

Conflict Management in Couples With Avoidant Attachment Style and Anxious Attachment Style in Romantic Relationships

Kayla Adzra Divaya ^{1*}, Dian Hutami Rahmawati ²

¹ Universitas Pembangunan Nasional “Veteran” Jawa Timur, Indonesia, 22043010170@student.upnjatim.ac.id

² Universitas Pembangunan Nasional “Veteran” Jawa Timur, Indonesia, dian.hutami.ilkom@upnjatim.ac.id

Corresponding Author Email: 22043010170@student.upnjatim.ac.id

ABSTRACT

Received : 21 May 2026

Accepted : 10 June 2026

Published : 30 June 2026

Keywords:

interpersonal communication, conflict management, avoidant attachment, anxious attachment, romantic relationship

This study aims to determine and analyze conflict management strategies in romantic relationships involving individuals with avoidant attachment and anxious attachment styles. Differences in attachment styles between two individuals in a romantic relationship frequently cause recurring communication conflicts that may direct the relationship toward an unhealthy condition. This research employed a descriptive qualitative approach using in-depth interview techniques with eight informants aged 19–22 years who were in or had been in romantic relationships. Informants were selected using purposive sampling and identified as having avoidant or anxious attachment through an attachment styles questionnaire. Results showed that individuals with anxious attachment tend to be more emotional, seek validation, experience overthinking, and strongly desire quick conflict resolution to preserve the relationship. Conversely, individuals with avoidant attachment tend to avoid conflict, maintain emotional distance, prioritize independence, and have a low need for external validation. These differences generate a recurring pursuer-distancer dynamic that causes repeated communication conflicts. The conflict management strategies found include: avoiding strategy (among avoidant informants), and compromising and accommodating strategies (among anxious informants). Open interpersonal communication, emotional space provided with assurance, and high empathy were proven to be key factors in managing conflict constructively.

INTRODUCTION

The phenomena of avoidant attachment and anxious attachment have garnered significant attention on social media, particularly on the TikTok platform. One piece of content depicting a conversation between an individual with avoidant attachment and one with anxious attachment attracted substantial audience engagement, accumulating 20.6 million views, 3.6 million likes, and approximately 16,000 comments. Furthermore, hashtags related to avoidant attachment and anxious attachment on social media have exceeded 150,000 uses. This data demonstrates that the topic of attachment styles in romantic relationships is highly relevant and has become part of a broad conversation

in today's digital society. In human life, love and affection are fundamental needs that can be fulfilled through family, friends, or romantic partners. This aligns with Abraham Maslow's hierarchy of needs theory, specifically at the love and belonging level the need for social relationships, affection, and acceptance from one's environment. As individuals grow into adulthood, they tend to seek the fulfillment of love needs through romantic relationships. Dating can be considered one of the ways two individuals seek compatibility with the aim of developing a more serious relationship such as marriage (Radde et al., 2022). Romantic relationships are characterized by reciprocal and continuous interactions, identifiable

through expressions of affection and specific forms of intimacy. Effective communication is one of the key foundations of a healthy relationship (Macedonia, 2023). Good communication creates positive bonds, while poor communication skills can push a relationship toward a toxic condition (Awing & Arsyad, 2023).

Each individual's communication patterns are strongly influenced by the attachment style developed in childhood. Individuals with a secure attachment style have a high likelihood of happiness and strong trust in romantic relationships. Conversely, individuals with an insecure attachment style experience fear of intimacy, jealousy issues, low self-esteem, and dissatisfaction in relationships. Insecure attachment is divided into two main patterns: avoidant attachment and anxious attachment (Kalamsari & Ginanjar, 2022). Researchers have identified a frequently recurring pattern in relationships between avoidant and anxious attachment individuals: the pursuer-distancer dynamic. In this pattern, the anxious individual becomes dependent, demanding, and critical toward their partner, while the avoidant individual withdraws and seeks emotional distance. As the anxious individual pursues more intensely, the avoidant individual withdraws further, creating a cycle that continuously repeats and can render the relationship unhealthy (Johnson, 2022).

Although this phenomenon has gained widespread public attention through social media, there remains limited empirical understanding of how couples with these contrasting attachment styles actually manage conflict in romantic relationships. Individuals with avoidant attachment tend to perceive conflict situations and their partner's behavior negatively, choosing avoidance because they believe their partner cannot employ proper conflict resolution strategies (Bretaña et al., 2024). Meanwhile, individuals with anxious attachment have a fear of rejection and abandonment, causing them to pursue their partner during conflict and more frequently choose to resolve issues quickly out of fear of being left (Kural & Kovacs, 2022). Research on conflict management specifically concerning avoidant and anxious attachment styles remains relatively limited. Many prior studies have examined conflict in relationships with a focus on significant differences such as cultural, religious, or socioeconomic gaps. However, research that specifically addresses conflict management

strategies based on differences in attachment style still requires further development. This highlights the need for additional research to understand how conflict management operates between couples with avoidant and anxious attachment in romantic relationships.

Based on this background, this study poses the following research question: how do couples with avoidant attachment and anxious attachment styles manage conflict in romantic relationships? The objective of this study is to identify and analyze the conflict management strategies employed by couples with these differing attachment styles, while also identifying the interpersonal communication patterns that emerge in their conflict management process.

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Interpersonal Communication

Interpersonal communication is a form of communication that occurs directly between two individuals, in which both parties interact and actively participate in the exchange of messages. According to Adler and Rodman, interpersonal communication can be understood as a process in which two or more people are actively involved in creating shared meaning through dynamically unfolding and mutually influential interactions. Joseph A. DeVito emphasized the importance of feedback in interpersonal communication, whereby a message delivered by one party can be received, responded to, and understood directly by the other (Anggraini et al., 2022). Interpersonal communication involves symbolic and nonverbal elements, such as body language, facial expressions, and vocal intonation, all of which play an important role in building meaning and strengthening relationships between individuals. In the context of romantic relationships, the ability to communicate interpersonally is crucial for establishing a harmonious relationship and avoiding conflict in everyday life (Rahadi, 2021). Effective interpersonal communication serves as an important foundation for conflict management, enabling both parties to mutually understand each other's needs, feelings, and perspectives. In this study, interpersonal communication is used to examine how couples with avoidant and anxious attachment styles exchange messages, express emotions, and negotiate conflict during interpersonal interactions.

2.2 Communication Psychology

Communication psychology is a branch of study that specifically examines various aspects of human behavior and mental events occurring during the process of interaction or communication. This field not only studies how messages are conveyed and received, but also delves more deeply into the character, attitudes, and psychological conditions of the individuals involved in that communication. Communication psychology places primary focus on individual perceptions of messages, communicative intentions or goals, interactions between parties, message retention capacity, and the conditions necessary for shared goals to be effectively achieved (Suardi, 2023). In the context of this study, communication psychology provides a framework for understanding how psychological factors such as anxiety, fear of rejection, and the need for validation arising from an individual's attachment style influence how they communicate and respond to conflict. The differing psychological conditions between avoidant and anxious attachment individuals directly impact the communication patterns that form in their romantic relationships. Accordingly, this theory helps explain the psychological processes underlying participants' communication behaviors during conflict situations in romantic relationships.

2.3 Conflict Mode Instrument Theory

Developed by Kenneth W. Thomas and Ralph H. Kilmann, the Conflict Mode Instrument Theory is a conceptual framework designed to understand how individuals behave when confronting conflict. The theory identifies five conflict management styles available to individuals, based on two primary dimensions: assertiveness and cooperativeness (Thomas & Kilmann, 1978). First, the avoiding strategy involves managing conflict by withdrawing or postponing issues, reflecting low levels of both cooperativeness and assertiveness. Individuals employing this style seek to avoid threats by withdrawing from the situation. Second, the collaborating strategy reflects high assertiveness and high cooperativeness, aiming to find solutions satisfying both parties through negotiation. Third, the compromising strategy represents a moderate approach that balances self-interest and the interests of others, with each party willing to relinquish part of

their desires for a mutually acceptable solution. Fourth, the accommodating strategy is characterized by low assertiveness but high cooperativeness, in which the individual sets aside their own interests to meet the needs of the other party. Fifth, the competing strategy is characterized by high assertiveness but low cooperativeness, in which the individual maintains their own position and desires (Murisa et al., 2024). In this study, these five conflict management styles serve as the analytical framework for identifying how participants respond to and manage interpersonal conflict with their romantic partners

2.4 Interpersonal Conflict Management Theory

In interpersonal conflict management theory, several factors influence the selection of a conflict strategy. First, goals the objectives sought in the short or long term. Second, emotional state the feelings experienced during interpersonal conflict, which influence strategy selection; for example, one's strategy when angry differs from when sad. Third, cognitive assessment the evaluation of the causes of conflict, which shapes the conflict style chosen. Fourth, personality and communication competence a person's personality influences their preferred conflict style. Fifth, family history the ways in which an individual manages conflict can be influenced by the values and conflict patterns taught by their family (Shinta Maheswari et al., 2024). This theory supports the present study by explaining the factors that may influence participants' choice of conflict management strategies within romantic relationships.

2.5 Avoidant Attachment

Avoidant attachment is an emotional bonding style in which a person tends to avoid closeness and emotional intimacy with others. Individuals with this style typically feel uncomfortable with intimacy, prefer independence, and find it difficult to open up in interpersonal relationships. Although they may appear physically and emotionally independent and strong, they actually harbor a deep fear of closeness and dependency, which leads them to maintain emotional distance as a self-protective mechanism against potential pain, rejection, or stress that may arise in relationships. Characteristic traits of avoidant attachment in relationships include avoiding emotional discussions, difficulty trusting a partner, maintaining emotional distance, focusing on

independence, and difficulty expressing affection. Individuals with avoidant attachment tend to view others negatively while perceiving themselves positively (Angela & Ariela, 2021). Avoidant individuals also tend to be more passive and choose to minimize all forms of interaction with their partner in a romantic relationship. The impact of avoidant attachment on relationships includes the emergence of discord due to lack of emotional communication and a decline in relationship quality (Bretaña et al., 2024). In this study, the concept of avoidant attachment is used to interpret participants' tendency to withdraw, avoid emotional discussions, and maintain distance during conflict with their partners

2.6 Anxious Attachment

Anxious attachment is an emotional bonding style characterized by an excessive fear of being abandoned or ignored by a loved one. Individuals with anxious attachment frequently question whether they are truly loved and feel anxious and unsettled when separated from their partner. This condition is associated with a negative self-image and low self-esteem, leading them to strongly need ongoing validation and attention from their partner to feel emotionally secure. Characteristics of anxious attachment include high emotional dependency, difficulty trusting others, jealousy, and difficulty controlling emotions and setting boundaries in relationships. Individuals with anxious attachment tend to feel unworthy of love, constantly need validation from others, and harbor a persistent worry about being abandoned by their partner (Suryadi & Sherly, 2022). A person with anxious attachment frequently questions their own worth and tends to view themselves negatively while perceiving others as good (Angela & Ariela, 2021). This pattern typically develops as a result of childhood experiences with inconsistent or emotionally unresponsive caregiving. In this study, the concept of anxious attachment is used to explain participants' tendency to seek reassurance, pursue their partners during conflict, and display heightened emotional responses in romantic relationships.

METHOD

This study employs descriptive research combined with a qualitative approach. The qualitative approach was selected based on the research objective of exploring and gaining an in-depth understanding of how both attachment types influence the ways couples confront and manage conflict in their relationships. This study adheres to a constructivist paradigm, which views reality as subjectively constructed by each individual, thereby requiring a deep understanding of the meanings and perspectives of the informants.

The data collection technique used was the in-depth interview. In-depth interviews are a face-to-face questioning process between the researcher and the informant, aimed at obtaining rich and open-ended data. This technique employs open-ended questions that allow informants to express their views, feelings, and experiences freely without being constrained by pre-prepared answers. In addition to verbal responses, the researcher also observed the nonverbal responses of informants as part of the collected data.

Informant selection used purposive sampling, a sampling method in which the researcher intentionally selects informants based on specific criteria relevant to the research objectives. Prior to interviews, the researcher posted a call for participants on the X platform to reach potential informants, then administered screening questions and an attachment styles questionnaire to identify each individual's attachment style. The attachment style questionnaire was adapted from previously established attachment theory instruments and was used solely as a screening tool to classify participants into avoidant or anxious attachment categories. The informant criteria were: (1) aged 19 or above, (2) currently in or previously in a romantic relationship, and (3) identified as having avoidant or anxious attachment.

Interviews were conducted during April 2026 in Surabaya and its surroundings, both in person and online. Eight individuals participated in the study, as presented in the following table:

Table 1. Research Informant Profiles

No	Code	Age	Domicile	Status	Attachment	Notes
1	RB	22	Surabaya	Single	Anxious	Ex-partner of LA (~2 years)
2	LA	22	Surabaya	Single	Avoidant	Ex-partner of RB (~2 years)
3	SA	22	Jakarta	Single	Anxious	Independent informant
4	GR	21	Surabaya	In relationship	Avoidant	Active partner of G (3 years)
5	G	22	Surabaya	In relationship	Anxious	Active partner of GR (3 years)
6	DA	22	Surabaya	Situationship	Avoidant	Independent informant
7	AP	21	Surabaya	Single	Avoidant	Independent informant
8	AE	22	Solo	Single	Anxious	Independent informant

Data analysis employed the interactive data analysis model proposed by Miles and Huberman, comprising three stages: data condensation, data presentation, and conclusion drawing. Data condensation involved selecting, simplifying, and transforming data from interview transcripts into more concise and focused forms. Data presentation was conducted narratively to facilitate understanding and conclusion drawing. The final stage involved drawing conclusions inductively based on patterns, themes, or categories identified in the data.

RESULT

4.1 Identification of Informants' Attachment Styles

Based on the results of questionnaires and in-depth interviews, the eight informants were categorized into two attachment style groups. Four informants (LA, GR, DA, AP) were identified as having avoidant attachment, and the remaining four (RB, SA, G, AE) were identified as having anxious attachment.

The four avoidant informants consistently displayed the following characteristics: (1) a tendency to establish certain boundaries in romantic relationships as a mechanism for maintaining emotional distance from their partner, (2) an absence of strong need for partner validation, (3) no tendency toward overthinking about their partner's condition or the relationship, and (4) a tendency to avoid directly discussing problems with their partner. These characteristics align with the depiction of avoidant attachment in the literature, wherein individuals develop excessive independence as a form of internal working model in which emotional closeness is perceived as potentially causing discomfort (Bretaña et al., 2024).

Conversely, the four anxious informants displayed characteristics including: (1) a strong need for partner validation, (2) a tendency to overthink about their partner's feelings and condition, (3) intense worry about the possibility of being abandoned by their partner, and (4) panic when their partner is unreachable or not nearby. These characteristics reflect the internal working model of anxious individuals, who view relationships as inherently unstable and prone to loss, causing them to develop a high need for closeness and validation from others (Angela & Ariela, 2021).

4.2 Conflict Patterns in Romantic Relationships

All informants in this study viewed conflict not as something entirely negative, but rather as a natural and even beneficial part of a relationship. However, the way each individual interpreted and responded to conflict differed significantly based on their attachment style.

Informants with avoidant attachment tended to view conflict from a more analytical and instrumental perspective. They accepted conflict as a phenomenon that can provide deeper insight into their partner,

provided the conflict did not threaten their autonomy or emotional comfort. DA stated:

"The more conflict there is, the more we learn about our partner we understand how they handle problems. I think that's important too."

Conversely, informants with anxious attachment held a more emotionally nuanced view. Their acceptance of conflict was accompanied by a stronger orientation toward its emotional and relational impact. G stated:

"It's fine if there's conflict, as long as it's not too frequent. We've been together 3 years and have started to know each other well, so if there's conflict, I'd rather just resolve it right away instead of letting it become a time bomb that explodes unexpectedly."

Based on the interviews, the sources of conflict in romantic relationships between avoidant and anxious individuals can be categorized into three main sources: (1) miscommunication and misunderstanding, (2) differences in ways of thinking and perspectives, and (3) emotional and individual behavioral factors.

Miscommunication was the most dominant source of conflict. Conflict arose when a message sent by one party was not received or interpreted as intended by the other, whether due to unverified assumptions, misinterpreted messages, or unexpressed expectations. GR stated:

"Miscommunication, like I said earlier. Like it turned out she felt she needed to be needed to feel like she was actually a girlfriend, while I felt that being a girlfriend didn't necessarily mean being the person most needed. That's the core of it most of our conflicts come down to miscommunication, and it doesn't happen often, but when it does it's really bad."

Regarding the impact of conflict, informants with anxious attachment consistently reported that conflict produced intense emotional impacts in the form of panic, excessive anxiety (overthinking), and unease that persisted until the conflict was resolved. RB stated:

"I just want it to be over quickly not the relationship, but the problem. Like if we go out, have a fight, then he goes home, I keep thinking about it. Like 'How long

is he going to be angry?', 'Is he okay?'. Yes, I panic what if we fight again, and because it keeps happening he starts considering leaving me or something."

Avoidant informants, in contrast, showed conflict impacts that were more focused on internal emotional discomfort and a tendency toward withdrawal. Although appearing calm externally, conflict still produced deep impact when it touched aspects of self-esteem and ego. LA revealed that the most significant conflict event in her relationship deeply wounded her ego and pushed her to end the relationship, even though her external reaction appeared calm.

4.3 Conflict Management Strategies of Avoidant Attachment Informants

All four avoidant attachment informants LA, GR, DA, and AP consistently applied the avoiding strategy when facing conflict in romantic relationships. This strategy aligns with the characteristics of avoidant attachment: a tendency to avoid emotional closeness, prioritizing independence, and using distance as an emotional regulation mechanism.

In LA's case, the avoiding pattern was highly explicit. LA completely withdrew from communication with her partner when conflict arose, fearing that emotional intensity would continue to escalate if interaction continued. LA stated:

"I tend to avoid conflict because when I'm angry at someone or have a problem with them, I don't want to meet or talk with them. So I feel like I'll just avoid them until I'm not upset anymore."

LA also displayed more extreme avoidance behaviors, such as leaving messages unread and unilaterally blocking her partner's account without prior notice. This behavior reflects an inability to manage conflict constructively, with avoidance functioning as a defense mechanism to reduce emotional pressure.

Informants DA and AP exhibited a more passive but equally consistent avoiding pattern. Both explicitly stated that they would not take the initiative to contact their partner first when conflict occurred, and would only be willing to open communication if the partner reached out first. DA stated:

"Avoiding that's the main thing, definitely avoiding. Sometimes it's not even discussed but rather directly confronted and then I avoid them and won't reply to their messages. They have to reach out first."

AP similarly stated:

"I usually avoid until they come looking for me."

This condition creates an unbalanced relational dynamic, in which the partner is implicitly expected to always be the party who initiates conflict resolution. This pattern reflects a power imbalance in the relationship and has the potential to further deteriorate relationship quality if the partner lacks sufficient understanding of the avoidant attachment style.

The most adaptive variation of the avoiding strategy was found in informant GR, who applied what this study terms an avoiding with assurance strategy. Unlike the other informants, GR consistently chose to first apologize and inform his partner that he needed temporary distance before being ready to discuss the issue at hand. GR stated:

"What I do is first say sorry, then say: wait, I need some space so we can talk without emotions, so we can talk with a clear head. After that we talk it out calmly."

The strategy GR applied proved effective because it provided relational assurance to his partner who has anxious attachment. By communicating the reason for his withdrawal before actually distancing himself, GR prevented his partner (G) from interpreting the withdrawal as rejection or abandonment. GR described this pattern as a 'win-win solution' because he did not feel pressured to resolve the conflict amid heightened emotions, while his partner did not need to feel abandoned. This strategy demonstrates that avoiding is not always dysfunctional in romantic relationships when accompanied by clear communication, avoidance can actually become an adaptive emotional regulation strategy.

4.4 Conflict Management Strategies of Anxious Attachment Informants

Informants with anxious attachment employed two primary strategies in facing conflict: the compromising strategy applied by G and AE, and the accommodating strategy applied by RB and SA.

The compromising strategy applied by G and AE reflects a pursuing pattern combined with a willingness to provide emotional space to the partner. When conflict arose, G and AE tended to take active initiative to discuss the issue directly, while also demonstrating good empathy and understanding toward their partner's emotional state. G stated:

"My effort in resolving conflict is: listening to each other and understanding. If at the beginning there are

high emotions, give time for those emotions to settle first. Then come back to communicate."

AE added:

"I always try to compromise meet up quickly and resolve it."

This pursuing pattern combined with the provision of emotional space represents a manifestation of adaptive compromising strategy in the context of romantic relationships with differing attachment styles. The ability of anxious individuals to restrain the urge to pursue and patiently wait for a more conducive moment reflects more mature emotional regulation, enabling more effective and constructive communication in conflict resolution (Johnson, 2022).

Meanwhile, RB and SA applied an accommodating strategy driven by a deep fear of potentially being abandoned by their partner. They consciously set aside personal desires and interests to meet the partner's needs. RB stated:

"I give in. Truly, it's like: love over ego. So I set my ego aside and maybe a bit of my self-worth but whatever, as long as the relationship goes smoothly and he doesn't leave me."

SA similarly stated:

"Yes, actually he also wanted to be understood. He said he just couldn't at the time and was already angry, and the only way for us to continue was for me to understand him."

The love over ego behavior applied by RB and SA is not merely a purely altruistic expression of love. When examined through attachment theory, this yielding behavior is rooted in the fundamental characteristics of anxious attachment that cause individuals to develop a tendency to continually prove their commitment and maintain emotional closeness by conceding and placing the partner's needs above their own (Kural & Kovacs, 2022). In the long run, this pattern of unbalanced accommodation can lead to emotional exhaustion, as experienced by SA, who ultimately decided to end her relationship.

4.5 Shared Effective Strategy: Compromise Through Mutual Agreement

Among all the findings, the strategy proven most effective in managing conflict in relationships between avoidant and anxious attachment individuals is compromise through mutual agreement, as applied by the couple GR and G. The effectiveness of this strategy is supported by GR's ability to deliver assurance before

withdrawing, and G's ability to provide the space GR needs without interpreting it as abandonment.

GR described this mechanism as follows:

"The teamwork is: if I don't withdraw, if from the start I say sorry and say I need time. So she's like, okay, maybe we agree to meet at a certain time to resolve it, or she waits until I finish my work before we talk. At that point she doesn't message me pressuring me to answer right away. So I think that's a win-win solution she doesn't need to wonder where I've gone, and I don't feel burdened by being pressured like that."

G confirmed:

"My effort in resolving conflict is: listening to each other and understanding. If at the beginning there are high emotions, give time for those emotions to settle first. Then come back to communicate."

The success of GR and G in managing conflict demonstrates that differences in avoidant and anxious attachment styles do not automatically result in an unhealthy relationship. By building communication agreements that mutually respect each other's needs through a process of trial and error over three years of their relationship, both individuals have succeeded in creating a healthier and more stable relationship environment.

4.6 The Influence of Attachment Style on Conflict Management Strategy

The selection of conflict management strategies applied by each individual is inseparable from the influence of their attachment style. Individuals with anxious attachment are driven by a profound fear of potentially being abandoned to react actively when conflict arises. This fear pushes them to pursue their partner, continuously strive to maintain closeness, and even concede entirely to fulfill their partner's desires. This yielding behavior is not solely a freely chosen decision, but also constitutes a protective response driven by relational anxiety to minimize the risk of rejection or the end of the relationship they so deeply fear.

On the other side, individuals with avoidant attachment display a generally opposing response pattern. When confronted with conflict, they choose to withdraw and establish distance, both physically and emotionally. Personal calm and comfort become their primary priority, often without considering the emotional impact this may have on their partner. Avoidant individuals tend to be stubborn in

maintaining their desire to disappear from conflict situations, making conflict resolution more difficult to achieve.

The interaction patterns between both attachment styles generate a pursuer-distancer dynamic that, if not managed through open interpersonal communication, will continue to deteriorate the relationship. The couple RB and LA, who ended up separating, serve as an example of how this cycle can lead to the erosion of trust and emotional exhaustion resulting in a breakup. Meanwhile, the couple GR and G, who remain together, demonstrate that communication adaptation and awareness of each other's attachment style needs can serve as a bridge to breaking this cycle.

These findings align with the research by Angela and Ariela (2021), which states that high levels of attachment avoidance and anxiety can cause the quality of a romantic relationship to decline. However, this study adds that such decline in relationship quality can be counterbalanced through relational awareness and adaptive interpersonal communication specifically through the provision of assurance by the avoidant individual and the provision of space by the anxious individual.

CONCLUSION

Based on the findings of this study on conflict management strategies in couples with avoidant and anxious attachment styles in romantic relationships, several conclusions can be drawn.

First, differences in attachment style strongly influence interpersonal communication patterns and the ways individuals approach conflict in romantic relationships. Individuals with anxious attachment tend to have high emotional needs, experience anxiety easily, fear abandonment, and wish to resolve conflict quickly to obtain relational certainty. Meanwhile, individuals with avoidant attachment prefer to maintain emotional distance, withdraw, and avoid discussing conflict because they feel uncomfortable with the emotional pressure it generates.

Second, the differing characteristics of both attachment styles give rise to a recurring conflict pattern: the pursuer-distancer dynamic. In this pattern, the anxious individual continuously pursues and demands certainty, while the avoidant individual increasingly withdraws and closes off. This pattern renders interpersonal communication less effective

because both individuals possess emotional needs and communication strategies that are directly opposed.

Third, the most dominant conflict management strategies differ based on attachment style. Avoidant individuals predominantly employ the avoiding strategy, ranging from direct avoidance without communication (LA, DA, AP) to avoidance accompanied by assurance (GR). Anxious individuals tend to employ compromising (G, AE) or accommodating/love over ego strategies (RB, SA). The strategy proven most effective is compromise through mutual agreement, as applied by the couple GR and G, because it combines assurance from the avoidant party with the provision of space from the anxious party.

Fourth, open interpersonal communication, the provision of emotional space accompanied by assurance, and high empathy have proven to be key factors in managing conflict constructively and maintaining a healthy relationship. Differences in attachment style are not an insurmountable obstacle with awareness of each other's needs and ongoing communication adaptation, couples with avoidant and anxious attachment can build a stable and harmonious relationship.

In practical terms, this study implies that couples with differing attachment styles need to build more open, honest, and mutually respectful interpersonal communication regarding each other's emotional needs. Individuals with anxious attachment need to learn to manage their anxiety and not become overly emotionally dependent on their partner, while individuals with avoidant attachment need to learn to be more open in expressing their feelings and not always avoid conflict. Future research is recommended to expand the number of informants, involve greater variation in age and cultural background, and consider the use of mixed methods to obtain a more comprehensive picture.

REFERENCES

- Angela, I., & Ariela, J. (2021). Pengaruh dimensi attachment avoidance dan anxiety terhadap kualitas hubungan berpacaran dewasa muda. *Jurnal Psikologi*. Udayana, 8(1), 1–12.
- Andini, A. Q., Rahardjo, T., & Rahmiaji, L. R. (2024). Manajemen konflik pasangan suami istri yang menjalani pernikahan jarak jauh lintas negara. Undergraduate Program of Communication Science, Universitas Diponegoro, 12(4).
- Anggraini, D., et al. (2022). Komunikasi interpersonal dalam hubungan romantis. *Jurnal Ilmu Komunikasi*.
- Awing, A., & Arsyad, M. (2023). Pola komunikasi dalam hubungan romantis dan toxic relationship. *Jurnal Komunikasi Indonesia*.
- Bretaña, M., et al. (2024). Avoidant attachment, conflict perception, and relationship quality. *Attachment & Human Development*, 26(1), 45–62.
- Bunga Suryaman Putri, et al. (2023). Gaya kelekatan dan perilaku dalam hubungan romantis remaja. *Jurnal Psikologi Perkembangan*.
- Chairunnisa, et al. (2024). Hubungan interpersonal dan komunikasi antarpribadi. *Jurnal Kajian Komunikasi*.
- Danahfatin, C. M. R., & Rizka, A. (2025). Pengaruh attachment styles terhadap ketergantungan emosional remaja berpacaran. *Psychology Department*. Paramadina University, 16(2).
- Erdoan, T., & Mersin, B. (2025). Hierarchy of needs and life satisfaction. *International Journal of Psychology*, 60(1), 12–25.
- Hutauruk, M., & Rudianto, R. (2022). Love and belonging dalam teori Maslow dan relevansinya terhadap hubungan interpersonal. *Jurnal Psikologi Sosial*.
- Jailani, M., et al. (2023). Purposive sampling dalam penelitian kualitatif: Panduan metodologis. *Jurnal Metodologi Penelitian*.
- Johnson, S. (2022). *Hold me tight: Seven conversations for a lifetime of love*. Little, Brown Spark.
- Kalamsari, D., & Ginanjar, A. (2022). Insecure attachment dalam hubungan romantis: Tinjauan teoritis. *Jurnal Psikologi Indonesia*, 19(1), 55–70.
- Kautsar, A., Nihaya, I. U., Kusumawati, N. D., Akbar, R. F., Rahman, M. F. W., Hadi, H. K., & Aji, T. S. (2023, September). Technology companies in Indonesia: How is the financial performance? In 2023 International Conference on Sustainable Islamic Business and Finance (SIBF) (pp. 154–158). IEEE.
<https://doi.org/10.1109/SIBF60067.2023.10379890>

- Kural, A. I., & Kovacs, M. (2022). Anxious attachment and relationship quality: A meta-analytic review. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 39(4), 978–1002.
- Macedonia, A. (2023). Komunikasi efektif dalam hubungan romantis. *Jurnal Komunikasi dan Relasi*, 5(2), 34–48.
- Malik, R., et al. (2024). Menfess sebagai media komunikasi anonim di platform X. *Jurnal Media Digital*, 3(1).
- Maradoni, & Rozali, Y. A. (2022). Komunikasi interpersonal sebagai pembentuk intimacy pada dewasa awal yang berpacaran. *JCA Psikologi*, 3(1), 1–14.
- Marfine, M., & Sahrani, R. (2024). Informed consent dalam penelitian psikologi kualitatif. *Jurnal Etika Penelitian*.
- Munthe, B. (2024). Manajemen konflik interpersonal: Strategi komunikasi efektif. Rajawali Press.
- Murisa, et al. (2024). Penerapan conflict mode instrument theory dalam manajemen konflik interpersonal. *Jurnal Manajemen Konflik dan Negosiasi*.
- Mustofa, A. (2022). Kebutuhan cinta dalam perspektif Maslow dan kaitannya dengan hubungan romantis. *Jurnal Psikologi Humanistik*.
- Nihaya, F., et al. (2022). Dinamika perbedaan dalam hubungan romantis. *Jurnal Psikologi Relasi*, 8(1).
- O'Brien, J. A., & Marakas, J. M. (2011). *Management information systems* (10th ed.). McGraw-Hill.
- Praptiningsih, N. A., et al. (2024). Komunikasi romantis dan minimalisasi toxic relationship. *Jurnal Komunikasi Interpersonal*, 12(2).
- Radde, N., et al. (2022). Romantic relationships and partner selection in emerging adulthood. *Journal of Adolescence*, 94(1), 100–115.
- Rahadi, D. R. (2021). Komunikasi interpersonal yang efektif dalam kehidupan sehari-hari. *Jurnal Ilmu Komunikasi Terapan*.
- Rahman, M. F. W., Kistyanto, A., & Surjanti, J. (2022). Does cyberloafing and person-organization fit affect employee performance? The mediating role of innovative work behavior. *Global Business and Organizational Excellence*, 41(5), 44–64. <https://doi.org/10.1002/joe.22159>
- Yuliantika, S., & Santoso, B. (2025). Strategi manajemen konflik dalam hubungan interpersonal. *Jurnal Komunikasi Konstruktif*.