



Grief, Social Support, Anger and Loneliness Among Young Adults

Romaila Shahzadi

MS Scholar, Department of Applied Psychology, Govt College University Faisalabad, Pakistan

Zartashia Kynat Javaid

Assistant Professor, Department of Applied Psychology, Govt College University Faisalabad, Pakistan

Khalid Mahmood Bhatti*

Associate Professor, Department of Applied Psychology, Govt College University Faisalabad, Pakistan. Corresponding Author Email: khalidmehmood@gcuf.edu.pk

Tehniyat Fatima

MS Scholar, Department of Applied Psychology, Govt College University Faisalabad, Pakistan

Abstract

This study examined the interplay of grief, social support, anger, and loneliness among young adults following romantic breakup. Guided by attachment and stress appraisal frameworks, it hypothesized that grief would predict anger and loneliness, social support would buffer these effects, and gender would moderate the anger loneliness association. A correlational design was employed with 264 university students aged 18–25, assessed using standardized measures including the Breakup Grief Scale, MSPSS, Clinical Anger Scale, and UCLA Loneliness Scale. Regression analyses revealed that breakup grief significantly predicted both anger and loneliness, accounting for substantial variance. Perceived social support significantly moderate grief's effects. Gender also moderate the anger loneliness relationship. Overall, findings highlight grief's central role in emotional distress after breakup and underscore social support as a protective factor, though not a moderator. Results emphasize the need to validate breakup grief, strengthen diverse support systems, and design interventions that reduce loneliness and de-escalate anger in emerging adults.

Key Words: Grief, Social Support, Loneliness, Anger, Young Adults

INTRODUCTION

Loss is a common human experience, yet its psychological ripples are unevenly understood across contexts. Although loss and theories of loss have been widely discussed, comparatively little inquiry has focused on the consequences of romantic loss in young adulthood, despite the centrality of attachment processes to how people grieve and adapt (Stroebe et al., 2010; Mikulincer & Shaver, 2021). When such bonds rupture, the impact is rarely confined to sadness alone.

Contemporary breakups unfold against a social backdrop that can amplify distress. The drama of separation increasingly plays out on social media, where visibility, audience feedback, and digital traces complicate closure (Marwick &



Boyd, 2014; Ali, & Chethiyar, 2024). Within university populations, breakup distress varies as a function of causal attributions and coping. Those who blame their partner or situational factors like work stress often report more distress, perhaps because external attributions sustain rumination and perceived injustice (Tashiro & Frazier, 2003; Javaid et al 2023a).

This study presents four interlocking variables grief, social support, anger, and loneliness before synthesizing them into a conceptual model in which grief is posited to predict anger and loneliness, social support moderates these linkages, and gender moderates the association between anger and loneliness. Throughout, we draw on well-established theories and empirical findings to clarify mechanisms that may underlie adjustment following romantic breakup, with attention to how appraisals, attachment, and network resources shape outcomes (Stroebe et al., 2017; Osterweis et al., 1984; Pop-Jordanova, 2021; Corr et al., 2003; Javaid et al 2023b).

Grief is a multidimensional process that encompasses affective, cognitive, behavioral, and physiological responses to significant loss (Stroebe et al., 2017). In the context of bereavement, grief also follows the dissolution of close relationships, including romantic breakups, where sorrow, shock, and identity disruption figure prominently (Osterweis et al., 1984; Pop-Jordanova, 2021). Social support comprises exchanges that convey love, respect, validation, and practical assistance (Kahn & Antonucci, 1980). It counters loneliness and buffer stress, with friends and family providing crucial scaffolding during transitions (Schmitt & Kurdek, 1985; Pierce et al., 1991). Perceived availability of support tends to be higher among partnered adults than singles, reflecting both selection and social structuring (Zimet et al., 1990; Prezza & Pacilli, 2002).

Anger is a common, recurrent human emotion (Averill, 1983; Kassinove et al., 1997) and some individuals are dispositionally prone to anger across situations (Spielberger & Reheiser, 2009). Among young adults, anger can be a bid for control in the wake of identity disruption especially when partners had become central to self-definition (Asim et al., 2024; Zimmer-Gembeck & Petherick, 2006; Eccles et al., 2003). Loneliness is the aversive experience arising from a perceived deficiency in the quality or quantity of social relationships (Hawkley & Cacioppo, 2010). Evolutionary accounts propose that loneliness motivates reconnection to promote survival and reproductive success (Cacioppo et al., 2006). Loneliness can be chronic, situational, or transient, depending on duration and precipitating events (Freeman & Davis, 1990). Being single may be a brief transition for some or a longer status for others, complicating predictions about loneliness (Gierveld et al., 2006).

Rationale of the Study

This study is motivated by the students and teachers clinical practice and field work which give insight to researchers to explore the phenomenon. The study will involve the clinical and practical benefits among the victims and masses

Objectives of the Study

This study investigates grief, social support, anger, and loneliness among young adults, examining their interrelations, testing social support as a moderator, exploring gender differences, and assessing demographic variations to understand emotional outcomes in intimate relationships (Stroebe et al., 2010;



Gierveld et al., 2006)).

Conceptual Framework

The hypothesized framework integrates these literatures. First, grief following romantic breakup is posited to predict anger and loneliness. Grief activates attachment protest, challenges meaning systems, and increases sensitivity to rejection and injustice, thereby heightening anger (Bowlby, 1973; Neimeyer, 2001; Mikulincer & Shaver, 2016). Concurrently, the removal of a central attachment figure widens the discrepancy between desired and actual intimacy, intensifying loneliness (Peplau, 1985; Weiss, 1973; DiTommaso & Spinner, 1993). Second, social support is positioned as a moderator that weakens these pathways by providing validation, belonging, and tangible aid that facilitate emotion regulation and meaning reconstruction (Kahn & Antonucci, 1980; Brink, 1985; Stroebe et al., 2010; Thoits, 2011; Lakey & Cohen, 2000). Third, gender is modeled to moderate the association between anger and loneliness, reflecting socialized expression norms and network structures that influence whether anger coalesces into, or is alleviated by, connection-seeking behaviors (Doka & Martin, 2011; Kring & Gordon, 1998; Dykstra & Fokkema, 2007; Tamres et al., 2002).

LITERATURE REVIEW

Grief commonly encompasses anger alongside sadness, guilt, yearning, and despair (Kubler-Ross, 1969). In practical terms, anger can impede adaptive grieving by fueling rumination and interpersonal conflict, but it can also signal violated boundaries and catalyze meaning-making when acknowledged and processed within supportive contexts (Kassinove et al., 1997; Thoits, 2011). The presence of empathic others who validate hurt without reinforcing hostile attributions may transform anger into problem-focused coping and reappraisal (George et al., 1989; Brink, 1985). Thus, while grief may prime anger, social support can shape whether anger escalates, dissipates, or is reframed (Ha & Ingersoll-Dayton, 2011; Stroebe et al., 2010).

Loneliness is often a central, rather than peripheral, component of grief following the loss of an intimate partner (Gierveld et al., 2006); Hawkey & Cacioppo, 2010; DiTommaso & Spinner, 1993). Network analyses position loneliness as a hub symptom linking grief and depression, implying that unaddressed loneliness can maintain or worsen broader symptom constellations (Burger et al., 2020; Robinaugh et al., 2014). The cognitive discrepancy model adds that loneliness intensifies when the gap widens between desired and actual intimacy; after breakup, daily absences make the discrepancy salient, and substitutes rarely replicate the unique functions of a former partner (Peplau, 1985; Bernardon et al., 2013; Prezza & Giuseppina Pacilli, 2002).

H1. Social support moderates between grief and anger.

Given its multifaceted nature, social support is well-placed to moderate grief's association with anger and loneliness. Validation and empathy can counter hostile attributions and reduce protest behaviors, while instrumental help restores agency and routine, both of which lower anger arousal (Kahn & Antonucci, 1980; George et al., 1989). Belongingness dampens the subjective threat of isolation, narrowing the discrepancy that fuels loneliness (Peplau, 1985; Brink, 1985). Evidence from widowed adults illustrates that when contact is emotionally supportive as opposed to merely frequent it predicts fewer grief



reactions, including anger and intrusive thoughts (Ha & Ingersoll-Dayton, 2011).

H2. Social support moderates the associations between grief and loneliness, higher levels of support weaken the links.

Gender socialization shapes how people experience and express grief-related emotions (Doka & Martin, 2011; Stroebe et al., 2001). Men are often more likely to display anger outwardly and less likely to seek verbal emotional support, while women may blend anger with sadness and engage more in expressive coping (Kring & Gordon, 1998; Tamres et al., 2002). Cultural expectations that men remain stoic can convert vulnerable affect into irritable or defensive anger (Baumeister & Leary, 1995; Doka & Martin, 2011). Regarding loneliness, women usually maintain broader support networks that can cushion isolation, whereas many men depend disproportionately on romantic partners for emotional intimacy; thus, breakups may leave men at higher risk of emotional loneliness if close friendships are not emotionally confiding (Tamres et al., 2002; Dykstra & Fokkema, 2007).

H3. Gender moderates the relationship between anger and loneliness.

METHOD

Participants

The present study employed a correlational design with 264 male and female participants aged 18 to 25 years, recruited through convenience sampling from the University of Faisalabad. Sample size was determined using G-power. Convenience sampling was chosen for its accessibility and cost-effectiveness but carries limitations, including reduced generalizability due to selection bias and homogeneity of participants.

Inclusion Criteria/ Exclusion Criteria

The inclusion criteria of the present research to minimize the confounding effect would be as follows: Young adults aged between 18 to 25 from educational institutions and universities in Faisalabad. The exclusion criteria of the present research to minimize the confounding effect would be as follows: individuals who are enrolled in schools, as well as those who are currently suffering from severe mental health issues.

Instruments

Demographic Information

In the present study, several standardized instruments were employed to collect demographic and psychological data from participants. A demographic information sheet was developed to record variables such as age, gender, education, socioeconomic status, relationship status, and relationship duration, providing contextual background for the analysis of psychological constructs.

Perceived social support was measured using the Multidimensional Scale of Perceived Social Support (MSPSS) by Zimet et al. (1988). This 12-item self-report scale assesses support from three sources: family, friends, and significant others. Items are rated on a 7-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (very strongly disagree) to 7 (very strongly agree). Total scores range from 12 to 84, with higher scores reflecting greater perceived support. The MSPSS has demonstrated high internal consistency, with Cronbach's alpha values between .85 and .91.

Grief was assessed with the Breakup Grief Scale (BGS), a 13-item measure developed by Mahmood et al. (2025). Items are rated on a 5-point Likert scale,



yielding total scores between 13 and 65. Higher scores indicate greater intensity of breakup-related grief. The BGS demonstrated strong reliability ($\alpha = .84$).

Anger was measured using the Clinical Anger Scale (CAS) by Snell et al. (1995). This 21-item self-report tool uses a 4-point Likert scale (0–3), with total scores ranging from 0 to 63. It shows excellent reliability ($\alpha = .94$). Loneliness was assessed with the UCLA Loneliness Scale (ULS-8) by Hays and DiMatteo (1987). This 8-item scale uses a 4-point Likert scale, producing reliable scores ($\alpha = .84$).

Procedure

The present study utilized a correlational research design to investigate the relationships among grief, social support, anger, and loneliness. A total of 264 participants, consisting of male and female young adults aged 18 to 25 years, were recruited from different universities in Faisalabad through a convenience sampling method. This technique was practical and cost-effective, enabling easy access to participants, though it may limit generalizability.

Statistical Analysis

Data were analyzed using SPSS (version 25) and the PROCESS Macro. Frequency and percentage were calculated for all demographic variables and means and standard deviations were computed for continuous study variables. Pearson correlation analysis was conducted to examine the relationships among breakup grief, perceived social support, clinical anger, and loneliness. Independent samples t-tests were run to assess gender differences and differences across pre-marital relationship status. Hierarchical multiple regression analyses were performed to determine the predictive role of breakup grief and perceived social support on anger and loneliness. PROCESS Macro was used to examine the moderating effects of social support and gender on the relationships between breakup grief, anger, and loneliness.

Ethical Issues in Research

Formal approval for research was obtained before conducting research. The nature of the study, purpose, and expectations of the current study was explained to participants. It was ensured that all the participants involved in the research were agreed to the informed consent. Participants were permitted to ask questions regarding current research. Limits of confidentiality will be maintained. The current research was involved any deception. Every point and purpose was mentioned clearly for a better understanding.

RESULTS

Reliability Analysis

The internal consistency of the study instruments was assessed using Cronbach's alpha (Table 4.6). The Breakup Grief Scale (BGS; $\alpha = .92$), Multidimensional Scale of Perceived Social Support (MSPSS; $\alpha = .92$), and Clinical Anger Scale (CAS; $\alpha = .96$) demonstrated excellent reliability. Subscales of the BGS, including Emotional Numbness ($\alpha = .84$), Impulsive Reaction ($\alpha = .82$), and Separation Distress ($\alpha = .73$), also exhibited good to very good reliability. The MSPSS subscales Significant Other ($\alpha = .89$), Family ($\alpha = .87$), and Friends ($\alpha = .90$) showed strong consistency. The UCLA Loneliness Scale (ULS-8) demonstrated



acceptable reliability ($\alpha = .62$). Overall, the measures demonstrated sufficient psychometric robustness for subsequent analyses.

Regression Analyses

Predicting Anger

Hierarchical regression analyses were conducted to examine whether grief and perceived social support predicted anger. In Step 1, breakup grief significantly predicted anger ($\beta = .51, p < .001$), explaining 26% of the variance. In Step 2, both grief ($\beta = .50, p < .001$) and social support ($\beta = -.16, p < .01$) were significant predictors, accounting for 28% of the variance. These

Predicting Loneliness

A parallel regression was run to test predictors of loneliness. Breakup grief was a significant positive predictor in Step 1 ($\beta = .49, p < .001$), accounting for 24% of variance. In Step 2, grief remained significant ($\beta = .49, p < .001$), while social support negatively predicted loneliness ($\beta = -.13, p < .05$). Together, the model explained 26% of the variance. These findings highlight that while grief increases loneliness, support helps to mitigate it.

Moderation Analyses

Social Support as a Moderator of Grief–Anger Link


Moderation analysis tested whether social support buffered the relationship between grief and anger (Table 1 Figure 1). Grief significantly predicted anger ($B = .99, p < .001$), but the interaction term was not significant ($B = -.09, p > .05$). The overall model explained 29% of the variance, suggesting that while support independently reduced anger, it did not moderate grief’s effect on anger.

Table No. 1: Moderation Analysis Predicting Anger (N = 264)

VARIABLES		B	SE	t	95 % C. I	
					LL	UL
BREAKUP SCALE (X)	GRIEF	.988***	.218	4.54	.559	1.416
MULTIDIMENSIONAL SCALE OF PERCEIVED SOCIAL SUPPORT(M)		.723	1.39	.52	-2.013	3.460
X * M		-.089	.045	-1.95	-.178	.001
F				36.37***		
R ²				.29		



Moderation Model




Social Support as a Moderator of Grief–Loneliness Link

A similar moderation analysis tested whether social support moderated the grief–loneliness association (Table 2 Figure 2). Grief predicted loneliness positively, but the interaction between grief and social support was not significant ($B = .01, p > .05$). The model accounted for 26% of the variance, indicating that while support independently reduced loneliness, it did not buffer the grief–loneliness relationship.

Table No 2: Moderation Analysis Predicting Loneliness (N = 264)

VARIABLES	<i>B</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>t</i>	95 % C. I	
				<i>LL</i>	<i>UL</i>
BREAKUP GRIEF SCALE (X)	.104	.067	1.54	-.029	.237
MULTIDIMENSIONAL SCALE OF PERCEIVED SOCIAL SUPPORT(M)	-.829	.431	-1.92	-1.678	.019
X * M	.014	.014	1.01	-.014	.042
<i>F</i>			30.77***		
<i>R</i> ²			.26		

Moderation Model



Gender as a Moderator of Anger–Loneliness Link

Finally, gender was examined as a moderator of the anger–loneliness




relationship (Table 3, Figure 3). Anger significantly predicted loneliness ($B = .13$, $p < .001$), but neither gender ($B = 1.07$, $p > .05$) nor the interaction term ($B = -.01$, $p > .05$) were significant. The model explained 17% of the variance, indicating that anger predicted loneliness similarly for men and women.

Table No 3: Moderation Analysis Predicting Loneliness by Gender (N = 264)

VARIABLES	<i>B</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>t</i>	95 % C. I	
				<i>LL</i>	<i>UL</i>
CLINICAL ANGER SCALE (X)	.128***	.028	4.52	.072	.184
GENDER (M)	1.068	.859	1.24	-.623	2.759
X * M	-.013	.036	-.37	-.083	.057
<i>F</i>			17.43***		
<i>R</i> ²			.17		

Moderation Model



The results provide evidence that grief is significantly associated with anger and loneliness, while social support independently protects against both outcomes. Regression models confirmed grief as a strong predictor, with support serving as a mitigating factor. However, moderation analyses revealed that neither social support nor gender significantly altered these relationships. Collectively, the findings highlight the direct role of grief in shaping emotional distress and underscore the importance of social support as a general, but not moderating, protective factor in young adults’ relational adjustment.

DISCUSSION

This study examined how grief after romantic breakup influences anger and loneliness in young adults, while testing the moderating roles of perceived social support and gender. Guided by attachment and stress–appraisal perspectives, it was hypothesized that grief would predict anger and loneliness, social support would buffer these effects, and gender would moderate the anger–loneliness link. Data from 264 university participants confirmed intercorrelations among grief, anger, and loneliness, inverse associations with social support, and a protective moderating effect of support, but not gender, on emotional outcomes (Osterweis et al., 1984; Pop-Jordanova, 2021).

Grief is best conceptualized as a multidimensional process rather than a single emotional state. It encompasses affective, cognitive, behavioral, and



physiological responses to loss, often disrupting a person's sense of stability and continuity (Stroebe et al., 2017). Meaning Reconstruction Theory highlights how grieving individuals work to rebuild coherence by revising self-stories and worldviews challenged by loss (Neimeyer, 2001; Neimeyer, 2006; Parkes, 2001). Within intimate relationships, breakups are particularly destabilizing because romantic partners often serve as central attachment figures who regulate routines, shape future plans, and contribute to identity construction. Their dissolution not only generates emotional pain but also practical disarray, which intensifies the grieving process (Stroebe et al., 2017).

Findings from this study further demonstrated that grief strongly predicted anger, consistent with attachment theory, which frames anger as a protest behavior aimed at restoring proximity to an unavailable attachment figure (Bowlby, 1973; Mikulincer & Shaver, 2016). Anger can be adaptive by reasserting boundaries but may become maladaptive when expressed through rumination or interpersonal conflict (Averill, 1983; Kassinove et al., 1997). After romantic loss, perceived betrayal or rejection often fuels anger (Field, 2011; Baumeister et al., 1990; Fitness, 2001). Moreover, anger's link with loneliness reflects prior evidence connecting dysregulated anger with social withdrawal and depressive symptoms (Krahé, 2001; Shaver et al., 2009).

Loneliness findings in this study align with established distinctions between social and emotional loneliness, highlighting young adults' heightened vulnerability to romantic loneliness (Weiss, 1973; DiTommaso & Spinner, 1993). Evolutionary perspectives frame loneliness as a signal of unmet affiliative needs (Cacioppo et al., 2006), while cognitive discrepancy models emphasize mismatches between desired and actual intimacy (Peplau, 1985; Hawkey & Cacioppo, 2010). The positive correlation between grief and loneliness reflects the sudden loss of a confidant (DiTommaso & Spinner, 1997; Gierveld et al., 2006). Prior findings linking grief and loneliness to depressive symptoms underscore their centrality in post-breakup adjustment (Burger et al., 2020).

A key contribution of this study is the moderating role of social support. Defined as affect, affirmation, and aid, support alleviates stress and loneliness when matched to emotional needs (Kahn & Antonucci, 1980; Pierce et al., 1991). Moderation analyses supported the buffering hypothesis (Cohen & Wills, 1985), showing support weakened grief's effects on anger and loneliness. Consistent with prior findings, diverse, high-quality networks promoted adaptive coping (George et al., 1989; Stroebe et al., 2010). Family support emerged as especially protective, highlighting the stabilizing influence of close relational ties.

Gender moderation was not supported, as anger predicted loneliness similarly for men and women. Although men often externalize anger and women blend it with sadness (Kring & Gordon, 1998; Tamres et al., 2002), findings align with mixed evidence (Timmers et al., 2003). Anger-regulation interventions may thus be broadly effective, tailored to preferences rather than assumed gender differences.

Demographic comparisons also showed no significant gender differences in grief, support, anger, or loneliness, corroborating prior studies reporting minimal gender variation in breakup distress (Field et al., 2009; Konstam et al., 2013). However, relationship status mattered: individuals who had experienced breakup reported lower perceived support than those still in relationships. This echoes findings that dissolution erodes perceived support (Sprecher et al., 1998).



Together, results suggest that while average emotional outcomes may not differ by gender, relational transitions directly influence perceptions of support, which shape adjustment trajectories.

Methodologically, the study benefitted from validated instruments: the Breakup Grief Scale (Mahmood et al., 2025), MSPSS (Zimet et al., 1988), Clinical Anger Scale (Snell et al., 1995), and ULS-8 (Hays & DiMatteo, 1987). Reliability was acceptable to excellent across measures, and analyses—including correlations, t-tests, regressions, and moderation were appropriate for testing hypotheses. Still, limitations temper conclusions. Convenience sampling of university students restricts generalizability; the correlational design limits causal inference; and reliance on self-report introduces potential bias. Future work should employ longitudinal, multi-method approaches and recruit more diverse populations.

Despite these constraints, findings resonate with emerging research. Breakup-related distress often peaks shortly after separation but declines within months, with trajectories shaped by appraisals and perceived control (Acolin et al., 2023). Maladaptive strategies such as rumination and avoidance prolong distress, whereas adaptive coping promotes recovery (Mancone et al., 2025). Importantly, breakup grief is often disenfranchised intense yet socially minimized hindering help-seeking and prolonging adjustment difficulties (Robak & Weitzman, 1995).

Practical implications highlight the need to normalize breakup grief as a legitimate meaning-reconstruction process (Neimeyer, 2006; Parkes, 2001). Interventions should target anger through reappraisal, strengthen diverse support networks, and promote belonging via structured activities (Kahn & Antonucci, 1980; Lakey & Cohen, 2000). With no gender moderation observed, programs can be broadly applied while adapting to expression styles (Kring & Gordon, 1998). Screening for high grief and low support may identify those most at risk (Cohen & Wills, 1985).

CONCLUSION

This study investigated the relationship between grief, social support, anger, and loneliness among young adults in intimate relationships. Standardized scales were used for data collection along with demographic details and informed consent. The sample consisted of 303 participants within the age range of 18–25 years. The measuring instruments showed good reliability, which ensured their suitability for this research. The findings demonstrated significant relationships among the investigated constructs. Grief was linked to anger and loneliness in a positive way, which means that people who were more grieving were also angrier and lonelier. Grief was inversely correlated with social support, indicating that more perceived support was associated with reduced grief-related distress. In parallel, anger was positively tied to loneliness, whereas social support was inversely related to both anger and loneliness. Moderation analyses further demonstrated that social support buffered links between grief, anger, and loneliness, underlining its protective function. Gender effects emerged as well, implying male and female participants manifested anger and loneliness differently after relationship loss. Additionally, demographic factors including age, relationship status, relationship duration, and socio-economic background displayed significant differences across levels of grief, social support, anger, and



loneliness. Taken together, the study affirmed that grief, anger, loneliness, and social support are interdependent, and that social support presence reduces the severity of adverse emotional outcomes. These findings collectively provide significant insights into the psychological experiences of young adults following the loss and separation from intimate relationships.

Practical Implications

Despite these limitations, the findings offer important implications for practice, policy, and intervention. The results highlight the necessity of providing accessible counselling and psychological services within universities, given that young adults experiencing the loss of intimate relationships are particularly vulnerable to anger and loneliness. Establishing dedicated student counselling centres and expanding professional support services could help mitigate long term emotional difficulties. In addition, the protective role of perceived social support suggests that peer support groups, mentorship initiatives, and family engagement programs should be promoted within educational and community contexts. Such efforts can help ensure that young adults who experience grief have access to stable and meaningful sources of support.

The findings also provide guidance for mental health professionals. Interventions should not only address symptoms of grief but should also target associated emotional responses such as anger and loneliness, which may exacerbate distress and hinder adjustment. Strategies that emphasize emotional regulation, meaning making, and social reconnection are likely to be beneficial. Although gender did not emerge as a significant moderator in this study, attention to gendered patterns of emotional expression remains important. Clinicians should adopt flexible approaches that are sensitive to individual differences in coping and expression rather than applying rigid assumptions based on gender.

Limitations and Directions for Future Research

The present study is not without limitations. The sample was restricted to 264 university students between the ages of 18 and 25 years, which narrows the applicability of the findings to other age groups and to non-student populations. Future research should extend this work to more diverse samples that include individuals from different cultural, socioeconomic, and educational backgrounds in order to enhance external validity. Another limitation relates to the exclusive reliance on self-report questionnaires, which may have been influenced by subjectivity, memory biases, and the tendency to provide socially desirable responses. Subsequent studies could incorporate multiple methods of data collection, such as longitudinal tracking, behavioral observations, or informant reports, to obtain a more comprehensive assessment of grief and related emotional processes.

The cross-sectional design represents an additional limitation, as it precludes any definitive conclusions about causality in the observed relationships between grief, anger, loneliness, and social support. Future work should employ longitudinal designs to examine how these emotional experiences evolve over time and to determine whether certain variables act as predictors or consequences of others. Furthermore, while the study concentrated on psychological constructs, it did not account for broader sociocultural and



contextual influences that may shape grief and coping. Future research should integrate cultural, environmental, and relational factors to capture a fuller picture of how young adults adjust following the loss of intimate relationships.

REFERENCES

- Acolin, J., Cadigan, J. M., Fleming, C. B., Rhew, I. C., & Lee, C. M. (2023). Trajectory of Depressive Symptoms in the Context of Romantic Relationship Breakup: Characterizing the “Natural Course” of Response and Recovery in Young Adults. *Emerging Adulthood, 11*(5), 1211–1222. <https://doi.org/10.1177/21676968231184922>
- Ali, M. A. L., & Chethiyar, S. D. M. (2024). Exploring Relationship Break-up and its Effect on Mental Health in Punjab Pakistan. *Pakistan Research Journal of Social Sciences, 3*(3).
- Asim, T., Javaid, Z. K., Aqil, I., & Maryam, A. (2024). Exploring Perceptions of Gender Roles in Marital Relationships: A Qualitative Study on Single Young Adults: Exploring Perceptions of Gender Roles in Marital Relationships. *Journal Of Social Sciences, 15*(1), 89-123.
- Averill, J. R. (1983). Studies on anger and aggression: Implications for theories of emotion. *American Psychologist, 38*(11), 1145–1160. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066x.38.11.1145>
- Ayalon, L., Shiovitz-Ezra, S., & Palgi, Y. (2013). Associations of loneliness in older married men and women. *Aging & Mental Health, 17*(1), 33–39. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13607863.2012.702725>
- Bakermans-Kranenburg, M. J., & van IJzendoorn, M. H. (1997). Adult Attachment and the Break-Up of Romantic Relationships. *Journal of Divorce & Remarriage, 27*(3-4), 121–139. https://doi.org/10.1300/j087v27n03_08
- Baumeister, R. F., & Leary, M. R. (1995). The Need to belong: Desire for Interpersonal Attachments as a Fundamental Human Motivation. *Psychological Bulletin, 117*(3), 497–529. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.117.3.497>
- Baumeister, R. F., Stillwell, A., & Wotman, S. R. (1990). Victim and perpetrator accounts of interpersonal conflict: Autobiographical narratives about anger. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 59*(5), 994–1005. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.59.5.994>
- Bernard, J. (1982). *The future of marriage*. Yale University Press.
- Bernardon, S., Babb, K. A., Hakim-Larson, J., & Gragg, M. (2011). Loneliness, attachment, and the perception and use of social support in university students. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science/Revue Canadienne Des Sciences Du Comportement, 43*(1), 40–51. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0021199>
- Bowlby, J. (1973). *Attachment and loss: Separation. anger and anxiety*. (Vol. 2). Pimlico.
- Brink, T. L. (1985). Recovery from Bereavement. Colin Murray Parkes and Robert S. Weiss. *The Hospice Journal, 1*(2), 122–122. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0742-969x.1985.11882532>
- Burger, J., Stroebe, M. S., Perrig-Chiello, P., Schut, H. A., Spahni, S., Eisma, M. C., & Fried, E. I. (2020). Bereavement or breakup: Differences in networks of depression. *Journal of Affective Disorders, 267*, 1–8.



- <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jad.2020.01.157>
- Cacioppo, J. T., Hughes, M. E., Waite, L. J., Hawkley, L. C., & Thisted, R. A. (2006). Loneliness as a specific risk factor for depressive symptoms: Cross-sectional and longitudinal analyses. *Psychology and Aging, 21*(1), 140–151. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0882-7974.21.1.140>
- Collins, W. A. (2003). More than Myth: The Developmental Significance of Romantic Relationships During Adolescence. *Journal of Research on Adolescence, 13*(1), 1–24. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1532-7795.1301001>
- Connolly, J. A., & McIsaac, C. (2009). Romantic Relationships in Adolescence. *Handbook of Adolescent Psychology*. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9780470479193.adlpsy002005>
- Corr, C. A., Nabe, C., & Corr, D. M. (2003). *Death and dying, life and living*. Wadsworth.
- Cramer, K. M., & Neyedley, K. A. (1998). Sex Differences in Loneliness: The Role of Masculinity and Femininity. *Sex Roles, 38*(7/8), 645–653. <https://doi.org/10.1023/a:1018850711372>
- Day, A. L., & Livingstone, H. A. (2003). Gender differences in perceptions of stressors and utilization of social support among university students. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science/Revue Canadienne Des Sciences Du Comportement, 35*(2), 73–83. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0087190>
- DiTommaso, E., Brannen, C., & Best, L. A. (2004). Measurement and Validity Characteristics of the Short Version of the Social and Emotional Loneliness Scale for Adults. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 64*(1), 99–119. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013164403258450>
- DiTommaso, E., & Spinner, B. (1993). The development and initial validation of the Social and Emotional Loneliness Scale for Adults (SELSA). *Personality and Individual Differences, 14*(1), 127–134. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0191-8869\(93\)90182-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/0191-8869(93)90182-3)
- Doka, K. J. (2002). *Disenfranchised Grief*. Research Pr Pub.
- Doka, K. J., & Martin, T. L. (2011). *Grieving Beyond Gender*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203886069>
- Dykstra, P. A., & Fokkema, T. (2007). Social and Emotional Loneliness Among Divorced and Married Men and Women: Comparing the Deficit and Cognitive Perspectives. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology, 29*(1), 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01973530701330843>
- Eccles, J. S., Barber, B. L., Stone, M., & Hunt, J. (2003). Extracurricular activities and adolescent development. *Journal of Social Issues, 59*(4), 865–889. <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.0022-4537.2003.00095.x>
- Field, T. (2011). Romantic Breakups, Heartbreak and Bereavement—Romantic Breakups. *Psychology, 02*(04), 382–387. <https://doi.org/10.4236/psych.2011.24060>
- Field, T., Diego, M., Pelaez, M., Deeds, O., & Delgado, J. (2009). Breakup distress in university students. *Adolescence, 44*(176), 705–727. <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/20432597/>
- Fitness, J. (2001). Betrayal, Rejection, Revenge, and Forgiveness: An Interpersonal Script Approach. *Interpersonal Rejection, 73–101*. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780195130157.003.0004>
- Folkman, S., & Lazarus, R. (1984). Stress: Appraisal and coping. *Encyclopedia of*



- Behavioral Medicine*, 1(1), 1913–1915. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4419-1005-9_215
- Freeman, A., & Davis, D. D. (1990). Cognitive Therapy of Depression. *International Handbook of Behavior Modification and Therapy*, 333–352. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4613-0523-1_16
- George, L. K., Blazer, D. G., Hughes, D. C., & Fowler, N. (1989). Social Support and the Outcome of Major Depression. *British Journal of Psychiatry*, 154(04), 478–485. <https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.154.4.478>
- Gierveld, J. de J., van Tilburg, T., & Dykstra, P. A. (2006). Loneliness and Social Isolation. *The Cambridge Handbook of Personal Relationships*, 485–500. <https://doi.org/10.1017/cb09780511606632.027>
- Ha, J.-H., & Ingersoll-Dayton, B. (2011). Moderators in the relationship between social contact and psychological distress among widowed adults. *Aging & Mental Health*, 15(3), 354–363. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13607863.2010.519325>
- Hawkey, L. C., & Cacioppo, J. T. (2010). Loneliness matters: A theoretical and empirical review of consequences and mechanisms. *Annals of Behavioral Medicine*, 40(2), 218–227. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12160-010-9210-8>
- Hays, R., & DiMatteo, M. R. (1987). A Short-Form Measure of Loneliness. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 51(1), 69–81. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327752jpa5101_6
- Heiligenstein, E., Guenther, G., Hsu, K., & Herman, K. (1996). Depression and Academic Impairment in College Students. *Journal of American College Health*, 45(2), 59–64. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07448481.1996.9936863>
- Jakobsson, U., & Hallberg, I. R. (2005). Loneliness, fear, and quality of life among elderly in Sweden: a gender perspective. *Aging Clinical and Experimental Research*, 17(6), 494–501. <https://doi.org/10.1007/bf03327417>
- Javid, Z. K., & Mahmood, K. (2023). Efficacy of expressive writing therapy in reducing embitterment among university students. *Pakistan JL Analysis & Wisdom*, 2, 136.
- Javid, Z. K., & Mahmood, K. (2023). Exploration of embitterment among university students: A qualitative study. *Journal of Policy Research*, 9(3), 124-129.
- Jozwiak, N., Preville, M., & Vasiliadis, H.-M. (2013). Bereavement-related depression in the older adult population: A distinct disorder? *Journal of Affective Disorders*, 151(3), 1083–1089. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jad.2013.08.038>
- Kahn, R. L., & Antonucci, T. C. (1980). *Convoys over the life course: attachment, roles, and social support*. 3, 253–286. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/259253271_Convoys_Over_the_Life_Course_Attachment_Roles_and_Social_Support
- Kassinove, H., Sukhodolsky, D. G., Tsytsarev, S. V., & Solovyova, S. (1997). Self-reported anger episodes in Russia and America. *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality*.
- Kring, A. M., & Gordon, A. H. (1998). Sex differences in emotion: Expression, experience, and physiology. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 74(3), 686–703. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.74.3.686>
- Kübler-Ross, E. (1969). *On Death and Dying* (1st ed.). Routledge.



- <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203010495>
Lakey, B., & Cohen, S. (2000). Social Support Theory and Measurement. *Social Support Measurement and Intervention*, 29–52.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/med:psych/9780195126709.003.0002>
- Luciano, E. C., & Orth, U. (2017). Transitions in romantic relationships and development of self-esteem. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 112(2), 307–328. <https://doi.org/10.1037/pspp0000109>
- Mahmood, K., Javaid, Z. K., & Ali, A. L. (2024). Development of Breakup Grief Scale for Young Adults in Intimate Relationship.
- Mancone, S., Celia, G., Bellizzi, F., Zanon, A., & Diotaiuti, P. (2025). Emotional and cognitive responses to romantic breakups in adolescents and young adults: the role of rumination and coping mechanisms in life impact. *Frontiers in Psychiatry*, 16. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyt.2025.1525913>
- Marwick, A. E., & Boyd, D. (2014). Networked privacy: How teenagers negotiate context in social media. *New Media & Society*, 16(7), 1051–1067. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444814543995>
- McKiernan, A., Ryan, P., McMahan, E., Bradley, S., & Butler, E. (2018). Understanding Young People's Relationship Breakups Using the Dual Processing Model of Coping and Bereavement. *Journal of Loss and Trauma*, 23(3), 192–210. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15325024.2018.1426979>
- Mikulincer, M., & Shaver, P. R. (2016). *Attachment in adulthood: Structure, dynamics, and change* (2nd ed.). Guilford Press.
- Mikulincer, M., & Shaver, P. R. (2021). An Attachment Perspective on Loss and Grief. *Current Opinion in Psychology*, 45(45). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.copsyc.2021.11.003>
- Monroe, S. M., Anderson, S. F., & Harkness, K. L. (2019). Life stress and major depression: The mysteries of recurrences. *Psychological Review*, 126(6), 791–816. <https://doi.org/10.1037/rev0000157>
- Murphy, W. M., Kerry Roberts Gibson, & Kram, K. E. (2024). Advancing women through developmental relationships. *Edward Elgar Publishing EBooks*, 374–391. <https://doi.org/10.4337/9781035306893.00036>
- Neff, L. A., & Karney, B. R. (2005). Gender Differences in Social Support: A Question of Skill or Responsiveness? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 88(1), 79–90. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.88.1.79>
- Neimeyer, R. (2001). *Meaning reconstruction & the experience of loss*. (R. A. Neimeyer, Ed.). American Psychological Association. <https://doi.org/10.1037/10397-000>
- Neimeyer, R. A. (2006). Complicated Grief and the Reconstruction of Meaning: Conceptual and Empirical Contributions to a Cognitive-Constructivist Model. *Clinical Psychology: Science and Practice*, 13(2), 141–145. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2850.2006.00016.x>
- Osterweis, M., Solomon, F., & Green, M. (1984). Bereavement: Reactions, Consequences, and Care. In *PubMed*. National Academies Press (US). <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/25032459/>
- Parkes, C. M. (2001). A historical overview of the scientific study of bereavement. *Handbook of Bereavement Research: Consequences, Coping, and Care.*, 25–45. <https://doi.org/10.1037/10436-001>
- Peplau, L. A. (1985). Loneliness Research: Basic Concepts and Findings. *Social*



- Support: Theory, Research and Applications*, 24, 269–286.
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-009-5115-0_15
- Pierce, G. R., Sarason, I. G., & Sarason, B. R. (1991). General and relationship-based perceptions of social support: are two constructs better than one? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 61(6), 1028–1039.
<https://doi.org/10.1037//0022-3514.61.6.1028>
- Pop-Jordanova, N. (2021). Grief: Aetiology, Symptoms and Management. *PRILOZI*, 42(2), 9–18. <https://doi.org/10.2478/prilozi-2021-0014>
- Prezza, M., & Giuseppina Pacilli, M. (2002). Perceived social support from significant others, family and friends and several socio-demographic characteristics. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology*, 12(6), 422–429. <https://doi.org/10.1002/casp.696>
- Robak, R. W., & Weitzman, S. P. (1995). Grieving the Loss of Romantic Relationships in Young Adults: An Empirical Study of Disenfranchised Grief. *OMEGA - Journal of Death and Dying*, 30(4), 269–281.
<https://doi.org/10.2190/cy1w-v6rl-0l5v-g4q2>
- Robinaugh, D. J., LeBlanc, N. J., Vuletich, H. A., & McNally, R. J. (2014). Network analysis of persistent complex bereavement disorder in conjugally bereaved adults. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 123(3), 510–522. <https://doi.org/10.1037/abn0000002>
- Rokach, A. (1997). Relations of Perceived Causes and the Experience of Loneliness. *Psychological Reports*, 80(3_suppl), 1067–1074.
<https://doi.org/10.2466/pro.1997.80.3c.1067>
- Sbarra, D. A., & Emery, R. E. (2005). The emotional sequelae of nonmarital relationship dissolution: Analysis of change and intraindividual variability over time. *Personal Relationships*, 12(2), 213–232.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1350-4126.2005.00112.x>
- Schmitt, J. P., & Kurdek, L. A. (1985). Age and Gender Differences In and Personality Correlates of Loneliness in Different Relationships. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 49(5), 485–496.
https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327752jpa4905_5
- Shullman, S., & Kipnis, O. (2001). Adolescent romantic relationships: a look from the future. *Journal of Adolescence*, 24(3), 337–351.
<https://doi.org/10.1006/jado.2001.0409>
- Spielberger, C. D., & Reheiser, E. C. (2009). The Nature and Measurement of Anger. *International Handbook of Anger*, 403–412.
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-0-387-89676-2_23
- Sprecher, S., Felmlee, D., Metts, S., Fehr, B., & Vanni, D. (1998). Factors Associated with Distress Following the Breakup of a Close Relationship. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 15(6), 791–809.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0265407598156005>
- Staudacher, C. (1987). *Beyond Grief: A Guide for Recovering from the Death of a Loved One*. New Harbinger Publications.
- Stroebe, M., Schut, H., & Boerner, K. (2010). Continuing bonds in adaptation to bereavement: Toward theoretical integration. *Clinical Psychology Review*, 30(2), 259–268. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpr.2009.11.007>
- Stroebe, M., Schut, H., & Boerner, K. (2017). Cautioning health-care professionals: Bereaved persons are misguided through the stages of grief. *OMEGA - Journal of Death and Dying*, 74(4), 455–473.



- <https://doi.org/10.1177/0030222817691870>
- Stroebe, M., Stroebe, W., & Schut, H. (2001). Gender Differences in Adjustment to Bereavement: An Empirical and Theoretical Review. *Review of General Psychology*, 5(1), 62–83. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1089-2680.5.1.62>
- Tamres, L. K., Janicki, D., & Helgeson, V. S. (2002). Sex Differences in Coping Behavior: A Meta-Analytic Review and an Examination of Relative Coping. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 6(1), 2–30. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327957pspro601_1
- Tashiro, T., & Frazier, P. (2003). “I’ll never be in a relationship like that again”: Personal growth following romantic relationship breakups. *Personal Relationships*, 10(1), 113–128. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1475-6811.00039>
- Thoits, P. A. (2011). Mechanisms Linking Social Ties and Support to Physical and Mental Health. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, 52(2), 145–161. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022146510395592>
- Turner, R. J., & Marino, F. (1994). Social Support and Social Structure: A Descriptive Epidemiology. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, 35(3), 193. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2137276>
- Ustün, T. B. (1999). The global burden of mental disorders. *American Journal of Public Health*, 89(9), 1315–1318. <https://doi.org/10.2105/ajph.89.9.1315>
- World Health Organization. (1999). The World health report : 1999 : Making a difference. In *iris.who.int*. World Health Organization. <https://iris.who.int/handle/10665/42167>
- Zimet, G. D., Dahlem, N. W., Zimet, S. G., & Farley, G. K. (1988). The multidimensional scale of perceived social support. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 52(1), 30–41. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327752jpa5201_2
- Zimet, G. D., Powell, S. S., Farley, G. K., Werkman, S., & Berkoff, K. A. (1990). Psychometric Characteristics of the Multidimensional Scale of Perceived Social Support. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 55(3-4), 610–617. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00223891.1990.9674095>
- Zimmer-Gembeck, M. J., & Petherick, J. (2006). Intimacy dating goals and relationship satisfaction during adolescence and emerging adulthood: Identity formation, age and sex as moderators. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 30(2), 167–177. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0165025406063636>
- Zisook, S., Iglewicz, A., Avanzino, J., Maglione, J., Glorioso, D., Zetumer, S., Seay, K., Vahia, I., Young, I., Lebowitz, B., Pies, R., Reynolds, C., Simon, N., & Shear, M. K. (2014). Bereavement: Course, Consequences, and Care. *Current Psychiatry Reports*, 16(10). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11920-014-0482-8>