

Humour in Attachment and Conflict Jahnvi Gupta* and Sohinee Ganguly**

Abstract

Personal differences in Humour styles have been determined. A sense of humour is a significant psychological personality trait, it affects how well people manage conflicts and plays a role in social relationships, involving adult attachments. The study aimed at studying the effect of humour style on the attachment and conflict management of young adults. An online survey was completed by 120 participants (60 females and 60 males) ages 18 to 25 years to study the link between Humour Styles with Adult Attachment Styles and Conflict Management. Correlation and regression were used to analyze the data. The findings of the research indicate that Affiliative Humour Styles and Self-Enhancing Humour Style had a positive relationship with closed attachment style, understanding natural response, understanding context, and apply approach. Aggressive Humour Style has a positive relationship with anxiety attachment style and a negative relationship with understanding natural response, understanding context, and apply approach. Self-Defeating Humour Style has a negative relationship with depend attachment style.

Keywords: Humour Styles, Affiliative Humour, Self-Enhancing Humour, Aggressive Humour, Self-Defeating Humour, Attachment Style, Closed Attachment, Depend Attachment, Anxiety Attachment, Conflict Management

Humour is a verbal or nonverbal social communication situation that generates a cheerful mental state and facilitates social interaction. Although humour hasn't always been viewed favourably, those with an increased sense of humour are thought to be more adept at handling anxieties, getting along with others, and enjoying enhanced physical and mental wellness. (Crawford, 1994; Lynch, 2002; Martineau, 1972; Romero, 2005; Robert & Yan, 2007). Yet, Humour has not always been seen favourably. The earliest theories of laughing, dating back to Aristotle and Plato, attribute it to a sense of superiority. However, the perspective of comedy as a stress-reduction strategy is particularly relevant to positive psychology, as is Freud's idea of comedy as a healthy defensive mechanism.

Humour is important to our emotional and cognitive assessments, behaviours, attitudes, values, and relationships. It can be used as a form of violence or as a coping strategy, and comedy styles are used to cope and adjust perceptions. Furthermore, it shapes the relationships we develop with others, as well as our modes of communication and persuasion.

Most human behaviour includes a sense of Humour. Martin et al. (2003) distinguished four types of humour:

1. **Affiliative Humour** is a sort of humour that is meant to improve relationships and is both pleasant and humorous. It entails sharing jokes or humorous anecdotes, playing innocent practical jokes, and having the desire to connect with others, amuse them, and strengthen bonds.

2. **Self-enhancing Humour** is the use of uplifting humour in order to enhance oneself; it is frequently considered to aid in coping and wellbeing. It can be found in those who maintain a humorous outlook on life and find humour in its quirks. It helps us keep an optimistic attitude and a realistic perspective despite

challenging circumstances. (Lefcourt, Davidson, Shepherd, Phillips, Prkachin & Mills, 1995).

3. **Aggressive Humour** is used for enhancing oneself at the expense of others is associated with being manipulative, sardonic, mocking, and ironic. It is considered to be utilised for being criticising and is considered to be negative humour meant to nurture connections with people. (Janes & Olson cited in Martin et al., 2003; Hodson, Rush, & MacInnis, 2010).

4. **Self-defeating Humour** refers to the act of making oneself the "butt of the joke" in order to attract attention. It is a form of negative Humour used to enhance the self. It is related to defensive denial and is employed to belittle or discredit oneself.

The four different kinds of humour are aggressive, affiliative, self-defeating, and self-enhancing. In general terms, self-enhancing and affiliative humour are considered adaptive humour types, whereas aggressive and self-defeating humour are considered maladaptive humour types (Dozois et al., 2009). The fact that these humour idioms can be found in both Eastern and Western cultures suggests that they are ubiquitous across cultural boundaries (Saroglou and Scariot, 2002; Martin et al., 2003; Chen and Martin, 2007; Taher et al., 2008). Positive humour is more appealing and socially appropriate than negative humour. Positive humour can indicate a propensity for forming emotional ties, whereas negative humour can indicate a lack of interest in or difficulty forming such bonds (Cann & Matson, 2014; Zeigler-Hill et al., 2013). Anxious attachment is positively associated with a self-defeating humour style and negatively associated with a self-enhancing humour style, whereas avoidant attachment is negatively related to an affiliative humour style and positively related to an aggressive humour style (Cann et al., 2008; Sar-El et al., 2013).

*PG Student of Psychology, Thapar School of Liberal Arts and Sciences, Thapar Institute of Technology, Patiala, Pb. Email: jgupta_ma21@thapar.edu

**Assistant Professor, School of Humanities and Social Sciences, Thapar Institute of Technology, Patiala, India, Email: sohineeeg@gmail.com

Mothers using affiliative, aggressive, and self-enhancing Humour during conflicts with their children can facilitate better communication during conflict management. (Ambarwati, 2020). Studies have shown that using humour may affect conflict management in both positive and negative ways. According to Suls and Martin (2005), affiliative and self-enhancing Humour styles are associated with more constructive conflict management, while aggressive and self-defeating Humour styles are associated with less constructive conflict management. According to Pasupuleti (2021), aggressive humour has a negative relation to the solution-oriented conflict management approach, whereas affiliative humour and self-enhancing humour have a positive relation with it.

Studies have shown that affiliative humour is particularly good at reducing conflict and increasing cooperation. It can serve to defuse tense situations and develop rapport between participants, facilitating the ability to collaborate on finding a solution (Oguz & Tumer, 2014; Gockel, Kerr, & Christensen, 2013). Self-enhancing humour can also help to alleviate stress and enhance resilience (Martin et al., 2001). Aggressive humour can intensify tensions and escalate disputes, while self-defeating humour can be detrimental to resolving conflict (Oguz & Tumer, (2014); Martin, Puhlik-Doris, Larsen, Gray, and Weir, 2003). Humour has two communication roles: helping people cope and manage conflict, and relieving stress and anxiety.

The theoretical basis for attachment theory in psychology was laid by John Bowlby's work (1958). In the 1930s, he had worked as a psychiatrist in a London child guidance clinic and found that attachment lasts throughout life and is found in both physical and mental representations of significant partners. The behaviour of the child's primary attachment figure, according to Bowlby (1969), encourages an internal working model of relationships, which results in a continuity between early attachment and later attachment. Attachment is a term coined by John Bowlby to refer to the affective bias a child develops towards an attachment figure. People's operational definitions of attachment, which make up their expectations, convictions, and objectives regarding the self-concerning others, vary (Dalbem & Dell'Aglio, 2005; Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991; Collins & Read, 1994; Pietromonaco & Feldman Barrett, 2000).

Based on the theoretical foundations of attachment theory (i.e., a way of defining the existence of meaningful relational attachments and security in relationships) (Ainsworth et al., 1978; Bowlby, 1973), adult attachment style in close partnerships is based on intimate relationships. Studies have found connections between attachment types and several characteristics of adult intimate relationships, such as relationship pleasure, romantic love beliefs and attitudes, relationship violence, and conflict

resolution techniques. Emotional reactions may also be predicted by a person's attachment pattern within the individual relationship in which they occur. Ainsworth argues that these representations produce distinct attachment patterns that we retain into adulthood as our internal representations and show up in our relationships and behaviour in all social situations. Conflict can reveal attachment processes by acting as a stressor, challenging partners' emotions and behaviour, and triggering behaviours that promote intimacy. Additionally, it can offer proof supporting various attachment desired outcomes, such as attaining intimacy or sustaining autonomy. (Kobak & Duemmler, 1994; Simpson, Rholes, & Phillips, 1996; Pietromonaco & Feldman Barrett, 1997).

The differing interpersonal relationships of a person are described by their attachment styles. The attachment style gets started at birth and remains continuous throughout a person's life, showing up in how they connect with people in intimate relationships and how they parent their children. Adult attachment patterns examined in this study include:

1. **Close (secure) attachment style** is the level of comfort and closeness that people feel within a well-established relationship, which may have helped them develop a more optimistic outlook on themselves and others.
2. **Dependent/avoidant attachment style** is characterized by individuals who feel comfortable relying on others and having others rely on them, whereas individuals who have an avoidant style shy away from connection and intimacy with others. They may find it difficult to communicate with others, especially when it comes to talking about feelings. They also tend to deny issues and repress their feelings, which can lessen the assistance they get from and give to others.
3. **Anxious attachment style** refers to the level of concern an individual has regarding potential abandonment or lack of love. This style in older persons may have hereditary foundations and be influenced by caregivers who exercise both punishing and nurturing methods while taking care of the child. They may become unduly dependent on other people's acceptance and approval, and worry excessively about what other people think of them, making them hesitant to ask for help. Their interpersonal history is characterized by emotions of failure and helplessness, leading to a negative perception of themselves and their talents.

Conflict is an unavoidable aspect of almost all relationships. It can also be a major source of stress in your relationships or at work. It differs from just holding opposing views in that it can often be sufficiently strong to interfere with some aspect of a relation. According to the conflict theory, which was first put forth by Karl Marx, society is constantly at

war with one another over scarce resources. According to conflict theory, social order is preserved by authority and dominance rather than by agreement and compliance.

The goal of conflict management tactics should be to keep it at a level where opposing ideas and opinions can be heard clearly while unproductive disputes are avoided. If handled correctly, conflict can be beneficial. Analytical and interpersonal abilities must be combined in order to manage conflicts. Conflict can arise due to differences in position, targets perspectives, and traditions of individuals or groups as well as competition for scarce resources (Ayas, Deniz, Kaan, & Ken, 2010). A group of people or an organisation that are at odds with one another may have tensions that need to be reduced or difficulties that need to be solved.

Conflict is an unavoidable part of close relationships and can be emotionally draining. Studies have revealed that how a conflict is handled rather than how much conflict there is in a relationship is more crucial. Conflict, meanwhile, isn't always harmful or counterproductive. Well-handled conflict can lead to more meaningful and rewarding relationships (Markman et al., 1993; Canary & Messman, 2000). The ability to manage conflict is crucial because it reveals a person's potential to:

1. Recognise their innate reaction to conflict.
2. Recognise the context of the conflict, including all parties' points of view.
3. Use a situation-appropriate conflict resolution technique.

Research has been done on several conflict management techniques, which are communication strategies used to avoid, manage, or end a conflict. The communication process is a strong instrument for conflict resolution, and asking for more information before reacting is an effective approach to provide an interim between the cause and the response, keeping in mind that we do not always choose our styles consciously. The five conflict resolution strategies—competing, avoiding, accommodating, compromising, and collaborating—explain our preoccupation with self vs. others. According to research, humour styles can play an important role in conflict resolution. To handle conflicts effectively, people must be aware of their innate conflict response, the context of the conflict, and the best conflict management strategy for the circumstance.

Objectives

To study the effects of humour style on attachment and conflict management in younger adults.

Hypotheses

- H1: There is a positive relationship between Affiliative Humour Style and Closed Attachment Style.
- H2: There is a negative relationship between Affiliative Humour Style and Depend Attachment style.

- H3: There is a negative relationship between Affiliative Humour Style and Anxiety Attachment Style.
- H4: There is a positive relationship between Self-Enhancing Humour Style and Closed Attachment style.
- H5: There is a negative relationship between Self-Enhancing Humour Style and Depend Attachment style.
- H6: There is a negative relationship between Self-Enhancing Humour Style and Anxiety Attachment style.
- H7: There is a negative relationship between Aggressive Humour Style and Closed Attachment Style.
- H8: There is a positive relationship between Aggressive Humour Style and Depend Attachment style.
- H9: There is a positive relationship between Aggressive Humour Style and Anxiety Attachment Style.
- H10: There is a positive relationship between Self-Defeating Humour Style and Closed Attachment Style.
- H11: There is a negative relationship between Self-Defeating Humour Style and Depend Attachment Style.
- H12: There is a positive relationship between Self-Defeating Humour Style and Anxiety Attachment Style.
- H13: There is a positive relationship between Affiliative Humour Style and Understanding Natural Response.
- H14: There is a positive relationship between Affiliative Humour Style and Understanding Context.
- H15: There is a positive relationship between Affiliative Humour Style and Apply Approach.
- H16: There is a positive relationship between Self-Enhancing Humour Style and Understanding Natural Response.
- H17: There is a positive relationship between Self-Enhancing Humour Style and Understanding Context.
- H18: There is a positive relationship between Self-Enhancing Humour Style and Apply Approach.
- H19: There is a negative relationship between Aggressive Humour Style and Understanding Natural Response.
- H20: There is a negative relationship between Aggressive Humour Style and Understanding Context.
- H21: There is a negative relationship between Aggressive Humour Style and Apply Approach.
- H22: There is a negative relationship between Self-Defeating Humour Style and Understanding Natural Response.

- H23: There is a negative relationship between Self-Defeating Humour Style and Understanding Context.
- H24: There is a negative relationship between Self-Defeating Humour Style and Apply Approach.

Method

Sample

The sample comprised 120 participants in the age group 18 to 25 years. Male participants' mean ages were 22.55 years (SD = 1.9) and female participants' average ages were 21.83 years (SD = 1.8).

Design

Correlation design was used. Humour styles was the independent variable and Adult Attachment and Conflict Management was the dependent variable.

Tools

A self-reported questionnaire was used in the data collection of the current study. Three measures were used:

1. **Humour styles questionnaire (HSQ), (Martin et al. 2003):** It was used for assessing humour styles.. It is a 32-item self-report scale with response options on a seven-point Likert scale. It assesses affiliative humour, self-enhancing humour, combative humour, and self-defeating humour, the four types of humour. Each subscale has eight items. The reliability of the scales is 0.80 (affiliative), 0.81 (self-enhancing), 0.77 (aggressive), and 0.80 (self-defeating) for the original sample.
2. **Revised Adult Attachment Scale- Close Relationships Version (Collins, 1996):** It is an 18-item measure having three subscales (CLOSE, DEPEND, and ANXIETY) with six item each. CLOSE, DEPEND, and ANXIETY are the three subscales. The CLOSE scale assesses a person's level of comfort with intimacy and closeness. The DEPEND scale evaluates how much a person feels they can rely on others to be there for them when they need them. The ANXIETY subscale evaluates how concerned a person feels about being left behind or unloved. Cronbach's alpha for anxiety= 0.72, dependence = 0.75, and closeness= 0.69. Satisfactory evidence of discriminatory and construct-related validity.
3. **Conflict Management Formative Questionnaire:** It was established by Research Collaboration (2015). It is a 21-item scale that identifies the three elements that are necessary to implement conflict management. The scale ranges from 1 (Not very like me) to 5 (Very like me). It was determined to be reliable moderately (21 items; $r = .871$). The reliability was calculated for each subscale, 'understand natural response'- 9 items ($\alpha = .787$), the 'understand context'- 6 items ($\alpha = .703$), and the 'apply approach' subscale- 6 items ($\alpha = .604$).

Procedure

An online questionnaire was circulated to gather data. Informed consent was needed. The questionnaire was distributed to participants over the Internet. They were assured that absolute confidentiality would be maintained, and they were required to complete the questionnaire with utmost honesty. There were three questionnaires, and the subjects were only to move on to the next after completing the first. The surveys were used to assess the impact of humour style on young adults' attachment and conflict management. The scoring was completed later, and the findings were interpreted.

Results

Note: CAS- closed attachment style, DAS- depend attachment style, AAS- anxiety attachment style, AHS- affiliative humour style, SEHS- self-enhancing humour style, AgHS- aggressive humour style, SDHS- self-defeating humour style, UNR- understanding natural response, UC- understanding context, AA- apply approach.

From Table 1 we can infer that the Affiliative humour Style (AHS) and Closed Attachment Style (CAS) is positively correlated ($r = .305$, $p < 0.01$) and statistically significant at 0.01 level. The Self-Enhancing humour Style (SEHS) and Closed Attachment Style are positively correlated ($r = .262$, $p < 0.01$) and statistically significant at 0.01 level. The Self-Defeating humour Style (SDHS) and Depend Attachment Style are negatively correlated ($r = -.252$, $p < 0.01$) and statistically significant at 0.01 level. The Aggressive humour Style (AgHS) and Anxiety Attachment Style are positively correlated ($r = .204$, $p < 0.05$) and statistically significant at 0.05 level. The Self-Defeating humour Style (SDHS) and Anxiety Attachment Style are positively correlated ($r = -.436$, $p < 0.01$).

Similarly, it can be determined from Table 1 that the Affiliative humour Style (AHS) and Understanding Natural Response (UNR) positively correlated ($r = .369$, $p < 0.01$) and were statistically significant at 0.01 level. The Aggressive humour Style (AgHS) and Understanding Natural Response (UNR) are negatively correlated ($r = -.332$, $p < 0.01$) and statistically significant at 0.01 level. The Affiliative humour Style (AHS) and Understanding Context (UC) positively correlated ($r = .315$, $p < 0.01$) and were statistically significant at 0.01 level. The Self-Enhancing humour Style (SEHS) and Understanding Context (UC) are positively correlated ($r = .378$, $p < 0.01$) and statistically significant at 0.01 level. The Aggressive humour Style (AgHS) and Understanding Context (UC) are negatively correlated ($r = -.391$, $p < 0.01$) and statistically significant at 0.01 level. The Affiliative humour Style (AHS) and Apply Approach (AA) positively correlated ($r = .347$, $p < 0.01$) and were statistically significant at 0.01 level. The Self-Enhancing humour Style (SEHS) and Apply Approach (AA) is positively correlated ($r = .339$, $p < 0.01$) and statistically significant at 0.01 level. The

Aggressive humour Style (AgHS) and Apply defeating humour style as indicated by Adjusted R Square. Approach (AA) is negatively correlated ($r=-.484$, Square.

Table 1: Correlation Analysis for Humour Styles, Adult Attachment Styles, and Conflict Management

	CAS	DAS	AAS	AHS	SEHS	AgHS	SDHS	UNR	UC	AA
CAS	1									
DAS	.457**	1								
AAS	-.145	-.501**	1							
AHS	.305**	-.069	.068	1						
SEHS	.262**	-.100	.010	.181*	1					
AgHS	-.085	.055	.204*	-.071	-.130	1				
SDHS	.040	-.252**	.436**	.160	.277**	.217*	1			
UNR	.330**	-.133	.129	.369**	.322**	-.332**	.035	1		
UC	.294**	-.035	.101	.315**	.378**	-.391**	.096	.704**	1	
AA	.298**	-.042	-.071	.347**	.339**	-.484**	.004	.613**	.740**	1

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

* . Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Table 2: Predicting Closed Attachment Style from Affiliative Humour Style and Self-Enhancing Humour Style

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		F	Adjusted R Square
		B	Std. Error	Beta	t		
1	(Constant)	12.648	1.781		7.101	.000	
	AHS	.151	.043	.305	3.483	.001	12.133 .086
2	(Constant)	9.217	2.236		4.123	.000	
	AHS	.132	.043	.267	3.055	.003	
	SEHS	.122	.050	.214	2.453	.016	9.334 .123

a. Dependent Variable: CAS

$p < 0.01$) and statistically significant at 0.01 level. From the above table, it was found that 1 unit increase in affiliative humour style (AHS) led to a .13 increase in closed attachment style (CAS). Likewise, a 1 unit increase in self-enhancing humour style (SEHS) led to a .12 increase in Closed Attachment Style as indicated by the B value. Further 12.3% variance in closed attachment style was explained by affiliative humour style and self-enhancing humour style as indicated by Adjusted R Square.

From the above table, it was found that a 1 unit increase in self-defeating humour style (SDHS) led to a .13 decrease in depend attachment style (DAS) as indicated by the B value. Further 5.6% variance in depend attachment style was explained by self-

From the above table, it was conferred that 1 unit increase in aggressive humour style (AgHS) led to a .08 increase in anxiety attachment style (AAS). Likewise, a 1 unit increase in self-defeating humour style (SDHS) led to a .27 increase in anxiety attachment style as indicated by the B value. Further 19% variance in anxiety attachment style was explained by aggressive humour style and self-defeating humour style as indicated by Adjusted R Square.

From the above table, it was conferred that a 1 unit increase in affiliative humour style (AHS) led to a .25-unit increase in understanding natural response (UNR). Likewise, a 1 unit increase in self-enhancing humour style (SEHS) led to a .21 unit increase in understanding natural response as indicated by the B

value. A 1 unit increase in aggressive humour style (AgHS) led to a .25 unit decrease in understanding context as indicated by the B value. Likewise, a 1 unit increase in self-enhancing humor style (SEHS) led to a .17 unit increase in understanding context as indicated by the B value. A 1 unit increase in aggressive humor style (AgHS) led to a .19 unit decrease in understanding context. Further 29.9% variance in understanding context was explained by affiliative humor style, self-enhancing

Table3: Predicting Depend Attachment Style from Self-Defeating Humour Style

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		F	Adjusted R Square
		B	Std. Error	Beta	t		
1	(Constant)	20.12	1.56		12.85	.000	
	SDHS	-.13	.04	-.25	-2.83	.005	8.01 .056

a. Dependent Variable: DAS

natural response. Further 26.2% variance in understanding natural response was explained by affiliative humour style, self-enhancing humour style, and aggressive humour style as indicated by Adjusted R Square. understanding context as indicated by the B value. A 1 unit increase in aggressive humor style (AgHS) led to a .19 unit decrease in understanding context. Further 29.9% variance in understanding context was explained by affiliative humor style, self-enhancing

Table 4: Predicting Anxiety Attachment Style from Aggressive Humour Style and Self- Defeating Humour Style

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		F	Adjusted R Square
		B	Std. Error	Beta	t		
1	(Constant)	14.86	1.88		7.90	.000	
	AgHS	.14	.06	.20	2.26	.025	5.14 .03
2	(Constant)	8.01	2.22		3.60	.000	
	AgHS	.08	.06	.11	1.36	.175	
	SDHS	.27	.05	.41	4.86	.000	14.91 .19

a. Dependent Variable: AAS

From the above table, it was conferred that a 1 unit increase in affiliative humor style (AHS) led to a .12-unit increase in understanding context (UC). humor style, and aggressive humor style as indicated by Adjusted R Square. From the above table, it was conferred that a 1 unit

Table 5: Predicting Understanding Natural Response from Affiliative Humour Style, Self-Enhancing Humour Style, and Aggressive Humour Style.

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		F	Adjusted R Square
		B	Std. Error	Beta	t		
1	(Constant)	21.130	2.890		7.312	.000	
	AHS	.304	.070	.369	4.317	.000	18.640 .129
2	(Constant)	14.104	3.572		3.949	.000	
	AHS	.265	.069	.322	3.835	.000	
	SEHS	.250	.079	.264	3.145	.002	14.968 .190
3	(Constant)	22.579	4.169		5.416	.000	
	AHS	.253	.066	.308	3.844	.000	
	SEHS	.218	.076	.230	2.848	.005	
	AgHS	-.250	.071	-.281	-3.530	.001	15.109 .262

a. Dependent Variable: UNR

increase in affiliative humour style (AHS) led to a .13 unit increase in apply approach (AA). Likewise, a 1

Humour, resulting in different attachments to maintain close relationships, and maintaining those

Table 6: Predicting Understanding Context from Affiliative Humour Style, Self-Enhancing Humour Style, and Aggressive Humour Style

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		F	Adjusted R Square
		B	Std. Error	Beta	t		
1	(Constant)	13.582	1.878		7.232	.000	
	AHS	.165	.046	.315	3.607	.000	13.009 .092
2	(Constant)	7.956	2.270		3.506	.001	
	AHS	.134	.044	.255	3.046	.003	
	SEHS	.200	.050	.332	3.963	.000	15.168 .192
3	(Constant)	14.424	2.586		5.578	.000	
	AHS	.125	.041	.239	3.057	.003	
	SEHS	.175	.047	.291	3.703	.000	
	AgHS	-.191	.044	-.337	-4.343	.000	17.945 .299

a. Dependent Variable: UC

unit increase in self-enhancing humour style (SEHS) led to a .13 unit increase in apply approach as indicated by the B value. A 1 unit increase in

relationships necessitates conflict management skills. Based on the past literature various hypotheses were formed. The hypothesis (H1) put forward was that

Table 7: Predicting Apply Approach from Affiliative Humour Style, Self-Enhancing Humour Style, and Aggressive Humour Style

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		F	Adjusted R Square
		B	Std. Error	Beta	t		
1	(Constant)	13.462	1.759		7.654	.000	
	AHS	.172	.043	.347	4.023	.000	16.181 .113
2	(Constant)	8.877	2.160		4.110	.000	
	AHS	.147	.042	.296	3.515	.001	
	SEHS	.163	.048	.285	3.394	.001	14.573 .186
3	(Constant)	16.783	2.327		7.212	.000	
	AHS	.136	.037	.275	3.702	.000	
	SEHS	.133	.043	.233	3.118	.002	
	AgHS	-.233	.040	-.434	-5.899	.000	24.122 .368

a. Dependent Variable: AA

aggressive humour style (AGHS) led to a .23 unit decrease in apply approach. Further 36.8% variance in apply approach was explained by affiliative humour style, self-enhancing humour style, and aggressive humour style as indicated by Adjusted R Square.

Discussion

The current research aimed to investigate the impact of humour styles on attachment and conflict management in young adults. Individuals use humour in social situations; each person has a sense of

there is a positive relationship between affiliative humour style and closed attachment style. This hypothesis was confirmed as we discovered a positive relationship between these two variables. Close attachment is a secure attachment type in which people are comfortable with closeness and dependability in their relationships. The degree to which someone is at ease with intimacy and proximity is assessed by this. The results of our study are consistent with previous literature. Martin, et al.'s (2003) research found that the affiliative humour

style and secure attachment style are positively correlated. People who use humour in an affiliative way to improve social interactions are more likely to have a secure attachment style, which expresses a good self-perception and the capacity to build fulfilling relationships.

The hypothesis (H4) stated that a positive relationship among self-enhancing humour style and closed attachment style. This hypothesis was approved. Close attachment is a sort of secure attachment in which people are at ease with closeness and dependability in their relationships. It assesses how comfortable a person feels with closeness and intimacy. According to a study by Cann et al. (2010), people who used self-enhancing humour had higher levels of secure attachment and lower levels of anxious and avoidant attachment.

The hypothesis (H9) proposed a positive relationship between aggressive humour style and anxiety attachment style. The findings of the study confirmed and accepted this hypothesis. Our findings are consistent with earlier research. A study by Martin et al. (1984) reported individuals using aggressive humour styles reacted to anxiety more nervously than those who reported using non-aggressive humour styles. According to the authors, this could be because aggressive humour typically involves making fun of others, which can lead to social rejection and extra stress.

The hypothesis (H11) stated a negative relationship between self-defeating humour style and dependent attachment style. The study's results approved and validated this hypothesis. While people with a dependent style feel at ease relying on others and have partners who depend on them, those with an avoidant style avoid closeness and connection with others. They may have trouble expressing themselves and repress their feelings, which can limit the help they receive. According to Cann et al. (2015), those who avoid attachment use self-defeating humour as a coping strategy in close relationships more frequently. Attachment-avoidant people have confessed to using self-defeating humour to keep a safe distance from others and avoid emotional commitment in close relationships.

The hypothesis (H12) proposed a positive relationship between self-defeating humour style and anxiety attachment style. This hypothesis was approved by the study's findings. Kazarian et al. (2004) discovered that self-deprecating humour was a predictor of the anxious attachment type in friendship relationships, which entails relational anxiety and fear of rejection and abandonment. People who struggle with these issues may utilize this form of humour to improve relationship security at their own expense.

The hypothesis (H13) proposed a positive relationship between affiliative humour style and understanding natural response. This hypothesis was approved. Understanding one's natural reaction to conflict can help one create tactics for handling conflicts more

successfully. The collaborating conflict style involves cooperating with the other party to resolve a dispute in a way that benefits both parties. This includes engaging in open dialogue, paying attention to other people's points of view, and collaborating with others. According to Brandt's (2013) study, University Line Officers who use "positive" humour, such as "Affiliative" Humour Styles, also utilize "Collaborating" Conflict Management Styles. This implies that using Collaborative approaches may help people better understand their feelings and emotions by actively listening to others and empathizing with their points of view.

The hypothesis (H14) stated a positive relationship between affiliative humour style and understanding context. This hypothesis was accepted. Understanding the context of a conflict is essential for managing it effectively. The compromising conflict style involves finding a middle ground where each party can make concessions to reach an agreement. By understanding the context and perspectives at play, it is possible to find a compromise that meets the needs of everyone involved. Wanzer, et al. (2006) found in one of their studies that teachers who utilized Humour in an affiliative manner were more likely to resolve problems with pupils using a compromising style. They may be more able to understand the context of a conflict and, as a result, use a compromise conflict style when resolving disputes with students.

The hypothesis (H15) that there is a positive relationship between affiliative humour style and apply approach was accepted. The accommodating conflict style prioritises the relationship between the parties over achieving personal goals or interests. According to Bakker, et al.'s (1996) study, those who use humour in an affiliative manner are more likely to resolve conflicts in the workplace by employing an accommodating conflict style. To reduce the tension and put more emphasis on the relationship than the conflict, they could apply a suitable approach to conflict management style.

The hypothesis (H16) stated a positive relationship between Self-Enhancing Humour Style and Understanding Natural Response. The findings of the study confirmed and approved the hypothesis. Understanding your natural response to conflict can help you to identify your own strengths and weaknesses, as well as your natural tendencies when it comes to resolving conflicts. By recognizing whether you tend to naturally gravitate towards a collaborative approach or not, you can begin to develop strategies for managing conflicts more effectively. According to Doyle-Portillo's (2019) research, persons using self-enhancing humour are more probable to collaborate during conflict resolution and approach problems with a constructive and positive attitude. It can assist people in understanding their natural reaction to a disagreement in a favourable manner.

The hypothesis (H17) that there is a positive relationship between self-enhancing humour style and understanding context was accepted. For a conflict to be managed successfully, the context must be understood. The compromising conflict style is locating a compromise point where each party can make a concession in order to come to an understanding. Finding a solution that satisfies the needs of all parties concerned requires understanding the context and viewpoints at work. Additionally, Brandt's (2013) research on the Conflict Management Styles of Line Officers showed that University Line Officers using positive humour, including self-enhancing humour styles, are likely to practice compromising conflict management styles. This suggests that those who are skilled at compromising are probably good at comprehending the context of a conflict and the requirements of the various parties involved.

The hypothesis (H18) anticipated a positive relationship between self-enhancing humour style and apply approach. The study's findings confirmed and approved the hypothesis. The integrative conflict style is a method of conflict resolution that aims to benefit all parties. Applying the right conflict management strategy requires analyzing the situation to determine which strategy will best serve the needs and interests of all parties involved. Both require a willingness to hear the opinions and needs of others and a dedication to working toward a just and equitable solution.

According to Cann, et al. (2008), the self-enhancing humour style was positively correlated with integrative conflict styles. Applying a situation-appropriate conflict management strategy requires using suitable techniques and understanding one's natural response and the context of the conflict.

The hypothesis (H19) anticipated a negative relationship between aggressive humour style and understanding natural response. The findings of the study confirmed and approved the hypothesis. The collaborative conflict style helps people understand their natural reactions by actively listening, communicating, and cooperating to create a win-win resolution. A study conducted by Bippus, (2019), suggested that people who rely on aggressive Humour are less inclined to engage in collaborative conflict resolution.

The hypothesis (H20) proposed a negative relationship between aggressive humour style and understanding context. The findings of the study confirmed and approved the hypothesis. Understanding the context entails understanding the conflict's background, including everyone's points of view. The use of compromise conflict management techniques necessitates a readiness to hear and comprehend everyone's viewpoints. According to research by Gross & Levenson from 1997, those who had high scores for aggressive humour style were less

likely to employ compromising conflict management techniques than people with low scores.

The hypothesis (H21) that there is a negative relationship between aggressive humour style and apply approach was accepted. Apply approach involves choosing a course of action that is appropriate for the given circumstances. Martin's (2007) research findings suggested that people who used aggressive humour in workplace interaction were more likely to experience conflict with colleagues and have lower levels of job satisfaction. It may as well be because they are less likely to use an Apply Approach to conflict management.

Conclusion

This research study aimed to study the impact of humour styles of young adults on their adult attachment styles and conflict management. It was found the humour styles predicted both adult attachments and conflict management. Both the positive or adaptive humour styles, affiliative humour style and self-enhancing humour style, had a significant positive relationship with closed attachment style. The aggressive humour style and the anxiety attachment style were revealed to have positively relationship. There was a negative relationship found between depend attachment type and self-defeating humour. It was established that the affiliative humour style had a positive relationship with understanding natural response, understanding context, and apply approach. Likewise, there was a positive relation between the self-enhancing humour type and understanding natural response, understanding context, and apply approach, whereas, the aggressive humour style had a significantly negative relationship with understanding natural response, understanding context, and apply approach. There are a few possible limitations to the research study, like self-reporting questionnaires were used which could have had potential biases. A potential future implication of the research could be that it could examine the impact on gender over a larger sample size as well as across different age groups. Additionally, since there aren't many studies that have looked at these aspects of conflict management with humour types, additional research may be done in this area.

References

- Abel, M. H. (2002). Humor, stress, and coping strategies. *Humor: International Journal of Humor Research*, 15(4), 365–381. <https://doi.org/10.1515/humr.15.4.365>
- Adamczyk, K., & Bookwala, J. (2013). Adult attachment and single vs. partnered relationship status in Polish university students. *Psichologiske Teme*, 22(3), 481–500.
- Anders, S. L., & Tucker, J. S. (2000). Adult attachment style, interpersonal communication competence, and social support. *Personal Relationships*, 7, 379–389. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-6811.2000.tb00023.x>

- Bartholomew, K., & Horowitz, L. M. (1991). Attachment styles among young adults: A test of a four-category model. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 61(2), 226–244. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.61.2.226>
- Bekelja Wanzer, M., Bainbridge Frymier, A., Wojtaszczyk, A. M., & Smith, T. (2006). Appropriate and inappropriate uses of humor by teachers. *Communication Education*, 55(2), 178–196. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03634520600566132>
- Bowlby, J. (1958). The nature of the child's tie to his mother. In P. M. D. Buckley (Ed.), *Essential papers on object relations*.
- Butzer, B., & Campbell, L. (2008). Adult attachment, sexual satisfaction, and relationship satisfaction: A study of married couples. *Personal Relationships*, 15(1), 141–154. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-6811.2007.00189.x>
- Brandt, S. E. (2013). *The Role of Humor and its Influence on the Self-Perceived and Others-Perceived Conflict Management Styles of Line Officers in Institutions of Higher Learning Serving Deaf, Hard-of-Hearing, and Hearing Students*. Gallaudet University.
- Cann, A., Norman, M. A., Welbourne, J. L., & Calhoun, L. G. (2008). Attachment styles, conflict styles and humour styles: interrelationships and associations with relationship satisfaction. *European Journal of Personality*, 22(2), 131–146. doi:10.1002/per.666
- Cann, A., Zapata, C. L., & Davis, H. B. (2011). Humor style and relationship satisfaction in dating couples: Perceived versus self-reported humor styles as predictors of satisfaction. *Humor: International Journal of Humor Research*, 24(1), 1–20. <https://doi.org/10.1515/HUMR.2011.001>
- Collins, N. L., & Read, S. J. (1990). Adult attachment, working models, and relationship quality in dating couples. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 58, 644 – 663. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.58.4.644>
- Diehl, M., Elnick, A. B., Bourbeau, L. S., & Labouvie-Vief, G. (1998). Adult attachment styles: Their relations to family context and personality. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 74(6), 1656–1669. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.74.6.1656>
- Dindia, K. (2000). Relational maintenance. In C. Hendrick & S. S. Hendrick (Eds.), *Close relationships: A sourcebook* (pp. 287–299). Sage Publications, Inc. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781452220437.n21>
- Dozois, D. J., Martin, R. A., & Bieling, P. J. (2009). Early maladaptive schemas and adaptive/maladaptive styles of humor. *Cognitive Therapy and Research*, 33, 585–596. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10608-008-9223-9>
- Fraley, R. C., & Waller, N. G. (1998). Adult attachment patterns: A test of the typological model. In J. A. Simpson & W. S. Rholes (Eds.), *Attachment theory and close relationships* (pp. 77–114). The Guilford Press.
- Gross, J. J., & Levenson, R. W. (1997). Hiding feelings: The acute effects of inhibiting negative and positive emotion. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 106(1), 95–103. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-843X.106.1.95>
- Gruner, C. R. (1997). *The game of humor: A comprehensive theory of why we laugh*. Transaction Publishers.
- Hall, J. A. (2013). Humor in long-term romantic relationships: The association of general humor styles and relationship-specific functions with relationship satisfaction. *Western Journal of Communication*, 77(3), 272–292. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10570314.2012.757796>
- Hoffman M. (2007). *Does sense of humor moderate the relationship between leadership style and conflict management style?* (dissertation). University of Nebraska-Lincoln.
- Horne, S. G., & Biss, W. J. (2009). Equality discrepancy between women in same-sex relationships: The mediating role of attachment in relationship satisfaction. *Sex Roles: A Journal of Research*, 60(9-10), 721–730. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-008-9571-7>
- Holland, A. S., & Roisman, G. I. (2010). Adult attachment security and young adults' dating relationships over time: self-reported, observational, and physiological evidence. *Developmental psychology*, 46(2), 552–557. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0018542>
- Jiang, F., Lu, S., Jiang, T., & Jia, H. (2020). Does the relation between humor styles and subjective well-being vary across culture and age? A meta-analysis. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 11, 2213. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.02213>
- Kazarian, S. S., & Martin, R. A. (2004). Humour styles, personality, and well-being among Lebanese university students. *European Journal of Personality*, 18(3), 209–219. <https://doi.org/10.1002/per.505>
- Kirkpatrick, L. A., & Shaver, P. R. (1992). An attachment-theoretical approach to romantic love and religious belief. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 18(3), 266–275. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167292183002>
- Kobak, R., & Duemmler, S. (1994). Attachment and conversation: Toward a discourse analysis of adolescent and adult security. In K. Bartholomew & D. Perlman (Eds.), *Attachment processes in adulthood* (pp. 121–149). Jessica Kingsley Publishers.
- Kuiper, N. A., Martin, R. A., & Dance, K. A. (1992). Sense of humour and enhanced quality of life. *Personality and individual differences*, 13(12), 1273–1283. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0191-8869\(92\)90169-P](https://doi.org/10.1016/0191-8869(92)90169-P)

- Kuipers, G. (2009). Humor Styles and Symbolic Boundaries. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 96(2), 219–239. <https://doi.org/10.1515/JLT.2009.013>
- Lefcourt, H. M. (2001). *Humor: The psychology of living buoyantly*. Springer Science & Business Media. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4615-4287-2>
- Lefcourt, H. M., Davidson, K., Shepherd, R., Phillips, M., Prkachin, K., & Mills, D. (1995). Perspective-taking humor: Accounting for stress moderation. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 14(4), 373–391. <https://doi.org/10.1521/jscp.1995.14.4.373>
- Luevano, V. X., Pablo, J. N., Velazquez, M. L., Chance, B., & Ramirez, B. (2021). Attachment as a predictor of attraction to humor styles. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 173, 110634. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2021.110634>
- McLeod, S. (2017). Bowlby's attachment theory. *Simply Psychology*. Retrieved from <https://www.simplypsychology.org/bowlby.html>
- Magai, C., Consedine, N. S., Gillespie, M., O'Neal, C., & Vilker, R. (2004). The differential roles of early emotion socialization and adult attachment in adult emotional experience: testing a mediator hypothesis. *Attachment & human development*, 6(4), 389–417. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1461673042000303118>
- Markman, H. J., Renick, M. J., Floyd, F. J., Stanley, S. M., & Clements, M. (1993). Preventing marital distress through communication and conflict management training: A 4- and 5-year follow-up. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 61(1), 70–77. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-006X.61.1.70>
- Martin, R. A. (2001). Humor, laughter, and physical health: Methodological issues and research findings. *Psychological Bulletin*, 127(4), 504–519. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.127.4.504>
- Martin, R. (2003). Sense of humor. In S. J. Lopez & C. R. Snyder (Eds.), *Positive psychological assessment: A handbook of models and measures* (pp. 313–326). American Psychological Association. <https://doi.org/10.1037/10612-020>
- Martin R. A., Ford T. (2018). *The Psychology of Humor: An Integrative Approach*. Burlington, MA: Elsevier Academic Press.
- Martin, R. A., Puhlik-Doris, P., Larsen, G., Gray, J., & Weir, K. (2003). Individual differences in uses of humor and their relation to psychological well-being: Development of the Humor Styles Questionnaire. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 37(1), 48–75. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0092-6566\(02\)00534-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0092-6566(02)00534-2)
- Martineau, W. H. (1972). A model of the social functions of humor. In J. H. Goldstein & P. E. McGhee (Eds.), *The psychology of humor* (pp. 101–125). New York: Academic Press.
- Mikulincer, M., & Shaver, P. R. (2005). Attachment theory and emotions in close relationships: Exploring the attachment-related dynamics of emotional reactions to relational events. *Personal Relationships*, 12(2), 149–168. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1350-4126.2005.00108.x>
- Nickerson, A. B., & Nagle, R. J. (2005). Parent and Peer Attachment in Late Childhood and Early Adolescence. *The Journal of Early Adolescence*, 25(2), 223–249. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0272431604274174>
- Noonan, P. M., & Erickson, A. S. G. (2017). *The skills that matter: Teaching interpersonal and intrapersonal competencies in any classroom*. Corwin Press
- Pietromonaco, P. R., & Barrett, L. F. (1997). Working models of attachment and daily social interactions. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 73(6), 1409–1423. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.73.6.1409>
- Pistole, M. C. (1989). Attachment in adult romantic relationships: Style of conflict resolution and relationship satisfaction. *Journal of social and personal relationships*, 6(4), 505–510. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0265407589064008>
- Priel, B., & Shamai, D. (1995). Attachment style and perceived social support: Effects on affect regulation. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 19(2), 235–241. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0191-8869\(95\)91936-T](https://doi.org/10.1016/0191-8869(95)91936-T)
- Ravitz, P., Maunder, R., Hunter, J., Sthankiya, B., & Lancee, W. (2010). Adult attachment measures: A 25-year review. *Journal of Psychosomatic Research*, 69, 419 – 432. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jpsychores.2009.08.006>
- Romero, E. J. (2005). The effect of humour on mental state and work effort. *International Journal of Work Organisation and Emotion*, 1(2), 137–149. DOI:10.1504/IJWOE.2005.008818
- Romero, E., & Pescosolido, A. (2008). Humor and group effectiveness. *Human relations*, 61(3), 395–418. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726708088999>
- Rubinstein, G., Tziner, A., & Bilig, M. (2012). Attachment, relationship quality and stressful life events: A theoretical meta-perspective and some preliminary results. *Revista de Psicología del Trabajo y de las Organizaciones*, 28(3), 151–156. <https://doi.org/10.5093/tr2012a12>
- Saroglou, V., & Scariot, C. (2002). Humor Styles Questionnaire: Personality and educational correlates in Belgian high school and college students. *European Journal of Personality*, 16(1), 43–54. <https://doi.org/10.1002/per.430>
- Shaver, P., & Hazan, C. (1992). Adult Romantic Attachment Process: Theory and Evidence. In D. Perlman, & W. Jones (Eds.), *Advances in Personal Relationships Outcomes* (Vol. IV, pp. 29–70). London: Jessica Kingsley Publisher.
- Simpson, J. A. (1990). Influence of attachment styles on romantic relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 59, 971–980. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.59.5.971>

- Simpson, J. A., Rholes, W. S., & Phillips, D. (1996). Conflict in close relationships: An attachment perspective. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 71(5), 899–914. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.71.5.899>
- Sumer, H. C., & Knight, P. A. (2001). How do people with different attachment styles balance work and family? A personality perspective on work-family linkage. *The Journal of applied psychology*, 86(4), 653–663. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.86.4.653>
- Waters, E., Crowell, J., Elliott, M., Corcoran, D., & Treboux, D. (2002). Bowlby's secure base theory and the social/personality psychology of attachment styles: work(s) in progress. *Attachment & human development*, 4(2), 230–242. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14616730210154216>