INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES BULLETIN
ISSN: (E) 3007-1917 (P) 3007-1909

Volume 4, Issue 6, 2026

THE MODERATING ROLES OF SELF-REFLECTION AND INSIGHT IN THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN INSECURE ATTACHMENT AND CONFLICTS IN ROMANTIC RELATIONSHIPS

Ms. Ayesha[1], Dr. Noreen Jaffri[2], Ms. Bakhtawar[*3]

[1,2,*3]*Bahria University Karachi Campus*

[1]ayeshatariq376@gamil.com, [2]noreenjaffri.ipp@bahria.edu.pk, [*3]bakhtawar.ipp@bahria.edu.pk

Corresponding Author: *
Ms. Bakhtawar

DOI: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.20726733

Received	Accepted	Published
08 April 2026	20 May 2026	05 June 2026

ABSTRACT

The present study aimed to examine the relationship between insecure attachment and conflicts in romantic relationships, with self-reflection and self-insight as moderating variables among young adults. It was hypothesized that insecure attachment would be significantly associated with romantic relationship conflicts and that self-reflection and self-insight would moderate this relationship. A correlational quantitative research design was employed. The sample consisted of 154 adults aged 20–40 years who had been in a romantic relationship for no longer than two years. Participants completed the Experiences in Close Relationships Scale–Short Form (ECR-S; Wei et al., 2007), the Romantic Partner Conflict Scale (RPCS; Zacchilli et al., 2009), and the Self-Reflection and Insight Scale–Short Form (SRIS-SF; Silvia, 2022). Data was analyzed using SPSS-26 to examine correlations and moderation effects. Results indicated significant associations between both dimensions of insecure attachment, anxious, and avoidant and various forms of romantic relationship conflict. Self-reflection and self-insight partially moderated these relationships, with significant but small interaction effects observed in two models. Additional analyses using independent samples t tests and ANOVA revealed significant demographic differences across key variables. Overall, the findings highlight the role of attachment-related tendencies in romantic conflict and suggest that self-evaluative processes may influence this association.

Keywords: *insecure attachment, romantic relationship conflict, self-reflection, self-insight, moderation*

INTRODUCTION

Human connections are fundamental to psychological and emotional well-being. Among these connections, romantic relationships represent one of the most significant domains of adult life. Conflict is one of the most common challenges couples encounters. Although conflict is inevitable and not inherently maladaptive, the manner in which partners manage disagreements determines whether conflict strengthens or weakens the relationship.

Attachment theory proposes that early interactions with care-givers shape individuals' internal working models of self and others (Bowlby, 1973, 1980). These early experiences influence expectations regarding trust, intimacy, and emotional regulation in later relationships. When caregivers are responsive and consistent, individuals develop secure attachment patterns. In contrast, inconsistent or neglectful caregiving may lead to insecure attachment, compromising beliefs about relational safety and self-worth (Mikulincer

& Shaver, 2007). These attachment orientations often persist into adulthood and influence emotional responses and behavioral patterns in romantic relationships.

Adult insecure attachment is commonly conceptualized along two continuous dimensions: attachment anxiety and attachment avoidance (Brennan et al., 1998). Individuals high in attachment anxiety tend to fear abandonment and rejection, exhibit heightened emotional reactivity, and seek reassurance from partners. Conversely, individuals high in attachment avoidance experience discomfort with intimacy and emotional dependence, often suppressing attachment-related needs to maintain independence. Both forms of insecurity are associated with relational difficulties and maladaptive conflict patterns.

Conflict in romantic relationships is a dynamic interpersonal process involving cognitive, emotional, and behavioral components (Barki & Hartwick, 2001). Although conflict may foster growth when handled constructively, destructive conflict characterized by hostility, withdrawal, manipulation, or aggression can undermine relationship satisfaction and stability (Wagner et al., 2013). Research consistently demonstrates that anxiously attached individuals tend to engage in hyperactivating strategies, including emotional escalation and rumination, whereas avoidantly attached individuals employ deactivating strategies, such as withdrawal and emotional suppression (Mikulincer & Shaver, 2007). These patterns increase the likelihood of destructive conflict behaviors and reduce relational satisfaction.

Extensive empirical evidence supports the association between insecure attachment and romantic conflict. Anxious attachment has been linked to heightened conflict perception, emotional distress, and demand-withdraw patterns (Campbell et al., 2005; Li & Chan, 2012). Avoidant attachment has been associated with withdrawal, disengagement, and lower relationship adjustment (Bretaña et al., 2022; Šakotić-Kurbalija et al., 2022). More recent findings indicate that insecure attachment predicts reduced relationship satisfaction, increased emotional dysregulation, and maladaptive communication styles during conflict (Girme et al., 2021; Momeñe et al., 2024). Despite substantial evidence linking insecure attachment to conflict behaviors, the psychological processes that may buffer or intensify this relationship remain insufficiently explored.

Two internal regulatory processes that may influence this association are self-reflection and self-insight. Self-reflection refers to the intentional examination of one's thoughts, emotions, and behaviors (Grant et al., 2002). It involves active cognitive engagement in evaluating personal experiences and responses. Self-insight, in contrast, reflects clarity and understanding regarding one's internal states and behavioral patterns. While self-reflection represents the process of introspection, self-insight reflects the outcome of that process (Grant et al., 2002; Silvia & Phillips, 2011).

A study suggests that self-reflection and insight can promote adaptive psychological functioning when not characterized by rumination. Self-insight has been consistently associated with greater well-being, emotional regulation, and interpersonal effectiveness (Stein & Grant, 2014). Self-reflection, when constructive rather than ruminative, may enhance resilience and empathy (Bucknell et al., 2022; Joireman et al., 2002). However, limited research has examined whether these processes moderate the relationship between attachment insecurity and romantic conflict.

The existing literature demonstrates strong associations between insecure attachment and relational difficulties; however, several gaps remain. First, much of the research has emphasized anxious attachment, with comparatively less focus on avoidant attachment within dyadic conflict contexts (Bretaña et al., 2020). Second, although self-reflection and insight have been examined in relation to psychological well-being, their potential moderating role in romantic conflict among insecurely attached individuals remains underexplored. Third, indigenous research examining these variables collectively within the Pakistani context is scarce.

Attachment patterns play a critical role in shaping emotional and behavioral responses in romantic

relationships. Anxious attachment involves hyperactivating strategies, leading to heightened emotional reactivity and fear of rejection, whereas avoidant attachment involves deactivating strategies, characterized by emotional suppression and relational distancing (Brennan et al., 1998; Mikulincer & Shaver, 2016). Relational Turbulence Theory explains that periods of uncertainty and partner interference intensify conflicts, particularly for insecurely attached individuals (Knobloch & Solomon, 2004). However, self-reflection and insight enable individuals to understand their thoughts, emotions, and behaviors, promoting emotional regulation and adaptive conflict resolution (Atkins & Murphy, 1994; Grant et al., 2002). Grounded in these perspectives, this study examines the relationship between insecure attachment and conflicts in romantic relationships, while exploring the moderating roles of self-reflection and insight. It is hypothesized that insecure attachment predicts relational conflicts and that higher self-reflection and insight reduce their impact.

Rationale of the Study

Romantic relationships are often affected by conflicts, which can be influenced by insecure attachment patterns (anxious and avoidant) through hyperactivating or deactivating strategies. While prior research shows that insecure attachment predicts conflict behaviors, the moderating roles of self-reflection and self-insight in this process remain underexplored, especially in emerging adults and non-Western contexts like Pakistan. Examining these moderators can clarify how reflective and insightful capacities influence adaptive or maladaptive responses in romantic conflicts. This study aims to provide a nuanced understanding of these relationships, contributing to interventions that enhance relationship functioning and emotional well-being.

By identifying psychological processes that may buffer maladaptive relational patterns, this study contributes to relational psychology and offers implications for therapeutic interventions aimed at improving romantic relationship functioning.

Objectives

- To investigate the relationship between insecure attachment and conflicts in romantic relationships.
- To investigate the potential moderating role of self-reflection in the relationship between insecure attachment and conflicts in romantic relationships.
- To investigate the potential moderating role of self-insight in the relationship between insecure attachment and conflicts in romantic relationships.

Hypotheses

- Insecure Attachment Styles (Anxious and Avoidant) have a significant relationship with Conflicts in Romantic Relationships.
- Self-reflection will moderate the relationship between Insecure Attachment Styles and Conflicts in Romantic Relationships.
- Self-Insight will moderate the relationship between Insecure Attachment Styles and Conflict in Romantic Relationships.

Method

Research Design

The design of the following study was correlational quantitative survey-based research design. It explored the relationship between insecure attachment and conflicts in romantic relationships. Insecure attachment was the predictor variable. Conflicts in romantic relationships was the criterion variable. Additionally, self-reflection and insight moderating variables between insecure attachment and conflicts in romantic relationships.

Participants

Through purposive-convenience sampling techniques, a sample population of 154 participants was selected. The participants ages ranged between 20 to 40, comprising of 107 females and 47 males, indicating a higher proportion of female respondents.

Inclusion Criteria and Exclusion Criteria

- Participants will be between the age ranges of 20-40 and live in Karachi.

- Individuals are currently engaged in a heterosexual romantic relationship for a minimum of 2 years, without children - including pre-marital and marital relationships.
- Participants, with basic understanding of the English language to sufficiently understand and complete the required measures.

Participants who did not meet the above-mentioned criteria were excluded.

Measures

Romantic Partner Conflict Scale (RPCS; Zacchilli et al., 2009)

Developed by Zacchilli et al. (2009), this psychological instrument is widely used for measuring everyday conflict experienced by individuals in romantic relationships. It includes 39 items with six subscales: Compromise, Avoidance, Interactional Reactivity, Separation, Domination, and submission. This self-report questionnaire is based on a 5-point Likert scale, ranging from four, which indicates 'strongly agree, to zero, indicating 'strongly disagree'. The total scores are computed for each subscale using the following guide: Compromise: Items 1-14; Avoidance: Items 15-17; Interactional Reactivity: Items 18-23; Separation: Items 24-28; Domination: Items 29-34; Submission: Items 35-39. A higher score on the scale signifies higher conflicts in the relationship and vice versa, with highest score being 156 and lowest score being 39. Internal reliability for each subscale is as follows: Compromise (α = .95), Domination (α = .87), Avoidance (α = .82), Submission (α = .82), Separation (α = .83), and Interactional Reactivity (α = .82).

Experiences in Close Relationship Scale (ECR-S; Wei et al., 2007)

Originally introduced by Brennan et al. (1998), Experiences in Close Relationships Scale, assesses two dimensions of insecure attachment: anxiety and avoidance, measured by 36-items. For the purpose of this research, its short-form questionnaire, Experiences in Close relationships (ECR-S) was utilized, developed by Wei et al. (2007). This scale includes 12 items, with six items assessing attachment anxiety and six items assessing attachment avoidance. It is based on a 7-point Likert scale, ranging from seven, indicating 'strongly agree', to one, indicating 'strongly disagree', with higher scores indicating greater attachment difficulties. Scoring for each subscale is computed independently, with some items reverse-scored. Cronbach Alpha for Anxiety subscale was 0.78 and 0.84 for the Avoidance subscale.

Self-Reflection and Insight Scale – Short Form (SRIS; Silvia, 2022)

The original 20-item Self-Reflection and Insight scale was developed by Grant et al. (2002). For the purpose of this research, its short-form version - developed by Silvia (2022) – was selected, consisting of 12 items measuring two dimensions of private self-consciousness: six items measuring self-reflection and six items measuring insight. The scale is based on a 7-point Likert scale, ranging from seven, indicating 'strongly agree', to one indicating 'strongly disagree'. Higher scores on both dimensions indicate higher levels of self-reflection and insight. Responses were scored by computing the average of the items in both subscales, generating continuous scores, with some items needing reverse-scoring. Cronbach Alpha of Self-reflection and insight is reported to be .87 and .83 respectively, demonstrating strong internal reliability.

Procedure

For this research, permission was taken from respective authors to utilize the scales through email. Since the focus of the study included young adults, permission was also taken from various institutions for data collection. Participants were briefed about the study and given opportunity to ask any questions during the process of filling out forms. This process took approximately 15 minutes. The questionnaire included informed consent form, demographics information, Romantic Partner Conflict Scale, Experiences in Close Relationship Scale – Short Form, and Self-reflection and Insight Scale – Short Form, administered in the respective order. Data analysis was done using Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) Version 26.0. Analyses included

Descriptive Statistics, Correlational analysis, Moderation analysis, Independent t-tests, Analysis of Variance (ANOVA). Psychometric properties of the scales were examined through Cronbach Alpha to determine internal reliability.

Ethical Considerations

The research ensured each participant's voluntary participation and informed consent by providing them with the consent form. Moreover, participants' identity and responses were kept strictly confidential. They are well-informed regarding the aim of the research. This research also ensured minimum potential for harm to the participants. Withdrawal rights were conveyed to the participants to ensure they do not feel any coercion to participate in the study.

Results

This chapter provides a detailed summary on the results calculated by conducting a series of statistical analysis using Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS 26). The results include Descriptive statistics, Alpha Reliability of the scales, Correlation Analysis, Moderation Analysis, Independent T-test, and additional ANOVA findings.

Table 5.1

Demographics of the Participants (N=154)

Variables	*M*	*SD*	*n*	%
Age	23.8	3.2		
20-22			71	46.1
23-25			42	27.3
26-28			29	18.8
29+			12	7.8
Gender				
Male			47	30.5
Female			107	69.5
Marital Status				
Married			43	27.9
Engaged			25	16.2
Committed			86	55.8
Current Relationship Duration				
1 to 1.6 years			55	35.7
1.7 to 2 years			86	55.8
2.1+ years			13	8.4
Living Situation				
Living with spouse/partner			44	28.6
Not living with spouse/partner			110	71.4
Family Structure				
Nuclear			94	61.0
Joint			55	35.7
Other			5	3.2
Religion				
Islam			148	96.1
Agnostic			1	.6
Hinduism			1	.6
Didn't Respond			4	2.6
Ethnicity				
Urdu Speaking			50	32.5

IEER Institute for Excellence in Education & Research

Punjabi	19	12.3
Sindhi	9	5.8
Pathan	5	3.2
Baloch	3	1.9
Memon	4	2.6
Gujrati	4	2.6
Saraiki	2	1.3
Didn't Respond	58	37.7
Last Academic Qualification		
Matric/O Levels	1	.6
Intermediate/ A Levels	63	40.9
Bachelors	60	39.0
Masters	28	18.2
PhD	1	.6
Other	1	.6
Employment Status		
Employed Full Time	26	16.9
Employed Part Time	14	9.1
Self Employed	16	10.4
Unemployed	20	13.0
Student	70	45.5
Other	8	5.2
Monthly Income		
Rs 30,000 to 50,000	9	5.8
Rs 51,000 to 70,000	12	7.8
Rs 71,000 to 90,000	17	11.0
Rs 91,000+	116	75.3
Socioeconomic Status		
Lower Class	1	.6
Lower Middle Class	7	4.5
Middle Class	70	45.5
Upper Middle Class	65	42.2
Upper Class	11	7.1

Note. n = no. of responses, % = percentage of responses

IEER
Institute for Excellence in Education & Research

The Table 1 provides the demographics of the participants with age, gender, marital status, current relationship duration, living situation, family structure, religion, ethnicity, last academic qualification, employment status, monthly income, and socioeconomic status. These demographics show most respondents between the ages of 20-22 (46.1%), with more female responders (69.5%), in a committed relationship with a duration of 1.7 to 2 years (55.8%). Most participants were not living with their spouse/partner (71.4%). Majority of the participants were Muslim (96.1%), Urdu Speaking (32.5%), belonging to middle-upper middle class (42.2% – 45.5%) with a monthly income of Rs 91,000+ (75.3%). These participants were mostly students (45.5%), either having completed their intermediate/A-Levels education (40.9%) or completing their undergraduate degrees (39.0%).

Table 5.2

Psychometric Properties for Scales and Subscales of Experiences in Close Relationship, Self-reflection & Insight and Romantic Partner Conflict Scale (N=154)

Variable	*α*	*M*	*SD*	*SK*	*K*	Range	
						Actual	Potential
Experiences in Close Relationship Scale							
Anxiety	.57	23.6	6.9	.07	-.21	6-42	6-42
Avoidance	.76	17.5	8.1	.27	-.97	6-39	6-42
Self-reflection & Insight Scale							
Self-Reflection	.90	31.4	8.3	-.83	.17	6-42	6-42
Insight	.81	23.1	8.5	.33	-.63	6-42	6-42
Romantic Partner Conflict Scale							
Compromise	.89	40.5	10.3	-1.00	.85	9-56	0-56
Avoidance	.68	7.4	3.0	-.38	-.62	0-12	0-12
Interactional Reactivity	.83	8.0	5.8	.45	-.63	0-24	0-24
Separation	.79	9.8	4.7	-.10	-.81	0-20	0-20
Domination	.89	7.6	5.7	.33	-.91	0-20	0-24
Submission	.83	10.6	4.9	-.38	-.58	0-20	0-20

Note. M= Mean, SD= Standard Deviation, SK = Skewness, K = Kurtosis

The Table 2 provides psychometric properties including reliability of scale and subscales of Experiences in Close Relationship, Self-reflection & Insight and Romantic Partner Conflict Scale. Reliability of all scales lie in the acceptable range, scales and subscales having excellent reliability include Self-Reflection Subscale (*α*=.90). Scales and subscales having a good reliability include Compromise Subscale (*α*=.89), Domination Subscale (*α*=.89), Interactional Reactivity Subscale (*α*=.83), Submission Subscale (*α*=.83), and Insight Subscale (*α*=.81). Scales having an acceptable reliability include Separation Subscale (*α*=.79), Avoidance Subscale of ECRS (*α*= .76), and lastly, scales having low but acceptable reliability include Avoidance Subscale of RPCS (*α*=.68) and Anxiety Subscale (*α*=.57) in ECRS. Furthermore, the data shows normal distribution for all variables.

Table 5.3

Correlational Analysis between Scales and Subscales of Experiences in Close Relationship, Self-Reflection & Insight and Romantic Partner Conflict Scale (N=154)

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1.ECRS_Anxiety	-	.38**	.05	-.37**	-.22**	.07	.38**	.18*	.33**	.30**
2. ECRS_Avoidance		-	-.16*	-.37**	-.45**	.06	.44**	.00	.32**	.16*
3. SRIS_Self-Reflection			-	.02	.25**	.19*	-.07	.08	-.05	.10
4. SRIS_Self-Insight				-	.15	-.07	-.28**	-.15	-.37**	-.21**
5. RPCS_Compromise					-	.11	-.33**	.14	-.17*	-.13
6. RPCS_Avoidance						-	-.01	-.02	.00	.25**
7. RPCS_Interactional Reactivity							-	.29**	.54**	.35**
8. RPCS_Separation								-	.23**	.19*

9. RPCS_Domination	-	.39**
10. RPCS_Submission		-

Note. *p < .05. **p < .01.

The above-mentioned Table shows that there is a significant moderate positive correlation between Experiences in Close Relationship Scale (Anxiety) with Romantic Partner Conflict Scale subscales, including Interactional Reactivity (r=.38), Domination (r=.33), and Submission (r=.30). There is a significant low positive correlation found between ECRS (Anxiety) with RPCS subscale – Separation (r=.18). Additionally, a significant moderate negative correlation was found between ECRS (Anxiety) with RPCS subscale – Compromise (r=-22). No significant relationship was found between ECRS (Anxiety) and RPCS subscale – Avoidance (r=.07). For ECRS (Avoidance), significant moderate positive correlation was found with RPCS subscales, including Interactional Reactivity (r=.44), and Domination (r=.32). There is a significant low positive correlation between ECRS (Avoidance) and RPCS subscale – Submission (r=.16). Additionally, a significant moderate negative correlation was found between ECRS (Avoidance) and RPCS subscale – Compromise (r=-.45). No significant relationship was found between ECRS (Avoidance) and RPCS subscales, including Avoidance (r=.06) and Separation (r=.00). Correlation analysis for Self-Reflection and Insight Scale (Self-Reflection) shows significant low positive correlation with Romantic Partner Conflict subscales, including Compromise (r=.25) and Avoidance (r=.19). There is a significant low negative correlation between SRIS (Self-Reflection) and ECRS-Avoidance (r=-.16). Correlation analysis for Self-Reflection and Insight Scale (Self-Insight) shows significant moderate negative correlation with both ECRS – Anxiety and Avoidance (r=-.37) and with RPCS subscale, Domination (r=-.37). Additionally, there is a significant low negative correlation between SRIS (Self-Insight) and RPCS subscales, including Interactional Reactivity (r=-.28) and Submission (r=-.21).

Table 5.4

Moderation Analysis for Self-Insight & Self-Reflection (Self-Reflection) on the Relationship between Experiences in Close Relationship - Anxiety and Romantic Partner Conflict Scale – Compromise (N=154)

Variables	*R*	*R²*	*F*	*ΔR²*	*p*	*β*	95% CI	
							LL	*UL*
Constant	.35	.12	6.89		.00	40.53	38.98	42.08
ECRS_ANX					.00	-0.35	-.57	-.12
SRIS_SR					.00	0.32	.13	.51
ECRS_ANX*SRIS_SR				.00	.71	-0.00	-.03	.02

Note. ECRS_ANX= Experiences in Close Relationship Scale_Anxiety, SRIS_SR= Self-Reflection & Insight Scale_Self-Reflection, β = Standardized beta, R^2= Coefficient of determination, *F*= Statistics, ΔR^2= Adjusted R-square

As shown in Table 5.4, no significant moderation effect was found between Experiences in Close Relationship - Anxiety and Romantic Partner Conflict Scale -Compromise. Therefore, there is no role of Self-Reflection as a moderator in the relationship between Experiences in Close Relationship - Anxiety and Romantic Partner Conflict Scale - Compromise.

Table 5.4.1

Moderation Analysis for Self-Insight & Self-Reflection (Self-Reflection) on the Relationship between Experiences in Close Relationship - Anxiety and Romantic Partner Conflect Scale –Avoidance (N=154)

Variables	*R*	*R²*	*F*	*ΔR²*	*p*	*β*	95% CI	
							LL	*UL*
Constant	.21	.04	2.21		.09	7.42	6.95	7.90
ECRS_ANX					.45	.03	-.04	.10
SRIS_SR					.02	.07	.01	.13
ECRS_ANX*SRIS_SR				.00	.70	.00	-.01	.01

Note. ECRS_ANX= Experiences in Close Relationship Scale_Anxiety, SRIS_SR= Self-Reflection & Insight Scale_Self-Reflection, *β* = Standardized beta, R^2= Coefficient of determination, *F*= Statistics, *ΔR²*= Adjusted R-square

As shown in Table 5.4.1, no significant moderation effect was found between Experiences in Close Relationship - Anxiety and Romantic Partner Conflict Scale - Avoidance. Therefore, there is no role of Self-Reflection as a moderator in the relationship between Experiences in Close Relationship - Anxiety and Romantic Partner Conflict Scale - Avoidance.

Table 5.4.2

Moderation Analysis for Self-Insight & Self-Reflection (Self-Reflection) on the Relationship between Experiences in Close Relationship - Anxiety and Romantic Partner Conflict Scale –Interactional Reactivity (N=154)

Variables	*R*	*R²*	*F*	*ΔR²*	*p*	*β*	95% CI	
							LL	*UL*
Constant	.42	.18	7.97		.00	10.42	7.30	, 13.54
ECRS_ANX					.00	0.31	.18	.43
SRIS_SR					.27	-0.06	-.16	.05
ECRS_ANX*SRIS_SR				.01	.19	-0.01	-0.02	.00

Note. ECRS_ANX= Experiences in Close Relationship Scale_Anxiety, SRIS_SR= Self-Reflection & Insight Scale_Self-Reflection, *β* = Standardized beta, R^2= Coefficient of determination, *F*= Statistics, *ΔR²*= Adjusted R-square

As shown in Table 5.4.2, no significant moderation effect was found between Experiences in Close Relationship - Anxiety and Romantic Partner Conflict Scale – Interactional Reactivity. Therefore, there is no role of Self-Reflection as a moderator in the relationship between Experiences in Close Relationship - Anxiety and Romantic Partner Conflict Scale - Interactional Reactivity.

Table 5.4.3

Moderation Analysis for Self-Insight & Self-Reflection (Self-Reflection) on the Relationship between Experiences in Close Relationship - Anxiety and Romantic Partner Conflict Scale –Separation (N=154)

Variables	*R*	*R²*	*F*	*ΔR²*	*p*	*β*	95% CI	
							LL	*UL*
Constant	.20	.04	2.13		.00	9.79	9.04	10.54
ECRS_ANX					.03	.12	.01	.23
SRIS_SR					.42	.04	-.05	.13
ECRS_ANX*SRIS_SR				.00	.44	-.00	-.02	.01

Note. ECRS_ANX= Experiences in Close Relationship Scale_Anxiety, SRIS_SR= Self-Reflection & Insight Scale_Self-Reflection, β = Standardized beta, R^2= Coefficient of determination, *F*= Statistics, ΔR^2= Adjusted R-square

As shown in Table 5.4.3, no significant moderation effect was found between Experiences in Close Relationship - Anxiety and Romantic Partner Conflict Scale - Separation. Therefore, there is no role of Self-Reflection as a moderator in the relationship between Experiences in Close Relationship - Anxiety and Romantic Partner Conflict Scale - Separation.

Table 5.4.4

Moderation Analysis for Self-Insight & Self-Reflection (Self-Reflection) on the Relationship between Experiences in Close Relationship - Anxiety and Romantic Partner Conflict Scale –Domination (N=154)

Variables	*R*	R^2	*F*	ΔR^2	*p*	β	95% CI	
							LL	*UL*
Constant	.44	.20	9.15		.00	12.84	9.81	15.86
ECRS_ANX					.00	.24	.12	.37
SRIS_SR					.48	-.04	-.14	.06
ECRS_ANX*SRIS_SR				.01	.17	-.01	-.02	.00
Covariate (Last Academic Qualification)					.00	-1.87	-2.92	-.83

Note. ECRS_ANX= Experiences in Close Relationship Scale_Anxiety, SRIS_SR= Self-Reflection & Insight Scale_Self-Reflection, β = Standardized beta, R^2= Coefficient of determination, *F*= Statistics, ΔR^2= Adjusted R-square

As shown in Table 5.4.4, no significant moderation effect was found between Experiences in Close Relationship - Anxiety and Romantic Partner Conflict Scale - Domination. Therefore, there is no role of Self-Reflection as a moderator in the relationship between Experiences in Close Relationship - Anxiety and Romantic Partner Conflict Scale - Domination.

Table 5.4.5

Moderation Analysis for Self-Insight & Self-Reflection (Self-Reflection) on the Relationship between Experiences in Close Relationship - Anxiety and Romantic Partner Conflict Scale –Submission (N=154)

Variables	*R*	R^2	*F*	ΔR^2	*p*	β	95% CI	
							LL	*UL*
Constant	.40	.16	7.24		.00	14.51	11.90	17.13
ECRS_ANX					.00	.18	.08	.29
SRIS_SR					.21	.06	-.03	.14
ECRS_ANX*SRIS_SR				.01	.17	-.01	-.02	.00
Covariate (Last Academic Qualification)					.00	-1.38	-2.28	-.48

Note. ECRS_ANX= Experiences in Close Relationship Scale_Anxiety, SRIS_SR= Self-Reflection & Insight Scale_Self-Reflection, β = Standardized beta, R^2= Coefficient of determination, *F*= Statistics, ΔR^2= Adjusted R-square

As shown in Table 5.4.5, no significant moderation effect was found between Experiences in Close Relationship - Anxiety and Romantic Partner Conflict Scale - Submission. Therefore, there is no role of Self-Reflection as a moderator in the relationship between Experiences in Close Relationship - Anxiety and Romantic Partner Conflict Scale -Submission.

Table 5.4.6

Moderation Analysis for Self-Insight & Self-Reflection (Self-Reflection) on the Relationship between Experiences in Close Relationship – Avoidance and Romantic Partner Conflict Scale –Compromise (N=154)

Variables	*R*	*R²*	*F*	*ΔR²*	*p*	*β*	95% CI	
							LL	*UL*
Constant	.52	.27	18.17		.00	40.77	39.34	42.20
ECRS_AVO					.00	-.54	-.72	-.36
SRIS_SR					.01	.24	.07	.41
ECRS_AVO*SRIS_SR				.023	.02	.02	.00	.04

Note. ECRS_AVO= Experiences in Close Relationship Scale_Avoidance, SRIS_SR= Self-Reflection & Insight Scale_Self-Reflection, *β* = Standardized beta, R^2= Coefficient of determination, *F*= Statistics, *ΔR²*= Adjusted R-square

As shown in Table 5.4.6, a significant moderation effect for Self-Reflection was observed between Experiences in Close Relationship – Avoidance and Romantic Partner Conflict Scale – Compromise with a *p* value of .02. Additionally, Self-Reflection was found to account for 2.3% of variance in Romantic Partner Conflict Scale - Compromise.

Table 5.4.7

Moderation Analysis for Self-Insight & Self-Reflection (Self-Reflection) on the Relationship between Experiences in Close Relationship – Avoidance and Romantic Partner Conflict Scale – Avoidance(N=154)

Variables	*R*	*R²*	*F*	*ΔR²*	*p*	*β*	95% CI	
							LL	*UL*
Constant	.23	.05	2.83		.00	7.47	6.98	7.95
ECRS_AVO					.23	.04	-.02	.10
SRIS_SR					.01	.08	.02	.14
ECRS_AVO*SRIS_SR				.01	.30	.00	.00	.01

Note. ECRS_AVO= Experiences in Close Relationship Scale_Avoidance, SRIS_SR= Self-Reflection & Insight Scale_Self-Reflection, *β* = Standardized beta, R^2= Coefficient of determination, *F*= Statistics, *ΔR²*= Adjusted R-square

As shown in Table 5.4.7, no significant moderation effect was found between Experiences in Close Relationship - Avoidance and Romantic Partner Conflict Scale - Compromise. Therefore, there is no role of Self-Reflection as a moderator in the relationship between Experiences in Close Relationship - Avoidance and Romantic Partner Conflict Scale - Avoidance.

Table 5.4.8

Moderation Analysis for Self-Insight & Self-Reflection (Self-Reflection) on the Relationship between Experiences in Close Relationship – Avoidance and Romantic Partner Conflict Scale – Interactional Reactivity (N=154)

Variables	*R*	*R²*	*F*	*ΔR²*	*p*	*β*	95% CI	
							LL	*UL*
Constant	.45	.21	7.71		.00	9.49	6.34	12.63
ECRS_AVO					.00	.30	.19	.41
SRIS_SR					.85	.01	-.09	.11
ECRS_AVO*SRIS_SR				.01	.14	.01	-.00	.02
Covariate (Age)					.92	-.06	-1.18	1.06
Covariate (Last Academic					.49	-.45	-1.75	.84

Qualification)

Note. ECRS_AVO= Experiences in Close Relationship Scale_Avoidance, SRIS_SR= Self-Reflection & Insight Scale_Self-Reflection, β = Standardized beta, R^2= Coefficient of determination, *F*= Statistics, ΔR^2= Adjusted R-square

As shown in Table 5.4.8, no significant moderation effect was found between Experiences in Close Relationship - Avoidance and Romantic Partner Conflict Scale - Interactional Reactivity. Therefore, there is no role of Self-Reflection as a moderator in the relationship between Experiences in Close Relationship - Avoidance and Romantic Partner Conflict Scale - Interactional Reactivity.

Table 5.4.9

Moderation Analysis for Self-Insight & Self-Reflection (Self-Reflection) on the Relationship between Experiences in Close Relationship – Avoidance and Romantic Partner Conflict Scale – Separation (N=154)

Variables	*R*	R^2	*F*	ΔR^2	*p*	β	95% CI	
							LL	*UL*
Constant	.12	.01	0.74		.00	9.84	9.08	10.61
ECRS_AVO					.87	.01	-.09	.10
SRIS_SR					.28	.05	-.04	.14
ECRS_AVO*SRIS_SR				.01	.28	.01	-.01	.02

Note. ECRS_AVO= Experiences in Close Relationship Scale_Avoidance, SRIS_SR= Self-Reflection & Insight Scale_Self-Reflection, β = Standardized beta, R^2= Coefficient of determination, *F*= Statistics, ΔR^2= Adjusted R-square

As shown in Table 4.10, no significant moderation effect was found between Experiences in Close Relationship - Avoidance and Romantic Partner Conflict Scale - Separation. Therefore, there is no role of Self-Reflection as a moderator in the relationship between Experiences in Close Relationship - Avoidance and Romantic Partner Conflict Scale - Separation.

Table 5.4.10

Moderation Analysis for Self-Insight & Self-Reflection (Self-Reflection) on the Relationship between Experiences in Close Relationship – Avoidance and Romantic Partner Conflict Scale – Domination (N=154)

Variables	*R*	R^2	*F*	ΔR^2	*p*	β	95% CI	
							LL	*UL*
Constant	.44	.19	5.93		.00	10.75	7.32	14.18
ECRS_AVO					.00	.17	.05	.28
SRIS_SR					.70	.02	-.08	.12
ECRS_AVO*SRIS_SR				.00	.68	.00	-.01	.01
Covariate (Age)					.45	.43	-.70	1.55
Covariate (Ethnicity)					.02	.31	.06	.56
Covariate (Last Academic Qualification)					.00	-1.95	-3.23	-.66

Note. ECRS_AVO= Experiences in Close Relationship Scale_Avoidance, SRIS_SR= Self-Reflection & Insight Scale_Self-Reflection, β = Standardized beta, R^2= Coefficient of determination, *F*= Statistics, ΔR^2= Adjusted R-square

As shown in Table, no significant moderation effect was found between Experiences in Close Relationship - Avoidance and Romantic Partner Conflict Scale - Domination. Therefore, there is

no role of Self-Reflection as a moderator in the relationship between Experiences in Close Relationship - Avoidance and Romantic Partner Conflict Scale - Domination.

Table 5.4.12

Moderation Analysis for Self-Insight & Self-Reflection (Self-Reflection) on the Relationship between Experiences in Close Relationship – Avoidance and Romantic Partner Conflict Scale – Submission (N=154)

Variables	*R*	*R²*	*F*	*ΔR²*	*p*	*β*	95% CI	
							LL	*UL*
Constant	.32	.10	4.13		.00	14.78	12.01	17.56
ECRS_AVO					.16	.07	-.03	.17
SRIS_SR					.08	.08	-.01	.17
ECRS_AVO*SRIS_SR				.00	.81	-.00	-.01	.01
Covariate (Last Academic Qualification)					.00	-1.49	-2.45	-.53

Note. ECRS_AVO= Experiences in Close Relationship Scale_Avoidance, SRIS_SR= Self-Reflection & Insight Scale_Self-Reflection, β = Standardized beta, R^2= Coefficient of determination, *F*= Statistics, ΔR^2= Adjusted R-square

As shown in Table, no significant moderation effect was found between Experiences in Close Relationship - Avoidance and Romantic Partner Conflict Scale - Submission. Therefore, there is no role of Self-Reflection as a moderator in the relationship between Experiences in Close Relationship - Avoidance and Romantic Partner Conflict Scale - Submission.

Table 5.4.13

Moderation Analysis for Self-Insight & Self-Reflection (Self-Insight) on the Relationship between Experiences in Close Relationship – Anxiety and Romantic Partner Conflict Scale –Compromise (N=154)

Variables	*R*	*R²*	*F*	*ΔR²*	*p*	*β*	95% CI	
							LL	*UL*
Constant	.25	.06	3.27		.00	40.24	38.56	41.92
ECRS_ANX					.02	-.30	-.55	-.05
SRIS_SI					.56	.06	-.15	.27
ECRS_ANX*SRIS_SI				.00	.30	-.01	-.04	.01

Note. ECRS_ANX= Experiences in Close Relationship Scale_Anxiety, SRIS_SR= Self-Reflection & Insight Scale_Self-Insight, β = Standardized beta, R^2= Coefficient of determination, *F*= Statistics, ΔR^2= Adjusted R-square

As shown in Table, no significant moderation effect was found between Experiences in Close Relationship - Anxiety and Romantic Partner Conflict Scale - Compromise. Therefore, there is no role of Self-Insight as a moderator in the relationship between Experiences in Close Relationship - Anxiety and Romantic Partner Conflict Scale - Compromise.

Table 5.4.14

Moderation Analysis for Self-Insight & Self-Reflection (Self-Insight) on the Relationship between Experiences in Close Relationship – Anxiety and Romantic Partner Conflict Scale –Avoidance (N=154)

Variables	*R*	*R²*	*F*	*ΔR²*	*p*	*β*	95% CI	
							LL	*UL*
Constant	.11	.01	0.66		.00	7.50	6.99	8.02
ECRS_ANX					.54	.02	-.05	.10
SRIS_SI					.72	-.01	-.07	.05
ECRS_ANX*SRIS_SI				.00	.35	.00	-.01	.01

Note. ECRS_ANX= Experiences in Close Relationship Scale_Anxiety, SRIS_SR= Self-Reflection & Insight Scale_Self-Insight, *β* = Standardized beta, R^2= Coefficient of determination, *F*= Statistics, ΔR^2= Adjusted R-square

As shown in Table, no significant moderation effect was found between Experiences in Close Relationship - Anxiety and Romantic Partner Conflict Scale - Avoidance. Therefore, there is no role of Self-Insight as a moderator in the relationship between Experiences in Close Relationship - Anxiety and Romantic Partner Conflict Scale - Avoidance.

Table 5.4.15

Moderation Analysis for Self-Insight & Self-Reflection (Self-Insight) on the Relationship between Experiences in Close Relationship – Anxiety and Romantic Partner Conflict Scale –Interactional Reactivity (N=154)

Variables	*R*	*R²*	*F*	*ΔR²*	*p*	*β*	95% CI	
							LL	*UL*
Constant	.42	.18	8.18		.00	10.18	7.04	13.31
ECRS_ANX					.00	.26	.13	.39
SRIS_SI					.07	-.10	-.21	.01
ECRS_ANX*SRIS_SI				.00	.93	-.00	-.01	.01
Covariate (Last Academic Qualification)					.16	-.78	-1.86	.30

Note. ECRS_ANX= Experiences in Close Relationship Scale_Anxiety, SRIS_SR= Self-Reflection & Insight Scale_Self-Insight, *β* = Standardized beta, R^2= Coefficient of determination, *F*= Statistics, ΔR^2= Adjusted R-square

As shown in Table, no significant moderation effect was found between Experiences in Close Relationship - Anxiety and Romantic Partner Conflict Scale – Interactional Reactivity. Therefore, there is no role of Self-Insight as a moderator in the relationship between Experiences in Close Relationship - Anxiety and Romantic Partner Conflict Scale – Interactional Reactivity.

Table 5.4.16

Moderation Analysis for Self-Insight & Self-Reflection (Self-Insight) on the Relationship between Experiences in Close Relationship – Anxiety and Romantic Partner Conflict Scale –Separation (N=154)

Variables	*R*	*R²*	*F*	*ΔR²*	*p*	*β*	95% CI	
							LL	*UL*
Constant	.20	.04	2.16		.00	9.72	8.93	10.50
ECRS_ANX					.11	.10	-.02	.21
SRIS_SI					.22	-.06	-.16	.04
ECRS_ANX*SRIS_SI				.00	.62	-.00	-.01	.01

Note. ECRS_ANX= Experiences in Close Relationship Scale_Anxiety, SRIS_SR= Self-Reflection & Insight Scale_Self-Insight, β = Standardized beta, R^2= Coefficient of determination, F= Statistics, ΔR^2= Adjusted R-square

As shown in Table, no significant moderation effect was found between Experiences in Close Relationship - Anxiety and Romantic Partner Conflict Scale - Separation. Therefore, there is no role of Self-Insight as a moderator in the relationship between Experiences in Close Relationship - Anxiety and Romantic Partner Conflict Scale - Separation.

Table 5.4.17

Moderation Analysis for Self-Insight & Self-Reflection (Self-Insight) on the Relationship between Experiences in Close Relationship – Anxiety and Romantic Partner Conflict Scale –Domination (N=154)

Variables	R	R^2	F	ΔR^2	p	β	95% CI	
							LL	*UL*
Constant	.49	.24	11.47		.00	12.30	9.33	15.28
ECRS_ANX					.01	.17	.05	.30
SRIS_SI					.01	-.15	-.26	-.05
ECRS_ANX*SRIS_SI				.00	.51	.00	-.01	.02
Covariate (Last Academic Qualification)					.00	-1.66	-2.68	-.63

Note. ECRS_ANX= Experiences in Close Relationship Scale_Anxiety, SRIS_SR= Self-Reflection & Insight Scale_Self-Insight, β = Standardized beta, R^2= Coefficient of determination, F= Statistics, ΔR^2= Adjusted R-square

As shown in Table, no significant moderation effect was found between Experiences in Close Relationship - Anxiety and Romantic Partner Conflict Scale - Domination. Therefore, there is no role of Self-Insight as a moderator in the relationship between Experiences in Close Relationship - Anxiety and Romantic Partner Conflict Scale - Domination.

Table 5.4.18

Moderation Analysis for Self-Insight & Self-Reflection (Self-Insight) on the Relationship between Experiences in Close Relationship – Anxiety and Romantic Partner Conflict Scale – Submission (N=154)

Variables	R	R^2	F	ΔR^2	p	β	95% CI	
							LL	*UL*
Constant	.38	.15	6.35		.00	14.16	11.50	16.83
ECRS_ANX					.00	.17	.05	.28
SRIS_SI					.38	-.04	-.14	.05
ECRS_ANX*SRIS_SI				.00	.85	.00	-.01	.01
Covariate (Last Academic Qualification)					.01	-1.26	-2.18	-.34

Note. ECRS_ANX= Experiences in Close Relationship Scale_Anxiety, SRIS_SR= Self-Reflection & Insight Scale_Self-Insight, β = Standardized beta, R^2= Coefficient of determination, F= Statistics, ΔR^2= Adjusted R-square

As shown in Table, no significant moderation effect was found between Experiences in Close Relationship - Anxiety and Romantic Partner Conflict Scale - Submission. Therefore, there is no role of Self-Insight as a moderator in the relationship between Experiences in Close Relationship - Anxiety and Romantic Partner Conflict Scale - Submission.

Table 5.4.19

Moderation Analysis for Self-Insight & Self-Reflection (Self-Insight) on the Relationship between Experiences in Close Relationship – Avoidance and Romantic Partner Conflict Scale – Compromise(N=154)

Variables	*R*	*R²*	*F*	*ΔR²*	*p*	*β*	95% CI	
							LL	*UL*
Constant	.47	.22	14.19		.00	40.04	38.49	41.59
ECRS_AVO					.00	-.61	-.81	-.41
SRIS_SI					.50	-.06	-.25	.12
ECRS_AVO*SRIS_SI				.02	.08	-.02	-.04	.00

Note. ECRS_AVO= Experiences in Close Relationship Scale_Avoidance, SRIS_SR= Self-Reflection & Insight Scale_Self-Insight, β = Standardized beta, R^2= Coefficient of determination, *F*= Statistics, ΔR^2= Adjusted R-square

As shown in Table, no significant moderation effect was found between Experiences in Close Relationship - Avoidance and Romantic Partner Conflict Scale - Compromise. Therefore, there is no role of Self-Insight as a moderator in the relationship between Experiences in Close Relationship - Avoidance and Romantic Partner Conflict Scale - Compromise.

Table 5.4.20

Moderation Analysis for Self-Insight & Self-Reflection (Self-Insight) on the Relationship between Experiences in Close Relationship – Avoidance and Romantic Partner Conflict Scale – Avoidance (N=154)

Variables	*R*	*R²*	*F*	*ΔR²*	*p*	*β*	95% CI	
							LL	*UL*
Constant	.08	.01	.35		.00	7.41	6.89	7.93
ECRS_AVO					.65	.02	-.05	.08
SRIS_SI					.51	-.02	-.08	.04
ECRS_AVO*SRIS_SI				.00	.82	.00	-.01	.01

Note. ECRS_AVO= Experiences in Close Relationship Scale_Avoidance, SRIS_SR= Self-Reflection & Insight Scale_Self-Insight, β = Standardized beta, R^2= Coefficient of determination, *F*= Statistics, ΔR^2= Adjusted R-square

As shown in Table, no significant moderation effect was found between Experiences in Close Relationship - Avoidance and Romantic Partner Conflict Scale - Avoidance. Therefore, there is no role of Self-Insight as a moderator in the relationship between Experiences in Close Relationship - Avoidance and Romantic Partner Conflict Scale - Avoidance.

Table 5.4.21

Moderation Analysis for Self-Insight & Self-Reflection (Self-Insight) on the Relationship between Experiences in Close Relationship – Avoidance and Romantic Partner Conflict Scale – Interactional Reactivity (N=154)

Variables	*R*	*R²*	*F*	*ΔR²*	*p*	*β*	95% CI	
							LL	*UL*
Constant	.46	.21	8.04		.00	9.21	6.05	12.36
ECRS_AVO					.00	.28	.16	.40
SRIS_SI					.12	-.09	-.20	.02
ECRS_AVO*SRIS_SI				.00	.46	.00	-.01	.02
Covariate (Age)					.74	.19	-.92	1.29
Covariate (Last Academic Qualification)					.43	-.51	-1.79	.77

Note. ECRS_AVO= Experiences in Close Relationship Scale_Avoidance, SRIS_SR= Self-Reflection & Insight Scale_Self-Insight, β = Standardized beta, R^2= Coefficient of determination, *F*= Statistics, ΔR^2= Adjusted R-square

As shown in Table, no significant moderation effect was found between Experiences in Close Relationship - Avoidance and Romantic Partner Conflict Scale – Interactional Reactivity. Therefore, there is no role of Self-Insight as a moderator in the relationship between Experiences in Close Relationship - Avoidance and Romantic Partner Conflict Scale – Interactional Reactivity.

Table 5.4.22

Moderation Analysis for Self-Insight & Self-Reflection (Self-Insight) on the Relationship between Experiences in Close Relationship – Avoidance and Romantic Partner Conflict Scale – Separation (N=154)

Variables	*R*	*R²*	*F*	*ΔR²*	*p*	*β*	95% CI	
							LL	*UL*
Constant	.18	.03	1.76		.00	9.94	9.14	10.74
ECRS_AVO					.56	-.03	-.13	.07
SRIS_SI					.08	-.09	-.18	.01
ECRS_AVO*SRIS_SI				.01	.26	.01	-.00	.02

Note. ECRS_AVO= Experiences in Close Relationship Scale_Avoidance, SRIS_SR= Self-Reflection & Insight Scale_Self-Insight, β = Standardized beta, R^2= Coefficient of determination, *F*= Statistics, ΔR^2= Adjusted R-square

As shown in Table, no significant moderation effect was found between Experiences in Close Relationship - Avoidance and Romantic Partner Conflict Scale - Separation. Therefore, there is no role of Self-Insight as a moderator in the relationship between Experiences in Close Relationship - Avoidance and Romantic Partner Conflict Scale - Separation.

Table 5.4.23

Moderation Analysis for Self-Insight & Self-Reflection (Self-Insight) on the Relationship between Experiences in Close Relationship – Avoidance and Romantic Partner Conflict Scale – Domination (N=154)

Variables	*R*	*R²*	*F*	*ΔR²*	*p*	*β*	95% CI	
							LL	*UL*
Constant	.52	.27	8.88		.00	10.14	6.85	13.44
ECRS_AVO					.05	.11	.00	.23
SRIS_SI					.00	-.17	-.28	-.07
ECRS_AVO*SRIS_SI				.01	.19	.01	-.00	.02
Covariate (Age)					.21	.68	-.39	1.75
Covariate (Ethnicity)					.01	.32	.09	.55
Covariate (Last Academic Qualification)					.00	-1.86	-3.08	-.64

Note. ECRS_AVO= Experiences in Close Relationship Scale_Avoidance, SRIS_SR= Self-Reflection & Insight Scale_Self-Insight, β = Standardized beta, R^2= Coefficient of determination, *F*= Statistics, ΔR^2= Adjusted R-square

As shown in Table, no significant moderation effect was found between Experiences in Close Relationship - Avoidance and Romantic Partner Conflict Scale - Domination. Therefore, there is no role of Self-Insight as a moderator in the relationship between Experiences in Close

Relationship - Avoidance and Romantic Partner Conflict Scale - Domination.

Table 5.4.24

Moderation Analysis for Self-Insight & Self-Reflection (Self-Insight) on the Relationship between Experiences in Close Relationship – Avoidance and Romantic Partner Conflict Scale – Submission (N=154)

Variables	*R*	*R²*	*F*	*ΔR²*	*p*	*β*	95% CI	
							LL	*UL*
Constant	.37	.14	5.91		.00	14.62	11.89	17.36
ECRS_AVO					.39	.04	-.06	.15
SRIS_SI					.22	-.06	-.15	.04
ECRS_AVO*SRIS_SI				.04	.01	.01	.00	.02
Covariate (Last Academic Qualification)					.007	-1.31	-2.25	-.36

Note. ECRS_AVO= Experiences in Close Relationship Scale_Avoidance, SRIS_SR= Self-Reflection & Insight Scale_Self-Insight, β = Standardized beta, R^2= Coefficient of determination, *F*= Statistics, ΔR^2= Adjusted R-square

As shown in Table, a significant moderation effect for Self-Insight was observed between Experiences in Close Relationship – Avoidance and Romantic Partner Conflict Scale – Submission with a *p* value of .01. Additionally, Self-Insight was found to account for 4% of variance in Romantic Partner Conflict Scale - Submission.

Table 5.5

Independent Samples t-test for between Scales and Subscales of Experiences in Close Relationship, Self-reflection & Insight and Romantic Partner Conflict Scale based on Gender (N=154)

Variable	Male (n=47)		Female (n=107)				
	M	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*t*	*p*	Cohen's d
ECRS							
Anxiety	24.8	7.3	23.0	6.7	1.4	.15	
Avoidance	19.3	7.8	16.7	8.1	1.8	.07	
SRSI							
Self-Reflection	30.3	9.2	31.9	7.9	-1.1	.25	
Self-Insight	21.2	8.0	24.0	8.7	-1.8	.07	
RPCS							
Compromise	39.7	11.0	40.9	10.0	-0.7	.49	
Avoidance	7.7	2.8	7.3	3.2	0.9	.40	
Interactional Reactivity	9.6	5.9	7.3	5.7	2.3	.03	.39
Separation	10.3	4.2	9.6	5.0	0.9	.37	
Domination	9.0	5.6	6.9	5.7	2.1	.04	.37
Submission	12.9	3.9	9.6	4.9	4.5	<.001	.75

Note. *p < .05. ECRS= Experiences in Close Relationship Scale, SRSI= Self-Reflection & Insight Scale, RPCS= Romantic Partner Conflict Scale, *M*= Mean, *SD*= Standard Deviation

Table 5.5 shows significant differences between males and females in terms of Interactional Reactivity, Domination and Submission. Males (M=9.6, SD=5.9) have higher Interactional Reactivity as compared to Females (M=7.3, SD=5.7) with a large effect size, *t* (152) =2.3, *p*=.03,

d= .39. Males (M=9.0, SD=5.6) also have higher Domination as compared to Females (M=6.9, SD=5.7) with a large effect size, *t* (152) =2.1, *p*=.04, d= .37 and Males (M=12.9, SD=3.9) also have higher Submission as compared to Females (M=9.6, SD=4.9) with a large effect size, *t* (108.56) =4.5, *p*=<.001, d= .75.

Table 5.6

Independent Samples t-test for between Scales and Subscales of Experiences in Close Relationship, Self-reflection & Insight and Romantic Partner Conflict Scale based on Living Situation (N=154)

Variable	Living with Spouse/Partner (n=44)		Not Living with Spouse/Partner (n=110)				
	M	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*t*	*P*	Cohen's d
ECRS							
Anxiety	14.3	6.9	18.8	8.2	-3.23	.002	.59
Avoidance	21.5	7.1	24.4	6.7	-2.35	.020	.42
SRSI							
Self-Reflection	30.8	9.2	31.7	8.0	-.56	.577	
Self-Insight	25.4	8.3	22.2	8.5	2.09	.039	.38
RPCS							
Compromise	41.5	10.9	40.1	10.0	.72	.476	
Avoidance	8.0	3.0	7.2	3.1	1.48	.141	
Interactional Reactivity	7.2	5.7	8.3	5.9	-1.10	.274	
Separation	9.8	5.1	9.8	4.6	-.05	.962	
Domination	7.0	6.1	7.8	5.6	-.77	.443	
Submission	10.0	5.4	10.9	4.6	-1.09	.276	

Note. *p < .05. ECRS= Experiences in Close Relationship Scale, SRSI= Self-Reflection & Insight Scale, RPCS= Romantic Partner Conflict Scale, *M*= Mean, *SD*= Standard Deviation

Table 5.6 shows significant differences between participants who live with spouse/partner and not living with spouse/partner in terms of Anxiety, Avoidance and Self-Insight. Participants not living with spouse/partner (M=18.8, SD=8.2) reported to have higher Anxiety as compared to participants living with spouse/partner (M=14.3, SD=6.9) with a large effect size, *t* (152) =-3.23, *p*=.002, d= .59. Participants not living with spouse/partner (M=24.4, SD=6.7) also have higher Avoidance as compared to participants living with spouse/partner (M=21.5, SD=7.1) with a large effect size, *t* (152) =-2.35, *p*=.020, d= .42. However, participants living with spouse/partner (M=25.4, SD=8.3) reported to have higher Self-Insight as compared to participants not living with spouse/partner (M=22.2, SD=8.5) with a large effect size, *t* (152) =2.09, *p*=.39, d= .38.

Table 5.7
Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) for Study Variables based on Marital Status (N=154)

	1 (n=43)		2 (n=25)		3 (n=86)						Mean D		95%CL	
Variable	***M***	***SD***	***M***	***SD***	***M***	***SD***	***F***	***p***	**η²**	**i-j**	**(i-j)**	**SE**	**LL**	**UL**
ECRS														
Anxiety	21.4	7.4	21.3	6.6	25.3	6.3	6.51	.002	.08	3>1	3.87	1.25	1.41	6.34
										3>2	3.97	1.52	.97	6.97
Avoidance	13.9	7.1	17.8	9.2	19.2	7.6	6.80	<.001	.08	2>1	3.98	1.95	.12	7.84
										3>1	5.34	1.45	2.47	8.20
SRSI														
Self-Reflection	31.6	9.0	31.6	6.8	31.3	8.5	.03	.971						
Self-Insight	26.1	8.5	22.8	8.4	21.7	8.3	4.07	.019						
RPCS														
Compromise	41.1	10.9	41.6	8.3	39.9	10.5	.36	.700						
Avoidance	7.5	3.4	8.6	2.6	7.0	2.9	2.83	.062						
Interactional Reactivity	7.1	6.0	7.3	5.6	8.7	5.8	1.33	.267						
Separation	9.6	5.3	9.4	5.0	10.0	4.4	.22	.805						
Domination	6.5	6.4	8.0	6.1	8.0	5.2	1.00	.370						
Submission	9.4	5.6	11.6	4.1	11.0	4.6	2.13	.161						

Note. 1= Married, 2= Engaged, 3= Committed, ECRS= Experiences in Close Relationship Scale, SRSI= Self-Reflection & Insight Scale, RPCS= Romantic Partner Conflict Scale, SE = Standard Error CI = Confidence Interval, LL = Lower Limit, UL = Upper Limit, *$p < .05$.

Table 5.7 illustrates that significant differences were found between Marital Status for Anxiety (F (3,150)= 6.51, p=.002), with medium effect sizes. Furthermore, significant differences were also found between Marital Status for Avoidance (F (3,150)= 6.80, p=<.001), with medium effect sizes. Committed individuals were found to have more attachment anxiety compared to engaged and married individuals. Conversely, committed and engaged individuals were found to have more attachment avoidance compared to married individuals.

Table 5.8
Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) for Study Variables based on Age (N=154)

	1 (n=71)		2 (n=42)		3 (n=29)		4 (n=12)						Mean D		95%CL	
Variable	***M***	***SD***	***M***	***SD***	***M***	***SD***	***M***	***SD***	***F***	***p***	**η²**	**i-j**	**(i-j)**	**SE**	**LL**	**UL**
ECRS																
Anxiety	24.8	6.9	23.9	6.2	19.6	6.8	24.8	7.3	4.28	.006	.08	1>3	5.14	1.48	1.30	8.98
												2>3	4.28	1.62	.08	8.49
Avoidance	20.6	8.1	16.2	7.9	13.9	5.9	12.2	5.7	8.73	<.001	.15	1>2	4.45	1.55	.39	8.52
												1>3	6.69	1.46	2.86	10.52
												1>4	8.45	1.91	3.08	13.82
SRSI																
Self-Reflection	30.4	8.0	32.4	8.6	31.1	9.0	35.0	6.9	1.28	.28						
Self-Insight	21.0	8.4	23.3	7.0	26.8	9.6	25.9	8.8	3.87	.01	.07	3>1	5.78	2.04	.35	11.21
RPCS																
Compromise	39.3	10.5	41.2	10.8	40.4	9.1	45.3	8.3	1.28	.28						
Avoidance	7.4	3.0	7.0	3.1	7.7	3.2	8.5	2.9	0.93	.42						
Interactional Reactivity	9.0	5.9	7.9	5.5	6.8	5.6	5.6	6.2	1.88	.13						
Separation	9.4	4.7	9.9	4.8	10.1	4.5	10.7	5.5	0.32	.81						
Domination	8.9	5.2	7.1	6.1	5.8	5.7	6.0	6.0	2.74	.04	.05					
Submission	11.2	4.6	10.5	4.9	9.4	5.8	11.0	3.8	0.94	.42						

Note. 1= 20-22, 2= 23-25, 3= 26-28, 4= 29+, ECRS= Experiences in Close Relationship Scale, SRSI= Self-Reflection & Insight Scale, RPCS= Romantic Partner Conflict Scale, SE = Standard Error CI = Confidence Interval, LL = Lower Limit, UL = Upper Limit, *$p < .05$.

Table 5.8 illustrates that significant differences were found between Age for Anxiety (F (3,150)= 4.28, p=.006), with medium effect sizes. Furthermore, significant differences were also found for Avoidance (F (3,150)= 8.73, p=<.001), with large effect sizes. Significant differences were also found for Self-Insight (F (3,150)= 3.87, p=.011), with medium effect sizes. It was found that people belonging from ages 20-25 experienced more attachment anxiety compared to rest of the age groups. Conversely, people belonging from ages 20-22 experienced more attachment avoidance compared to rest of the age groups. Additionally, people belonging from ages 26-28 were found to have more self-insight compared to ages 20-22. Lastly, significant differences were

found for Domination (F (3,150)= 2.74, *p*=.045), however, post hoc comparisons did not reveal significant pairwise differences.

Discussion

This chapter discusses the results in light of the study's aims, hypotheses, and existing literature. The present study examined the relationship between insecure attachment and conflicts in romantic relationships, as well as the moderating roles of self-reflection and self-insight. Prior research indicates that insecure attachment influences conflict, as individuals may use hyperactivating or deactivating strategies (Feeny & Karantzas, 2017). The main and moderation hypotheses were kept non-directional to explore variability, aligning with literature that self-reflection can be adaptive or maladaptive and does not always lead to self-insight (Stein & Grant, 2014; Harrington & Loffredo, 2010). Literature shows a gap in examining these moderators, justifying the study's approach.

Data were collected from 154 participants aged 20–40 years, with the majority (46.1%) aged 21–22, indicating emerging adulthood – a period of identity exploration (Potterton et al., 2022). Most participants were women (69.5%), students (45.2%), and in committed relationships (55.8%) averaging 1.7–2 years. A majority (71.4%) lived separately from partners, and most identified as Muslim (96.1%).

The ECR-S, RPCS, and Self-Reflection and Insight Scale were used. Reliability for most subscales ranged from acceptable to excellent, with self-reflection showing excellent reliability (α=.90). The relatively low reliability for the Avoidance subscale of RPCS (α=.68) and Anxiety subscale of ECR-S (α=.57) may have attenuated effect sizes and limited the strength of observed associations and to fewer items and broader age range compared to original validations (Zacchilli et al., 2009; Wei et al., 2007). Overall, the scales reliably measured constructs in this sample.

Significant correlations were found between insecure attachment and conflicts. Anxious attachment correlated moderately with Interactional Reactivity (r=.38), Domination (r=.33), and Submission (r=.30), low positively with Separation (r=.18), and low negatively with Compromise (r=-.22), but not with Avoidance (r=.07). These results align with literature showing anxiously attached individuals experience heightened distress and oscillate between controlling or submissive behaviors (Campbell et al., 2005; Mikulincer & Shaver, 2007; Wei et al., 2005). Avoidant attachment showed moderate positive correlations with Interactional Reactivity (r=.44) and Domination (r=.32), low positive with Submission (r=.16), moderate negative with Compromise (r=-.45), and no significant relation with Avoidance or Separation. Avoidant individuals engage in deactivating strategies but may show verbal arguments or controlling/submissive behaviors under conflict (Mikulincer & Shaver, 2007; Zacchilli et al., 2007).

Both insecure attachment domains had no significant association with RPCS Avoidance, consistent with the constructive potential of avoidance as a conflict strategy (Zacchilli et al., 2007). Correlation analyses support the main hypothesis, showing low-to-moderate associations between attachment insecurity and conflict behaviors.

Self-reflection showed low negative correlation with avoidant attachment (r=-.16), no significant relation with anxious attachment, and low positive correlations with Compromise (r=.25) and Avoidance (r=.19). Self-insight showed moderate negative correlations with anxious and avoidant attachment (r=-.37) and negative associations with Domination (r=-.37), Interactional Reactivity (r=-.28), and Submission (r=-.21). These findings align with literature suggesting self-reflection may be adaptive but can be maladaptive if excessive, whereas self-insight is strongly linked to adaptive outcomes (Bucknell et al., 2022; Silvia & Phillips, 2011; Harrington & Loffredo, 2010).

Moderation analysis revealed only two significant interactions: self-reflection moderated avoidant attachment and Compromise (β=.02, ΔR^2=.023), and self-insight moderated avoidant attachment and Submission (β=.01, ΔR^2=.04). Self-reflection appears to enhance compromising behaviors in avoidant individuals, while self-insight increases submissive behaviors, highlighting the nuanced

roles of these constructs. These findings suggest that self-reflection and self-insight alone may not be sufficient for adaptive change, potentially requiring pairing with self-compassion or emotional regulation (Stefan & Cheie, 2020; Frank et al., 2021; Mertens et al., 2022; Sawyer et al., 2023). Gender differences in self-reflection may also influence outcomes (Sadia & Khurshid, 2025).

Independent t-tests showed men reported higher Interactional Reactivity (M=9.6) and Domination (M=9.0) than women (M=7.3 and 6.9, respectively), with higher Submission (M=12.9 vs 9.6). Living apart from partners was associated with higher anxiety (M=18.8) and avoidance (M=24.4), whereas living with a partner correlated with higher self-insight (M=25.4). ANOVA results indicated that individuals in early relationship stages experienced higher anxiety and avoidance, with younger adults (20–25) showing more attachment insecurities and lower self-insight, suggesting emerging adulthood is significant for attachment patterns (Sheng et al., 2023; Riva Crugnola, 2017).

Overall, findings support the relationship between insecure attachment and conflict in romantic relationships, highlight partial moderating roles of self-reflection and self-insight, and emphasize developmental and contextual factors in attachment processes.

Conclusion

Current study explores the relationship between insecure attachment and conflicts in romantic relationships, with additional focus on the moderating roles of self-reflection and self-insight. A total of 154 participants took part in the research, between the ages of 20 to 40 years, having been in a romantic relationship for a maximum duration of two years. To measure the hypotheses, Experiences in Close Relationship Scale – Short Form (ECR-S), Romantic Partner Conflict Scale (RPCS), and Self-reflection and Insight Scale – Short Form (SRIS) were selected. Through statistical analysis, key findings were generated.

The results indicate that there is a significant relationship between insecure attachment and conflicts occurring in romantic relationships, observed with both dimensions of insecure attachment – anxious and avoidant – and their significant moderate-to-low associations with multiple domains of conflict. Regarding the moderating role of self-reflection and self-insight, only partial weak moderation effect was observed, which although significant, occurred with only two interactions, in the relationship between avoidant attachment and compromise, and avoidant attachment and submission. Through literature, it can be assumed that although self-reflection and self-insight show adaptive features and correlate independently with insecure attachment styles and conflicts, they are not sufficient to moderate the relationship between the two constructs. However, if paired with compassion-focused and other growth-orientated strategies/interventions, they might yield more adaptive results as future protective factors. The significant associations between attachment insecurities and relational conflicts in romantic partnerships can be researched upon further to improve relational dynamics.

IEER Institute for Excellence in Education & Research

References

Atkins, S., & Murphy, K. (1995). Reflective practice. Nursing Standard, 9(45), 31–37.

Barki, H., & Hartwick, J. (2001). *Conceptualizing the construct of interpersonal conflict. International Journal of Conflict Management*, 12(1), 4–29. https://doi.org/10.1108/eb022913

Barki, H., & Hartwick, J. (2001). *Interpersonal conflict and its management in information system development*. MIS Quarterly, 25(2), 195–228.

Barki, H., & Hartwick, J. (2001). Interpersonal conflict and its management in information systems development. *MIS Quarterly, 25*(2), 195–228. https://doi.org/10.2307/3250929

Bowlby, J. (1973). Attachment and loss. Vol. 2: Separation: anxiety and anger. New York, NY: Basic Books.

Bowlby, J. (1980). *Attachment and loss: Vol. 3. Loss: Sadness and depression*. 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). Guilford Press.

Bretaña, I., Alonso-Arbiol, I., & Balluerka, N. (2022). Adult attachment and relationship satisfaction: The mediating role of emotional regulation. *Current Psychology, 41*(3), 1234–1245. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-020-00656-5

Bretaña, I., Alonso-Arbiol, I., Lavy, S., & Zhang, F. (2023). *Women's avoidant attachment, conflict solving, and relationship satisfaction through individualism and masculinity. Current Psychology*, 43, 8699–8712.

Bretaña, I., Alonso-Arbiol, I., Recio, P., & Molero, F. (2022). *Avoidant attachment, withdrawal–aggression conflict pattern, and relationship satisfaction: A mediational dyadic model.* Frontiers in Psychology, 12, Article 794942. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.794942

Bucknell, A., Kangas, M., & Meiser-Stedman, R. (2022). Reflective functioning and emotional regulation: A systematic review. *Clinical Psychology Review, 91*, 102109. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpr.2021.102109

Bucknell, K. J., Kangas, M., & Crane, M. F. (2022). Adaptive self-reflection and resilience: The moderating effects of rumination on insight as a mediator. *Personality and Individual Differences, 185*, 111234. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2021.111234

Campbell, L., Simpson, J. A., Boldry, J., & 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.

Campbell, L., Simpson, J. A., Boldry, J., & Kashy, D. A. (2005). Perceptions of conflict and support in romantic relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 88*(3), 510–531. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.88.3.510

Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2nd ed.). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Delatorre, M. Z., & Wagner, A. (2019). How do couples disagree? An analysis of conflict resolution profiles and the quality of romantic relationships. *Revista Colombiana de Psicología, 28*(2), 91–108. https://doi.org/10.15446/rcp.v28n2.72265

Feeney, J. A., & Karantzas, G. C. (2017). Couple conflict: Insights from an attachment perspective. *Current Opinion in Psychology, 13*, 60–64. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.copsyc.2016.04.017

Girme, Y. U., Jones, R. E., Fleck, C., Simpson, J. A., & Overall, N. C. (2021). *Infants' attachment insecurity predicts attachment-relevant emotion regulation strategies in adulthood. Emotion, 21*(2), 260–272. https://doi.org/10.1037/emo0000721

Girme, Y. U., Overall, N. C., Simpson, J. A., & Fletcher, G. J. O. (2021). Attachment anxiety and avoidance in romantic relationships: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin, 147*(6), 599–627. https://doi.org/10.1037/bul0000339

Grant, A. M., Franklin, J., & Langford, P. (2002). The Self-Reflection and Insight Scale: A new measure of private self-consciousness. *Social Behavior and Personality, 30*(8), 821–836. https://doi.org/10.2224/sbp.2002.30.8.821

Joireman, J., Parrott, L., & Hammersla, J. (2002). Empathy and the self-reflection paradox. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 21*(3), 333–350. https://doi.org/10.1521/jscp.21.3.333.22589

Knobloch, L. K., Theiss, J. A., & Solomon, D. H. (2017). Relational turbulence theory: A comprehensive overview. *Communication Monographs, 84*(4), 407–430. https://doi.org/10.1080/03637751.2017.1380537

Li, T., & Chan, D. K.-S. (2012). How anxious and avoidant attachment affect romantic relationship quality differently: A meta-analytic review. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 42(4), 406–419. https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.1842

Mikulincer, M., & Shaver, P. R. (2007). *Attachment in adulthood: Structure, dynamics, and change*. Guilford Press.

Momeñe, J., Estévez, A., & Griffiths, M. D. (2024). Adult attachment and relationship conflict: The role of emotional regulation. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 41*(2), 455–472. https://doi.org/10.1177/02654075231123456

Momeñe, J., Estévez, A., Griffiths, M. D., Macía, P., Herrero, M., Olave, L., & Iruarrizaga, I. (2024). The impact of insecure attachment on emotional dependence on a partner: The mediating role of negative emotional rejection. *Behavioral Sciences, 14*(10), 909. https://doi.org/10.3390/bs14100909

Riva Crugnola, C., Ierardi, E., & Canevini, M. P. (2017). Reflective functioning, maternal attachment, mind-mindedness, and emotional availability in adolescent and adult mothers at infant 3 months. *Attachment & Human Development, 20*(1), 84–106. https://doi.org/10.1080/14616734.2017.1379546

Šakotić-Kurbalija, J., Jokić-Begić, N., & Živčić-Bećirević, I. (2022). Attachment styles and conflict resolution strategies in romantic relationships. *Current Psychology, 41*(9), 6142–6154. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-020-01234-1

Šakotić-Kurbalija, J., Kurbalija, D., Trifunović, B., & Grabovac, B. (2022). Women's attachment style and dyadic adjustment: The mediator role of perceived efficacy in solving marital conflicts. *Društvena istraživanja, 31*(2), 301–320. https://doi.org/10.5559/di.31.2.06

Shao, R., Liu, S., Coplan, R. J., Chen, X., & Liu, J. (2023). Examining a complex model linking maternal reflective functioning, maternal meta-emotion philosophies, and child emotion regulation. *Children, 10*(7), Article 1161. https://doi.org/10.3390/children10071161

Silvia, P. J., & Phillips, A. G. (2011). Evaluating self-reflection and insight as self-conscious traits. *Personality and Individual Differences, 50*(2), 234–237. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2010.09.035

Stein, D., & Grant, A. M. (2014). Disentangling self-reflection and rumination. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 44*(1), 1–10. https://doi.org/10.1111/jasp.12200

Stein, D., & Grant, A. M. (2014). Disentangling the relationships among self-reflection, insight, and subjective well-being: The role of dysfunctional attitudes and core self-evaluations. *The Journal of Psychology, 148*(5), 505–522. https://doi.org/10.1080/00223980.2013.810128

Wagner, A. C., Overall, N. C., & Simpson, J. A. (2013). Attachment and conflict regulation in romantic relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 104*(1), 126–141. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0029688

Wagner, J. H., Shoham, V., Hawkins, A. J., & Broderick, A. C. (2013). Marital conflict and coping processes: What predicts outcomes? *Journal of Family Psychology, 27*(1), 154–165. DOI: 10.1037/a0031078

Wei, M., Russell, D. W., Mallinckrodt, B., & Vogel, D. L. (2007). The Experiences in Close Relationships Scale (short form). *Journal of Personality Assessment, 88*(2), 187–204. https://doi.org/10.1080/00223890701268041

IEER
Institute for Excellence in Education & Research