteem by Relationship Status.

Source	SS	df	MS	F	p
Between Groups	752.96	7	107.57	5.24	.000
Within Groups	5337.20	260	20.53		
Total	6090.16	267			

A one-way ANOVA was conducted to examine the differences in self-esteem across various relationship statuses. The results revealed a significant effect of relationship status on self-esteem, with an F-value of 5.24, which was statistically significant ($p < .001$).

Table 6. *One-Way ANOVA Summary Table for Relationship Anxiety by Relationship Status.*

Source	SS	df	MS	F	p
Between Groups	220.08	7	31.44	2.33	0.25
Within Groups	3507.84	260	13.49		
Total	3727.92	267			

A one-way ANOVA was performed to assess the impact of relationship status on relationship anxiety. The results indicated no significant effect of relationship status on relationship anxiety, as the F-value was 2.33, with a p-value of 0.25, which is greater than the conventional threshold of 0.05.

Table 7. *One-Way ANOVA Summary Table for Self-Esteem by Emotional Regulation*

Source	SS	df	MS	F	p
Between Groups	1854.76	3	618.25	38.54	.000
Within Groups	4235.40	264	16.04		
Total	6090.16	267			

A one-way ANOVA was conducted to examine the effect of emotional regulation on self-esteem. The results revealed a significant main effect, with an F-value of 38.54, $p < .001$, indicating that emotional regulation significantly influences self-esteem.

Table 8. *One-Way ANOVA Summary Table for Relationship Anxiety by Emotional Regulation*

Source	SS	df	MS	F	p
Between Groups	22.89	3	7.63	.54	.653
Within Groups	3705.04	264	14.03		
Total	3727.92	267			

A one-way ANOVA was conducted to investigate the effect of emotional regulation on relationship anxiety. The results indicated no significant effect of emotional regulation on relationship anxiety, with an F-value of 0.54 and a p-value of 0.653, which is well above the conventional significance level of 0.05.

Table 9. *Tukey's HSD Post-Hoc Test for Differences in Self-Esteem Across Relationship Statuses*

Comparison (I – J)	Mean Difference	Std. Error	p-value	95% CI Lower	95% CI Upper
Single vs Casual	0.51	1.56	1.000	-4.25	5.28
Single vs Situationship	0.28	1.31	1.000	-3.73	4.30
Single vs Relationship	-1.58	0.68	.289	-3.66	0.50
Single vs Live-in	8.51	4.55	.571	-5.38	22.41
Single vs Married	-4.13	0.82	.000	-6.64	-1.62
Single vs Divorced	6.51	4.55	.841	-7.38	20.41
Single vs Separated	-4.49	3.23	.861	-14.35	5.38
Casual vs Situationship	-0.23	1.96	1.000	-6.23	5.77
Casual vs Relationship	-2.09	1.61	.899	-7.02	2.83
Casual vs Live-in	8.00	4.78	.703	-6.59	22.59
Casual vs Married	-4.64	1.68	.107	-9.76	0.48
Casual vs Divorced	6.00	4.78	.914	-8.59	20.59
Casual vs Separated	-5.00	3.54	.851	-15.82	5.82
Situationship vs Relationship	-1.86	1.38	.878	-6.07	2.34
Situationship vs Live-in	8.23	4.70	.654	-6.14	22.60
Situationship vs Married	-4.41	1.45	.052	-8.84	0.02
Situationship vs	6.23	4.70	.889	-8.14	20.60

Divorced					
Situationship vs Separated	-4.77	3.44	.863	-15.29	5.75
Relationship vs Live-in	10.09	4.57	.349	-3.86	24.04
Relationship vs Married	-2.55	0.92	.105	-5.35	0.26
Relationship vs Divorced	8.09	4.57	.639	-5.86	22.04
Relationship vs Separated	-2.91	3.25	.986	-12.85	7.03
Live-in vs Married	-12.64	4.59	.111	-26.66	1.38
Live-in vs Divorced	-2.00	6.41	1.000	-21.58	17.58
Live-in vs Separated	-13.00	5.55	.275	29.96	3.96
Married vs Divorced	10.64	4.59	.287	-3.38	24.66
Married vs Separated	0.36	3.28	1.000	-10.40	10.40
Divorced vs Separated	-11.00	5.55	.496	-27.96	5.96

The comparison of self-esteem across relationship statuses showed that only married individuals had significantly higher self-esteem than singles. This suggests that marriage might offer certain emotional or social benefits—like stability, validation, or long-term emotional investment—that contribute positively to how individuals view themselves.

Table 10. *Tukey's HSD Post-Hoc Test for Differences in Relationship Anxiety Across Relationship Statuses*

Comparison (I – J)	Mean Difference	Std. Error	p-value	95% CI Lower	95% CI Upper
Single vs Casual	2.25	1.26	.636	-1.62	6.11
Single vs Situationship	2.61	1.07	.224	-0.65	5.86
Single vs Relationship	-0.95	0.55	.677	-2.64	0.74

Single vs Live-in	2.91	3.69	.994	-8.35	14.18
Single vs Married	0.12	0.67	1.000	-1.92	2.15
Single vs Divorced	-0.09	3.69	1.000	-11.35	11.18
Single vs Separated	-3.09	2.62	.937	-11.08	4.91
Casual vs Situationship	0.36	1.59	1.000	-4.51	5.23
Casual vs Relationship	-3.19	1.31	.224	-7.19	0.80
Casual vs Live-in	0.67	3.87	1.000	-11.16	12.50
Casual vs Married	-2.13	1.36	.770	-6.28	2.02
Casual vs Divorced	-2.33	3.87	.999	-14.16	9.50
Casual vs Separated	-5.33	2.87	.581	-14.11	3.44
Situationship vs Relationship	-3.55	1.12	.034	-6.96	-0.14
Situationship vs Live-in	0.31	3.81	1.000	-11.34	11.96
Situationship vs Married	-2.49	1.18	.408	-6.08	1.11
Situationship vs Divorced	-2.69	3.81	.997	-14.34	8.96
Situationship vs Separated	-5.69	2.79	.457	-14.22	2.83
Relationship vs Live-in	3.86	3.70	.967	-7.45	12.17
Relationship vs Married	1.07	0.74	.841	-1.21	3.34
Relationship vs Divorced	0.86	3.70	1.000	-10.45	12.17
Relationship vs Separated	-2.14	2.64	.992	-10.20	5.92
Live-in vs Married	-2.79	3.72	.995	-14.16	8.57
Married vs Divorced	-0.21	3.72	1.000	-11.57	11.16

Separated vs Relationship	2.14	2.64	.992	-5.92	10.20
Married vs Separated	3.21	2.66	.930	-4.93	11.34
Divorced vs Separated	-11.00	5.55	.496	-27.96	5.96

The results of the group comparison analysis reveal several interesting findings regarding the mean differences between various relationship statuses. Notably, the comparison between "Single" and "Situationship" yielded a mean difference of 2.61, though this was not statistically significant ($p = .224$), indicating that people in a situationship do not report substantially different outcomes from those who are single.

Table 11. *Tukey's HSD Post-Hoc Test for Differences in Self-Esteem Across Emotional Regulation Levels.*

Comparison (I – J)	Mean Difference	Std. Error	<i>p-value</i>	95% CI Lower	95% CI Upper
Excellent vs. Moderate Difficulty	4.76	0.58	< .001	3.25	6.26
Excellent vs. Significant Difficulty	9.53	0.91	< .001	7.17	11.88
Excellent vs. Severe Difficulty	11.06	1.80	< .001	6.40	15.72
Moderate Difficulty vs. Excellent	-4.76	0.58	< .001	-6.26	-3.25
Moderate Difficulty vs. Significant Difficulty	4.77	0.85	< .001	2.58	6.96
Moderate Difficulty vs. Severe Difficulty	6.30	1.77	.002	1.73	10.88
Significant Difficulty vs. Moderate Difficulty	-4.77	0.85	< .001	-6.96	-2.58

Significant Difficulty vs. Severe Difficulty	1.53	1.90	.852	-3.39	6.46
Severe Difficulty vs. Excellent	-11.06	1.80	< .001	-15.72	-6.40
Severe Difficulty vs. Moderate Difficulty	-6.30	1.77	.002	-10.88	-1.73
Severe Difficulty vs. Significant Difficulty	-1.53	1.90	.852	-6.46	3.39

Tukey's HSD Post-Hoc Test results provide significant insights into the differences in self-esteem across varying levels of emotional regulation difficulty. The comparisons between "Excellent" emotional regulation and the other levels, "Moderate Difficulty," "Significant Difficulty," and "Severe Difficulty," demonstrate a strong pattern of increasing mean differences in self-esteem, with each comparison showing statistically significant results ($p < .001$).

Table 12. *Tukey's HSD Post-Hoc Test for Differences in Relationship Anxiety Across Emotional Regulation Levels.*

Comparison (I – J)	Mean Difference	Std. Error	<i>p-value</i>	95% CI Lower	95% CI Upper
Excellent vs. Moderate Difficulty	-0.10	0.53	.998	-1.48	1.28
Excellent vs. Significant Difficulty	0.65	0.83	.865	-1.51	2.80
Excellent vs. Severe Difficulty	-3.19	1.65	.215	-7.44	1.07
Moderate Difficulty vs. Excellent	0.10	0.53	.998	-1.28	1.48
Moderate Difficulty vs. Significant Difficulty	0.75	0.77	.770	-1.25	2.74
Moderate Difficulty vs. Severe Difficulty	-3.09	1.62	.226	-7.27	1.09

Significant Difficulty vs. Excellent	-0.65	0.83	.865	-2.80	1.51
Significant Difficulty vs. Moderate Difficulty	-0.75	0.77	.770	-2.74	1.25
Significant Difficulty vs. Severe Difficulty	-3.83	1.74	.124	-8.33	0.66
Severe Difficulty vs. Excellent	3.19	1.65	.215	-1.07	7.44
Severe Difficulty vs. Moderate Difficulty	3.09	1.62	.226	-1.09	7.27
Severe Difficulty vs. Significant Difficulty	3.83	1.74	.124	-0.66	8.33

The Tukey's HSD Post-Hoc Test results for relationship anxiety reveal mixed findings regarding the relationship between emotional regulation levels and anxiety in relationships. The comparison between "Excellent" emotional regulation and the other levels ("Moderate Difficulty," "Significant Difficulty," and "Severe Difficulty") shows no significant differences in relationship anxiety, with p-values above the commonly accepted threshold of 0.05.

Table 13. *Karl Pearson's Coefficient of Correlation for Relationship Status and Self-Esteem.*

Variable	RS	SE
Relationship Status	1	
Self Esteem	.270*	1

A Pearson correlation analysis was conducted to examine the relationship between relationship status and self-esteem. The results revealed a small but statistically significant positive correlation between relationship status and self-esteem, with a correlation coefficient of 0.270 ($p < .05$).

Table 14. *Karl Pearson's Coefficient of Correlation for Relationship Status and Relationship Anxiety.*

Variable	RS	RA
Relationship Status	1	

Relationship Anxiety	0.49	1
-----------------------------	------	---

A Pearson correlation analysis was conducted to examine the relationship between relationship status and relationship anxiety. The results indicated a very weak positive correlation of 0.049, which was not statistically significant.

Table 15. *Karl Pearson's Coefficient of Correlation for Emotional Regulation and Self-Esteem.*

Variable	ER	SE
Emotional Regulation	1	
Self Esteem	.522*	1

A Pearson correlation analysis was conducted to explore the relationship between emotional regulation and self-esteem. The results revealed a moderate and statistically significant positive correlation of 0.522 ($p < .05$), indicating that individuals who report better emotional regulation tend to have higher self-esteem.

Table 16. *Karl Pearson's Coefficient of Correlation for Emotional Regulation and Relationship Anxiety.*

Variable	ER	RA
Emotional Regulation	1	
Relationship Anxiety	-.041	1

A Pearson correlation analysis was conducted to examine the relationship between emotional regulation and relationship anxiety. The results showed a very weak negative correlation of -0.041, which was not statistically significant.

4. Discussion

The study examined the relationship status and emotion regulation as a factor in self-esteem and relationship anxiety in a heterogeneous sample aged 18 to 60 years. The results provide detailed data on the overlaps of the relational context and emotional functioning based on the well-validated measures, the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale (Rosenberg, 1965),

Difficulties in Emotion Regulation Scale-Short Form (Kaufman et al., 2015), and established statistical tests.

Among the most significant findings of the research, the relationship status was found to have a significant influence on self-esteem, as indicated by the one-way ANOVA ($F(7,260) = 5.24, p < .001$). According to post hoc tests (Tukey HSD), the self-esteem of married people was significantly higher than that of single people. This implies that marriage can offer some emotional and social benefits, including stability, validation, and long-term commitment, which can have a positive impact on self-perception. These results align with past literature indicating that the context and security of intimate relationships can support self-worth (Campbell et al., 2005; Baumeister & Leary, 1995).

The positive and moderate relationship between relationship status and self-esteem ($r = .27$) suggests that being in a relationship may be associated with higher self-worth; however, the direction of this association cannot be concluded due to the cross-sectional research design. This is consistent with the attachment theory (Bowlby, 1982; Mikulincer & Shaver, 2007), which implies that secure relational bonds are likely to promote a positive self-perception, whereas less safe or more ambiguous statuses (e.g., situationships, separation) can undermine self-esteem.

Emotion regulation had a strong correlation with self-esteem. The ANOVA results ($F(3,264) = 38.54, p < .001$) and the strong positive Pearson correlation ($r = .522$) show that the better the emotion regulation abilities, the greater the self-esteem and vice versa. These findings support the process model of emotion regulation proposed by Gross (1998, 2015), which focuses on adaptive regulation as a factor that protects against negative self-evaluation, and extend prior studies that have found a connection between emotion dysregulation and low self-worth (Aldao et al., 2010; Nezlek & Kuppens, 2008). This strong correlation also echoes with the self-determination theory (Deci & Ryan, 2000), which considers emotional self-regulation as a route to psychological well-being and good self-esteem.

Contrary to expectations, the impact of emotional regulation on relationship anxiety was not significant ($F(3,264) = 0.54, p = .653$), and the Pearson correlation ($r = -.041$) did not reveal a meaningful relationship. This is unlike other studies that have found that worse emotion regulation is associated with more relationship anxiety (Mikulincer & Shaver, 2019). The absence of a meaningful relationship in the present study could be attributed to limitations

in measurement, unmeasured confounding factors (including attachment style) or sample-related factors.

In the same way, the correlation between relationship status and relationship anxiety was not significant ($r = .049$) as was demonstrated by Simpson et al. (1996, 2007) who revealed that although relationship context can provide a framework within which individual differences in anxiety are expressed, more fundamental psychological processes, including attachment insecurity or chronic emotional dysregulation, tend to be more influential.

Overall, the findings show that relationship status has an impact on self-esteem but not necessarily on relationship anxiety. Conversely, emotion regulation has a positive influence on self-esteem but cannot moderate relationship-specific anxieties among this population. This suggests specific interventions: programs aimed at enhancing emotion regulation skills can be expected to raise self-worth, and interventions aimed at relationship anxiety may require more emphasis on attachment-related fears and maladaptive beliefs (Shaver & Mikulincer, 2012).

4.1 Strengths, Limitations, and Future Directions

The strengths of the current study are the diversity of the sample and the administration of psychometrically sound instruments. However, it is necessary to admit limitations. To begin with, the cross-sectional design does not allow causal inferences. Second, self-report measures can be subject to bias. Third, small cell sizes were present in the categories (e.g., “situationships,” “separated”), which may have lowered the statistical power of group comparisons.

Researchers could consider conducting longitudinal or experimental studies and incorporating qualitative data in the future to more comprehensively reflect the dynamics of relational transitions and emotional processes (Creswell & Poth, 2017). Also, clinical measures of attachment or history of trauma may provide a more complete picture of relationship anxieties.

5. Conclusion

Overall, the findings support existing psychological theories and provide novel insights at the population level. Emotion regulation is one of the key predictors of self-esteem, and the status of relationships is a significant contributor to self-worth, which confirms both traditional and modern psychological theories (Bowlby, 1982; Gross, 2015; Deci & Ryan, 2000).

Nonetheless, relationship anxiety is multifactorial and requires further investigation of the interaction of emotional, cognitive, and relational processes underlying it.

References

- Aldao, A., Nolen-Hoeksema, S., & Schweizer, S. (2010). Emotion-regulation strategies across psychopathology: A meta-analytic review. *Clinical Psychology Review*, 30(2), 217–237.
- Baumeister, R. F., & Leary, M. R. (1995). The need to belong: Desire for interpersonal attachments as a fundamental human motivation. *Psychological Bulletin*, 117(3), 497–529.
- Bowlby, J. (1982). *Attachment and loss: Vol. 1. Attachment (2nd ed.)*. Basic Books. (Original work published 1969)
- Campbell, L., Simpson, J. A., Boldry, J. G., & Kashy, D. A. (2005). Perceptions of conflict and support in romantic relationships: The role of attachment anxiety. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 88(3), 510–531.
- Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2017). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (4th ed.). Sage.
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2000). The “what” and “why” of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of behavior. *Psychological Inquiry*, 11(4), 227–268.
- Erol, R. Y., & Orth, U. (2014). Development of self-esteem and relationship satisfaction in couples: Two longitudinal studies. *Developmental Psychology*, 50 (9), 2291–2303. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0037370>
- Garnefski, N., Kraaij, V., & Spinhoven, P. (2001). “Negative life events, cognitive emotion regulation and emotional problems.” *Personality and Individual Differences*, 30(8), 1311–1327. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0191-8869\(00\)00113-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0191-8869(00)00113-6)
- Gross, J. J. (1998). “The emerging field of emotion regulation: An integrative review.” *Review of General Psychology*, 2(3), 271–299. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1089-2680.2.3.271>
- Gross, J. J. (2015). Emotion regulation: Current status and future prospects. *Psychological Inquiry*, 26(1), 1–26.
- Gross, J. J., & John, O. P. (2003). “Individual differences in two emotion-regulation processes: Implications for affect, relationships, and well-being.” *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 85(2), 348–362. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.85.2.348>

- Huppertz, C., Moll, G. H., & Boessen, A. (2013). "Emotion regulation strategies in adolescents with internalizing symptoms: Links to anxiety and depression." *Zeitschrift für Kinder- und Jugendpsychiatrie und Psychotherapie*, 41(4), 241–249. <https://doi.org/10.1024/1422-4917/a000240>
- Izard, C. E. (1978). On the ontogenesis of emotions and emotion-cognition relationships in infancy. In M. Lewis et al. (Eds.), *The development of affect* (pp. 389–413). Springer Science + Business Media.
- Juretić, J. (2018). Quality of close relationships and emotional regulation regarding social anxiety. *Psychiatria Danubina*, 30(4), 441–451. <https://doi.org/10.24869/psyd.2018.441>
- Kaufman, S. B., Quilty, L. C., Grazioplene, R. G., Hirsh, J. B., Peterson, J. B., & DeYoung, C. G. (2015). Openness to Experience and Intellect Differentially Predict Creative Achievement in the Arts and Sciences. *Journal of Personality*, 83(2), 248–258. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jopy.12156>
- Kemper, T. D. (1978). *A social interactional theory of emotions*. New York: Wiley.
- Kuppens, P., Raes, F., & Goossens, L. (2007). "Negative emotions and sources of life satisfaction: The role of emotion frequency." *Journal of Adolescence*, 30(6), 1173–1185. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.adolescence.2007.03.002>
- Leary, M. R. (1999). Making sense of self-esteem. In R. F. Baumeister (Ed.), *The self in social psychology* (pp. 195–211). Psychology Press. (Original work expounding sociometer theory)
- Mikulincer, M., & Shaver, P. R. (2007). *Attachment in adulthood: Structure, dynamics, and change*. Guilford Press.
- Mikulincer, M., & Shaver, P. R. (2019). *Attachment, personality, and social relationships: Advances in personal relationships*. Cambridge University Press.
- Nezlek, J. B., & Kuppens, P. (2008). Regulating positive and negative emotions in daily life. *Journal of Personality*, 76(3), 561–580.
- Novaco, R. W. (1976). The functions and regulation of the arousal of anger. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 133(10), 1124–1128.
- Rosenberg, M. (1965). *Society and the adolescent self-image*. Princeton University Press.
- Scovel, T. (1978). The effect of affect on foreign language learning: A review of the anxiety research. *Language Learning*, 28(1), 129–142.

- Shaver, P. R., & Mikulincer, M. (2012). Attachment theory and research: Resurrection of the psychodynamic approach to personality. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 46(5), 527–531.
- Simpson, J. A., Rholes, W. S., Campbell, L., & Wilson, C. (2007). Changes in attachment orientations across the transition to parenthood. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 39(4), 317–331.
- Spielmann, S. S., MacDonald, G., & Wilson, A. E. (2013). On the rejection of potential mates: Fear of being single predicts willingness to date less desirable others. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 105(6), 1049–1073. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0034628>
- Vollrath, M. E., Torgersen, L., Alnaes, R., & Gjerde, L. C. (2017). “Changes in emotion regulation from early to late adolescence: Associations with depressive and anxiety symptoms.” *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 58(11), 1238–1246. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jcpp.12737>