The Love Attitude that Influences One's Happiness: The Relationship Between Love Attitude Scale Scores and Oxford Happiness Scores of Selected College Students

Frederick Edward T. Fabella

Ph.D., FEU Roosevelt Graduate School, Cainta, Rizal, Philippines

ABSTRACT

The COVID-19 pandemic wrought havoc upon many romantic relationships throughout the world. Since romantic love has been established as a source of happiness and that there are varying attitudes toward love, this study sought to ascertain whether differing love attitudes are associated with happiness. 116 romantically involved participants volunteered to be the respondents of this study. They were 2nd year college students of a private school in Marikina City, Philippines. The Love Attitudes Scale: Short form or L.A.S. was administered to measure the 6 love attitudes of the respondents, namely (1) Eros or passionate love, (2) Ludus or game-playing love, (3) Storge or friendship love, (4) Pragma or practical love, (5) Mania or possessive, dependent love and (6) Agape or altruistic love. On the other hand, the Oxford Happiness Questionnaire was administered to measure the respondents' degree of happiness. The findings revealed that the respondents' highest love attitude is Eros or passionate love while Ludus or game-playing love is the lowest. In addition, the respondents' Oxford happiness scores indicated that the respondents were only slightly happy. A significant low positive relationship between the respondents' Pragma love attitude scores and Oxford happiness scores was found. This implies that among the 6 love attitudes, only the respondents' Pragma love attitude score has a significant relationship with their Oxford happiness score, and that as one increases, the other slightly increases and vice-versa.

INTRODUCTION

Approximately 600 studies found that COVID-19 produced unprecedented levels of stress and mental health issues. In romantic relationships, this may have led to more negative interpersonal behaviors, such as reduced responsiveness or support toward a partner, withdrawal and even hostility. It was also found that breakups and divorces increased during the height of the pandemic[1].

Some couples struggled with preserving the romantic aspects of their relationship during the pandemic, while others struggled with conflict resolution and had to acquire new ways of communicating differently[2].

In one poll conducted by a university in 2022, the number of people who claim that their partner is very important to their happiness is at an all-time low. A survey conducted in the U.S. reported that 62% now seek more meaningful, committed relationships. 84% of those surveyed also now possess higher preference for a partner they can trust and confide in and is able to communicate their wants and needs than mere physical attractiveness[3].

Love is a collection of emotions and behaviors characterized by intimacy, commitment and passion. It encompasses protectiveness, attraction, affection, care,

closeness and trust. Love can differ in intensity and can change over time. It is linked to a variety of positive emotions, including life satisfaction, excitement, happiness and euphoria. However, it can also produce negative emotions such as stress and jealousy[4].

Many studies point to love being beneficial to one's health. First of all, love makes you happy. When you first fall in love, dopamine, the feel-good brain chemical linked to reward, is activated. Second, love lessens stress. In time, another brain chemical: oxytocin, or the bonding hormone is released. Third, love mitigates anxiety. Loneliness has been found to increase anxiety. Having a romantic partner helps prevent this. Fourth, love moves you take better care of yourself. And fifth love allows you to live longer. Research has established that married couples enjoy greater longevity than singles[5].

One study found that relationship satisfaction was among the main predictors of subjective well-being. This implies that cultivating satisfying romantic relationships leads toward a happier life[6]. Another study focused on a comparison of brain structures and found that not only does a romantic relationship boost subjective happiness but is associated with a reduction in gray matter density in the right dorsal striatum, which signifies a modulation of social reward[7].

However, a study claims that romantic love is not the only predictor of happiness. Maintaining close relationships with parents, children, siblings, friends and colleagues also contribute to happiness. Furthermore, unrequited love, love of a verbally abusive partner and obsessive lead do not enhance happiness. The findings suggest that wholehearted and reciprocated love for a lovable and caring partner leads to happiness. Irrational love does the opposite and that harmful emotions should be regulated[8].

Since there appear to be varying ways of expressing love, the attitudes towards love vary as well. This assumption was the basis for the creation of the Love Attitudes Scale[9] or L.A.S. The L.A.S. asserts that there are six love attitudes, namely (1) Eros or passionate love, (2) Ludus or game-playing love, (3) Storge or friendship love, (4) Pragma or practical love, (5) Mania or possessive, dependent love and (6) Agape or altruistic love.

To assess the applicability of the L.A.S., this instrument has been used in various cultural contexts and countries. In one study, the L.A.S. was found to be appropriate in the Malaysian context[10]. Another study concluded that an adaptation of the L.A.S. in Serbia was found to be a valid instrument in assessing the six love attitudes[11]. Similar findings resulted when the L.A.S. was utilized in Taiwan[12] and in Hungary[13].

A study attempting to establish the applicability of the L.A.S. on different age groups found that responses were similar between college-aged and middle-aged participants. However, age was found to be a factor in Mania and Agape love attitudes for females. Overall, the six love attitudes appeared consistent into the middle age[14].

However, males and females were found to have differences in L.A.S. responses. Females tended to exhibit higher Pragma, while male responses tended toward Eros and Ludus[15].

In one study, psychological constructs such as attachment style, cultural orientation, gender, and relationship length were tested as predictors for each of the six love styles. It found that each love attitude had a different profile, and no one construct appeared to dominate any one style which reinforces the idea that the styles are qualitatively different[16].

Since happiness has been established by the foregoing as among the results of being in a romantic relationship and that there exist different love attitudes as established by the L.A.S., this research attempted to ascertain whether a particular love attitude was more related to happiness. In particular, this study sought to address the following research questions:

1. **What are the Love Attitude Scores of the respondents in terms of**

1.1 Eros;

1.2 Ludus;

1.3 Storge;

1.4 Pragma;

1.5 Mania, and

1.6 Agape?

2. **What are the Oxford Happiness Questionnaire scores of the respondents?**

3. **Is there a significant relationship between the Oxford Happiness Questionnaire scores of the respondents and their Love Attitude Scores in terms of**

3.1 Eros;

3.2 Ludus;

3.3 Storge;

3.4 Pragma;

3.5 Mania, and

3.6 Agape?

METHODOLOGY

The 116 romantically involved participants volunteered to be the respondents of this study. They were 2nd year college students of a private school in Marikina City, Philippines belonging to the B.S. in Hospitality Management, B.S. in Information Technology, Bachelor of Secondary Education major in Filipino, Bachelor of Secondary Education major in English, Bachelor of Elementary Education, B.S. in Information Technology, B.S. in Business Administration major in Financial Management, B.S. in Business Administration major in Human Resource Management and B.S. in Business Administration major in Marketing Management degree programs. There were 63 males and 53 females. Their mean age was 21.22.

The Love Attitudes Scale: Short form or L.A.S.[15], an 18-item, 5-point Likert scale test was administered to measure the 6 love attitudes of the respondents, namely (1) Eros or passionate love, (2) Ludus or game-playing love, (3) Storge or friendship love, (4) Pragma or practical love, (5) Mania or possessive, dependent love and (6) Agape or altruistic love. On the other hand, the Oxford Happiness Questionnaire[17], a 29-item, 6-point Likert scale instrument was administered to measure the respondents' degree of happiness.

RESULTS

The following tables present the data collected and the statistical treatments applied.

Table 1: Scale of Interpretation for Kinds of Love Scores

Range	Verbal Interpretation
1.000 – 1.800	Strongly disagree
1.801 – 2.600	Disagree
2.601 – 3.400	Neutral
3.401 – 4.200	Agree
4.201 – 5.000	Strongly agree

Table 2: Item weighted Means for Eros scores

Statement	Weighted Mean N=116	Verbal Interpretation
1. My partner and I have the right physical chemistry between us.	3.862	Agree
2. I feel that my lover and I were meant for each other.	3.655	Agree
3. My partner fits my ideal standards of physical beauty/handsomeness.	4.035	Agree
Total weighted mean	3.851	Agree

Table 3: Item weighted Means for Ludus scores

Statement	Weighted Mean N=116	Verbal Interpretation
4. I believe that what my partner doesn't know about me won't hurt him/her.	2.948	Neutral
5. I have sometimes had to keep my partner from finding out about other lovers.	1.966	Disagree
6. My partner would get upset if he/she knew of some of the things I've done with other people.	3.216	Neutral
Total weighted mean	2.710	Neutral

Table 4: Item weighted Means for Storge scores

Statement	Weighted Mean N=116	Verbal Interpretation
7. Our love is the best kind because it grew out of a long friendship.	3.509	Agree
8. Our friendship merged gradually into love over time.	3.552	Agree
9. Our love relationship is the most satisfying because it developed from a good friendship.	3.785	Agree
Total weighted mean	3.615	Agree

Table 5: Item weighted Means for Pragma scores

Statement	Weighted Mean N=116	Verbal Interpretation
10. A main consideration in choosing my partner was how he/she would reflect on my family.	3.647	Agree
11. An important factor in choosing my partner was whether or not he/she would be a good parent.	3.948	Agree
12. One consideration in choosing my partner was how he/she would reflect on my career.	3.871	Agree
Total weighted mean	3.822	Agree

Table 6: Item weighted Means for Mania scores

Statement	Weighted Mean N=116	Verbal Interpretation
13. When my partner doesn't pay attention to me, I feel sick all over.	3.310	Neutral
14. I cannot relax if I suspect that my partner is with someone else.	3.767	Agree
15. If my partner ignores me for a while, I sometimes do stupid things to try to get his/her attention	2.905	Neutral
Total weighted mean	3.328	Neutral

Table 7: Item weighted Means for Agape scores

Statement	Weighted Mean N=116	Verbal Interpretation
16. I would rather suffer myself than let my partner suffer.	3.905	Agree
17. I cannot be happy unless I place my partner's happiness before my own.	3.595	Agree
18. I am usually willing to sacrifice my own wishes to let my partner achieve his/hers.	3.535	Agree
Total weighted mean	3.678	Agree

Table 8: Scale of Interpretation of the Item Weighted Means of the Oxford Happiness Questionnaire Scores

Range	Verbal Interpretation
1.000 – 1.833	Strongly disagree
1.834 – 2.666	Moderately disagree
2.667 – 3.499	Slightly disagree
3.500 – 4.333	Slightly agree
4.334 – 5.167	Moderately agree
5.168 – 6.000	Strongly agree

Table 9: Item weighted Means for the Oxford Happiness Questionnaire Scores

Statement	Weighted Mean N=116	Verbal Interpretation
I don't feel particularly pleased with the way I am	3.948	Slightly agree
I am intensely interested in other people	2.905	Slightly disagree
I feel that life is very rewarding	4.500	Moderately agree
I have very warm feelings towards almost everyone	3.819	Slightly agree
{reverse} I rarely wake up feeling rested	2.991	Slightly disagree
{reverse} I am not particularly optimistic about the future	3.690	Slightly agree
I find most things amusing	4.414	Moderately agree
I am always committed and involved	4.302	Slightly agree
Life is good	4.698	Moderately agree
{reverse} I do not think that the world is a good place	3.535	Slightly agree
I laugh a lot	4.759	Moderately agree
I am well satisfied about everything in my life	4.129	Slightly agree
{reverse} I don't think I look attractive	3.224	Slightly disagree
{reverse} There is a gap between what I would like to do and what I have done	2.578	Moderately disagree
I am very happy	4.129	Slightly agree
I find beauty in some things	5.009	Moderately agree
I always have a cheerful effect on others	4.517	Moderately agree
I can fit in everything I want to	3.914	Slightly agree
{reverse} I feel that I am not especially in control of my life	3.241	Slightly disagree
I feel able to take anything on	3.957	Slightly agree
I feel fully mentally alert	4.129	Slightly agree
I often experience joy and elation	4.207	Slightly agree
{reverse} I do not find it easy to make decisions	2.647	Slightly disagree
{reverse} I do not have a particular sense of meaning and purpose in my life	3.655	Slightly agree

I feel I have a great deal of energy	4.233	Slightly agree
I usually have a good influence on events	4.078	Slightly agree
{reverse} I do not have fun with other people	4.130	Slightly agree
{reverse} I don't feel particularly healthy	3.466	Slightly disagree
{reverse} I do not have particularly happy memories of the past	4.190	Slightly agree
Total weighted mean	3.896	Slightly agree

Table 10: Scale of Interpretation of the Total Weighted Mean of the Oxford Happiness Questionnaire Score

Range	Verbal Interpretation
1.000 – 1.833	Very unhappy
1.834 – 2.666	Moderately unhappy
2.667 – 3.499	Slightly unhappy
3.500 – 4.333	Slightly happy
4.334 – 5.167	Moderately happy
5.168 – 6.000	Very happy

Table 11: The Relationship between Eros Scores and Oxford Happiness Questionnaire Scores

X Values	X and Y Combined
∑ = 446.667 Mean = 3.851 ∑(X - Mx)2 = SSx = 86.077 Y Values ∑ = 451.966 Mean = 3.896 ∑(Y - My)2 = SSy = 26.662	N = 116 ∑(X - Mx)(Y - My) = 6.845 R Calculation r = ∑((X - My)(Y - Mx)) / √((SSx)(SSy)) r = 6.845 / √((86.077)(26.662)) = 0.1429 Meta Numerics (cross-check) r = 0.1429
The P-Value is .125948. The result is not significant at p < .05.	

Table 12: The Relationship between Ludus Scores and Oxford Happiness Questionnaire Scores

X Values	X and Y Combined
∑ = 314.333 Mean = 2.71 ∑(X - Mx)2 = SSx = 69.673 Y Values ∑ = 451.966 Mean = 3.896 ∑(Y - My)2 = SSy = 26.662	N = 116 ∑(X - Mx)(Y - My) = -0.872 R Calculation r = ∑((X - My)(Y - Mx)) / √((SSx)(SSy)) r = -0.872 / √((69.673)(26.662)) = -0.0202 Meta Numerics (cross-check) r = -0.0202
The P-Value is .831253. The result is not significant at p < .05.	

Table 13: The Relationship between Storge Scores and Oxford Happiness Questionnaire Scores

X Values	X and Y Combined
∑ = 419.333 Mean = 3.615 ∑(X - Mx)2 = SSx = 132.579 Y Values ∑ = 451.966 Mean = 3.896 ∑(Y - My)2 = SSy = 26.662	N = 116 ∑(X - Mx)(Y - My) = 6.561 R Calculation r = ∑((X - My)(Y - Mx)) / √((SSx)(SSy)) r = 6.561 / √((132.579)(26.662)) = 0.1104 Meta Numerics (cross-check) r = 0.1104
The P-Value is .238089. The result is not significant at p < .05.	

Table 14: The Relationship between Pragma Scores and Oxford Happiness Questionnaire Scores

X Values	X and Y Combined
∑ = 443.333 Mean = 3.822 ∑(X - Mx)2 = SSx = 84.985 Y Values ∑ = 451.966 Mean = 3.896 ∑(Y - My)2 = SSy = 26.662	N = 116 ∑(X - Mx)(Y - My) = 11.017 R Calculation r = ∑((X - My)(Y - Mx)) / √((SSx)(SSy)) r = 11.017 / √((84.985)(26.662)) = 0.2314 Meta Numerics (cross-check) r = 0.2314
The P-Value is .012444. The result is significant at p < .05.	

Table 15: The Relationship between Mania Scores and Oxford Happiness Questionnaire Scores

X Values	X and Y Combined
∑ = 386	N = 116
Mean = 3.328	∑(X - Mx)(Y - My) = -7.598
∑(X - Mx)2 = SSx = 105.996	
	R Calculation
Y Values	r = ∑((X - My)(Y - Mx)) / √((SSx)(SSy))
∑ = 451.966	
Mean = 3.896	r = -7.598 / √((105.996)(26.662)) = -0.1429
∑(Y - My)2 = SSy = 26.662	
	Meta Numerics (cross-check)
	r = -0.1429
The P-Value is .128375. The result is not significant at p < .05.	

Table 16: The Relationship between Agape Scores and Oxford Happiness Questionnaire Scores

X Values	X and Y Combined
∑ = 426.667	N = 116
Mean = 3.678	∑(X - Mx)(Y - My) = -7.218
∑(X - Mx)2 = SSx = 94.874	
	R Calculation
Y Values	r = ∑((X - My)(Y - Mx)) / √((SSx)(SSy))
∑ = 451.966	
Mean = 3.896	r = -7.218 / √((94.874)(26.662)) = -0.1435
∑(Y - My)2 = SSy = 26.662	
	Meta Numerics (cross-check)
	r = -0.1435
The P-Value is .125681. The result is not significant at p < .05.	

DISCUSSION

In Table 2, it can be seen that the total weighted mean for Eros love attitude is 3.851, which has a verbal interpretation of agree. In Table 3, it can be observed that the total weighted mean for Ludus love attitude is 2.710, which has a verbal interpretation of neutral. Table 4 shows the total weighted mean for Storge love attitude is 3.615, which has a verbal interpretation of agree. In Table 5, it can be seen that the total weighted mean for Pragma love attitude is 3.822, which has a verbal interpretation of agree. In Table 6, it can be observed that the total weighted mean for Mania love attitude is 3.328, which has a verbal interpretation of neutral. Table 7 shows the total weighted mean for Agape love attitude is 3.678, which has a verbal interpretation of agree. Overall, the Eros love attitude has the highest weighted mean while Ludus love attitude has the lowest weighted mean.

Table 9 shows all 29 items of the Oxford Happiness Questionnaire item weighted mean scores of the respondents. The highest weighted mean of 4.759 can be seen item 11 with a verbal interpretation of moderately agree, while item 14 has the lowest weighted mean of 2.578 which has a verbal interpretation of moderately disagree. The total weighted mean for all 29 items is 3.896

with a verbal interpretation of slightly happy.

Table 11 presents the Pearson r computation between the respondents' Eros love attitude scores and Oxford happiness scores. This resulted in an r value of 0.1429 but with a p value of .125948, which indicates that it is not significant. Table 12 shows the Pearson r computation between the respondents' Ludus love attitude scores and Oxford happiness scores. This resulted in an r value of -0.0202 but with a p value of .831253, which indicates that it is not significant. Table 13 presents the Pearson r computation between the respondents' Storge love attitude scores and Oxford happiness scores. This resulted in an r value of 0.1104 but with a p value of .238089, which indicates that it is not significant. Table 14 shows the Pearson r computation between the respondents' Pragma love attitude scores and Oxford happiness scores. This resulted in an r value of 0.2314 and with a p value of .125948, which indicates that it is significant. This means that there is a significant low positive relationship between the respondents' Pragma scores and Oxford happiness scores. Table 15 presents the Pearson r computation between the respondents' Mania love attitude scores and Oxford happiness scores. This resulted

in an r value of -0.1429 but with a p value of .128375, which indicates that it is not significant. Table 16 shows the Pearson r computation between the respondents' Agape love attitude scores and Oxford happiness scores. This resulted in an r value of -0.1435 but with a p value of .125681, which indicates that it is not significant.

CONCLUSIONS

Based on the findings of this study, the respondents' highest love attitude is Eros or passionate love while Ludus or game-playing love is the lowest. In addition, the total weighted mean of the Oxford happiness scores indicated that the respondents were only slightly happy in general.

Lastly, there is a significant low positive relationship between the respondents' Pragma love attitude scores and Oxford happiness scores. This implies that among the 6 love attitudes, only Pragma love attitude score has a significant relationship with the Oxford happiness score, and that as one increases, the other slightly increases and vice-versa.

Since Pragma is also known as practical love and consists of how the partner would reflect on one's family (L.A.S. item 10), whether the partner would be a good parent (L.A.S. item 11) and how the partner would reflect on one's career (L.A.S. item 12), and based on their mean age, it can be inferred that the respondents see their romantic happiness in a more mature manner. However, this practical attitude toward romantic involvement could also be a result of the aftermath of the COVID-19 pandemic.

It is therefore recommended that confirmation of these results by future researches be pursued as well as an investigation into the possible reasons for such findings.

REFERENCES

1. Lebow, H. I. (2021, December 15). *The pandemic's effect on our relationships.* Psych Central. Retrieved from https://psychcentral.com/health/the-impact-of-the-pandemic-on-relationships#Negatives-of-the-pandemic
2. Wolfe, J. (2022, January 21). *Coronavirus briefing: Love in the time of Covid.* The New York Times. Retrieved from https://www.nytimes.com/2022/01/21/briefing/coronavirus-briefing-love-in-the-time-of-covid.html
3. Lewandowski Jr, G. W. (2022, April 19). *The Long Tail of covid-19 for our romantic relationships.* Psychology Today. Retrieved from https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/blog/the-psychology-relationships/202204/the-long-tail-covid-19-our-romantic-relationships
4. Cherry, K. (2022, November 7). *Is love biological or is it a cultural phenomenon?* Verywell Mind. Retrieved from https://www.verywellmind.com/what-is-love-2795343
5. Ducharme, J. (2018, February 14). *5 ways love is good for your mental and Physical Health.* Time. Retrieved from https://time.com/5136409/health-benefits-love/
6. Londero-Santos, A., Natividade, J. C., & Féres-Carneiro, T. (2021). Do romantic relationships promote happiness? relationships' characteristics as predictors of subjective well-being. *Interpersona: An International Journal on Personal Relationships*, *15*(1), 3–19. https://doi.org/10.5964/ijpr.4195
7. Kawamichi, H., Sugawara, S. K., Hamano, Y. H., Makita, K., Matsunaga, M., Tanabe, H. C., Ogino, Y., Saito, S., & Sadato, N. (2016). Being in a romantic relationship is associated with reduced gray matter density in striatum and increased subjective happiness. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *7*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2016.01763

8. Brogaard, B. (2015, March 9). *How does love affect happiness?* Psychology Today. Retrieved from https://www.psychologytoday.com/intl/blog/the-mysteries-love/201503/how-does-love-affect-happiness

9. Hendrick, C., Hendrick, S., & Dicke, A. (1998). The Love Attitudes Scale: Short form. *Journal of Personal and Social Relationships, 15*, 147-159.

10. W. S., W. S., Mohd. Hoesni, S., & S.T., C. (2012). Investigating the factor structure of The love attitude scale (LAS) with Malaysian samples. *Asian Social Science*, *8*(9). https://doi.org/10.5539/ass.v8n9p66

11. Todosijevic, B., Arancic, A., & Ljubinkovic, S. (2009). An examination and revision of the love attitude scale in Serbia. *Interpersona: An International Journal on Personal Relationships*, *3*(1), 58–76. https://doi.org/10.5964/ijpr.v3i1.32

12. Huang, M.-H. (1999). Cross-cultural similarity in the love attitudes scale: Short form. *Psychological Reports*, *84*(2), 617–624. https://doi.org/10.2466/pr0.1999.84.2.617

13. Meskó, N., Zsidó, A.N., Láng, A. *et al.* Sex and Relationship Differences on the Short Love Attitude Scale: Insights from the Hungarian Adaptation. *Sexuality & Culture* 25, 1249–1272 (2021). https://doi.org/10.1007/s12119-021-09830-z

14. Butler, R., Walker, W. R., Skowronski, J. J., & Shannon, L. (1995). Age and responses to The love attitudes scale: Consistency in structure, differences in scores. *The International Journal of Aging and Human Development*, *40*(4), 281–296. https://doi.org/10.2190/yaa7-3c7g-tvxt-vatb

15. Hendrick, C., Hendrick, S., Foote, F. H., & Slapion-Foote, M. J. (1984). Do men and women love differently? *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, *1*(2), 177–195. https://doi.org/10.1177/0265407584012003

16. Smith, R., & Klases, A. (2016). Predictors of love attitudes: The contribution of cultural orientation, gender attachment style, relationship length and age in participants from the UK and Hong Kong. *Interpersona: An International Journal on Personal Relationships*, *10*(1), 90–108. https://doi.org/10.5964/ijpr.v10i1.204

17. Hills, P. & Argyle, M. (2002). The Oxford Happiness Questionnaire: a compact scale for the measurement of psychological well-being. Personality and Individual Differences, 33, 1073-1082.

******