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Abstract

It is frequently anticipated that men and women will differ with regards to relationship anxiety and avoidance as well as in self-ratings of physical attractiveness, emotional and intellectual intelligence, and communication abilities. In this study we measured self-reported relationship anxiety and avoidance and self-reported variables assessing various aspects of self-worth. There were a total of 232 participants, comprised of 116 heterosexual couples (116 men and 116 women). The average age of participants was 21.6; 80% were college students. Preliminary analyses showed that there were not many significant differences between the genders regarding relationship experiences or self-worth variables. Women reported marginally more relationship anxiety than men. Women also reported marginally higher self-reported emotional intelligence than men. There were not any gender differences on the other variables. Regarding associations between the self-worth and relationship variables, men's self-reported physical attractiveness was negatively correlated with relationship avoidance, but not correlated with relationship anxiety. Women's self-reported physical attractiveness was negatively correlated with relationship anxiety but not correlated with relationship avoidance, opposite to the men's results. Regarding self-reported intellectual intelligence there were no significant correlations with relationship anxiety or avoidance for both men and women. Self-reported emotional intelligence was negatively correlated with relationship avoidance but not correlated with relationship anxiety for men. A similar pattern emerged for women: self-reported emotional intelligence was not correlated with anxiety, and was marginally negatively correlated with avoidance. In terms of communication ability, both men's and women's self-reported abilities were negatively correlated with both anxiety and avoidance. Lastly, relationship anxiety and avoidance are positively correlated with each other. These findings illustrate that there are not many gender differences in self-reported self-worth variables or relationship avoidance, though women did report marginally more relationship anxiety. Additionally, gender difference emerged in the relationships between self-worth variables and relationship anxiety and avoidance, though overall, higher emotional intelligence, physical attractiveness, and communication abilities were associated with less relationship anxiety and avoidance.
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INTRODUCTION

It is frequently anticipated that men and women will differ with regards to relationship anxiety and avoidance as well as in self-ratings of physical attractiveness, emotional and intellectual intelligence, and communication abilities. In this study we measured self-reported relationship anxiety and avoidance and self-reported variables assessing various aspects of self-worth. Kenny and Sirin (2006), state that if a child has a caretaker that is sensitive and responsive to their emotional and physical needs then they will develop a sense of security. The child could have the confidence to explore his or her environment, and become a well adjusted adult. In the same study, Kenny and Sirin also state that if a child is raised with a caretaker that is insensitive and unreliable he or she could become unltrusting and believe themselves to be unworthy. Avoidant attachment style is an attachment style characterized by a suppression of attachment needs because attempts to be intimate have been previously rebuffed; people with this style find it difficult to develop intimate relationships. Anxious/ambivalent attachment style is an attachment style characterized by a concern that others will not reciprocate one’s desire for intimacy, resulting in higher-than-average levels of anxiety (Armon, Wilson, & Akert, 2005). In this study we sought to find if there is a difference between men and women when it comes to self-reported ratings of physical attractiveness, intelligence, emotional intelligence, and communication ability? Also, is there a relationship between the self-reported ratings and their relationship attachment style?

METHODS

There were a total of 232 participants, comprised of 116 heterosexual couples (116 men and 116 women). The average age of participants was 21.6; 80% were college students. Students in a Psychology 101 class were asked to participate in this study. The students brought in their partners. They could be married, engaged, or dating. The partners participated in a questioner study. In our survey, the Relationship items include two subscales from The Experiences in Close Relationships-Revised (ECR-R) Questionnaire by Fraley, Waller, and Brennan (2000). There are 18 “anxiety” items and 17 “avoidance” items.

ABSTRACT

In this study we measured self-reported relationship anxiety and avoidance and variables assessing various aspects of self-worth. There were a total of 116 heterosexual couples. The average age of participants was 21.6. We found that there are not many gender differences in self-reported self-worth variables or relationship anxiety, avoidance, though women did report marginally more relationship anxiety. Additionally, gender difference emerged in the relationship between self-worth variables and relationship anxiety and avoidance, though overall, higher emotional intelligence, physical attractiveness, and communication abilities were associated with less relationship anxiety and avoidance.

DISCUSSION

Relationship avoidant individuals have an inclination for distance and self-reliance and view interdependency and intimacy as threatening. When relationship avoidant individuals feel threatened, they often display defensive characteristics (Mukulincer et al, 2010). Men that report low values on physical attractiveness may feel a heightened sense of threat in their dating relationship and may display more relationship avoidance such as distancing themselves from their dating partner as a result. On the other hand, attachment-ambiverted individuals tend to have an intense fear of rejection and separation and have strong desires for security and closeness which causes them to focus on the potential rewards of intimacy and hold positive attitudes about dating relationships and their dating partners (Hazan & Shaver, 1987; Downey & Feldman, 1996). Women that report low values on physical attractiveness may be encouraged to draw closer to their dating partners due to a desire for intimacy and security.

Relationship avoidant individuals tend to view intimacy and closeness as aversive states and feel vulnerable revealing their core-selves (Rowe & Carnelley, 2005). Individuals that self-report low values on emotional intelligence may engage in relationship avoidant behaviors due to a heightened sense of discomfort in disclosing their feelings and emotions.

Confidence in communication ability correlates with relationship security between dating partners (Duesmier & Kobak, 2001).

Overall, higher emotional intelligence, physical attractiveness, and communication abilities were associated with less relationship anxiety and avoidance. The higher values individuals report of these self-worth variables, the more secure they feel in their relationships.

CORELATIONS BETWEEN SELF-WORTH & RELATIONSHIP VARIABLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>RELATIONSHIP ANXIETY</th>
<th>RELATIONSHIP AVOIDANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PHYSICAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATTRACTIVENESS</td>
<td><strong>.06</strong></td>
<td><strong>.05</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTELLIGENCE</td>
<td><strong>.29</strong></td>
<td><strong>.27</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMOTIONAL</td>
<td><strong>.27</strong></td>
<td><strong>.25</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMUNICATION</td>
<td><strong>.26</strong></td>
<td><strong>.29</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABILITY</td>
<td><strong>.20</strong></td>
<td><strong>.20</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MEN</strong></td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WOMEN</strong></td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MEN</strong></td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.27**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WOMEN</strong></td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.27**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MEN</strong></td>
<td><strong>.26</strong></td>
<td><strong>.29</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WOMEN</strong></td>
<td><strong>.24</strong></td>
<td><strong>.29</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

= p < .10, *p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001
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