

THE BIG FIVE PERSONALITY DIMENSIONS (OCEAN) AND ADULT ATTACHMENT STYLES AS THE PREDICTORS OF EMOTIONAL DIVORCE

Omran Davarinejad, Mehdi Shirzadifar, Adele Elahi, Maryam Shirzadi, Hassan Shahi*

Department of Psychiatry, School of Medicine, Kermanshah University of Medical Sciences, Kermanshah, Iran

ARTICLE INFO

Received:

03th Jun 2017

Accepted:

29th Nov 2017

Available online:

14th Dec 2017

Keywords: *Personality Dimensions, Attachment Styles, Emotional Divorce.*

ABSTRACT

In the current study, the contribution of the Big Five Personality Dimensions (OCEAN) and Adult Attachment Styles (AAS), in the prediction of Emotional Divorce (ED) has been investigated. Material and Methods: This research is descriptive research (correlation) is placed. The participants consist of 300 people (141 male, and 159 female) from among all married adults personnel in Kermanshah University of Medical Sciences (hospitals & faculties) to work who have been chosen by Multiple-Stage Cluster sampling method. To evaluate Big Five Personality Dimensions (OCEAN), Neo Five Factor Inventory (NEO-FFI) (Costa & McCrae, 1992), for evaluate Adult Attachment Styles (AAS), The Adult Attachment Scale (AAS) (Hazan & Shaver, 1987), and for evaluate Emotional Divorce, Gottman's Emotional Divorce Questionnaire (GEDQ) (Gottman, 1995) has been used. To analyze data, Pearson Correlation and Regression Analysis have been run. Results: According to Guttman (1995) earned higher scores 8 can be considered a criterion for the identification of individuals at risk of emotional divorce. Accordingly, 70 persons (23% of the research sample, including 29 female and 41 male) participating in the study were eligible for an emotional divorce and are at risk of separation and divorce. The results showed that there was a significant relationship between the Big Five Personality Dimensions (OCEAN) and Adult Attachment Styles (AAS), with Emotional Divorce (ED). Emotional Divorce (ED) has been predicted significantly by subfields of the Big Five Personality Dimensions (OCEAN) and Adult Attachment Styles (AAS). The results show Secure & Ambivalent Style are negative predictors, and Avoidant Style is a positive predictor of Emotional Divorce (ED). Moreover, other results show that that the personality trait of "Conscientiousness" is negative predictors, and "Neuroticism" is positive predictor of Emotional Divorce (ED). Other Personality Dimensions could not predict significantly the phenomena Emotional Divorce (ED). Discussion: The results show that two most important factors for achieving satisfaction in marital life, and prevent of getting on the way of Emotional Divorce (and probably formal divorce), are Personality Dimensions and Attachment Styles of the couples. So in order to promote healthy relations between couples and promote the quality of marital lives, it's necessary to educate the couples to rear constructive Personality Dimensions (like Conscientiousness) in themselves, and matched their Attachment Styles together.

Copyright © 2013 - All Rights Reserved - Pharmacophore

To Cite This Article: Omran Davarinejad, Mehdi Shirzadifar, Adele Elahi, Maryam Shirzadi, Hassan Shahi, (2017), "The big five personality dimensions (ocean) and adult attachment styles as the predictors of emotional divorce", *Pharmacophore*, 8(6S), e-1173155.

Introduction

The statistics have been recorded, indicative of the significant and increasing formal divorce, almost in all the provinces of the country (Iran), even in traditional, religious fanatics, and unfortunately it shows that divorce is common among all ethnic groups has breached. But in the meantime "Emotional Divorce" hidden phenomenon and yet the lives of many couples is that although the couple don't formally separated from each other, but without any feeling and affection to each other and only for the house to survive deals [1]. Attainment emotional divorce (although many of these couples begin their lives with love) can have multiple hypothetical causes, including: excessive labor and employment, economic and financial problems, differences in terms of issues marital and sex, having different ground, cultural, educational, having fun, different and disagreement over

Corresponding Author: Hassan Shahi, Department of Psychiatry, School of Medicine, Kermanshah University of Medical Sciences, Kermanshah, Iran, Email: Hassanshahi84@gmail.com.

how to spend leisure time and some "personality characteristics" such as selfishness, greed, pride and stubbornness, the diversity, the confidence and self-esteem [2-4].

But, in this research, it's been conceptualized that emotional divorce may better explanation based on personal variables. In fact, the contribution of "personality characteristics" is of great importance. Because many scientists within personality studies [5] believe that personality characteristics (within a developmental approach) are the main determinant of how many people are family and social interactions. Hans Eysenck believed that personality traits and factors that can be made by "factor analysis" revealed. He has identified three categories of traits, "Extraversion vs. Introversion", "Neuroticism vs. Emotional Stability" and "Psychoticism vs. Impulse Control" [6]. Costa and McCrae (1992) after longitudinal studies introduced five strong factors which later became known as the Big Five theory. The Big Five personality traits, also known as the Five Factor Model (FFM), is a model based on common language descriptors of personality (lexical hypothesis) [7]. The five factors have been defined as "Openness to Experience", "Conscientiousness", "Extraversion", "Agreeableness", and "Neuroticism", often listed under the acronyms OCEAN or CANOE [8].

Toegel & Barsoux (2012) being the most important features of these personality traits are expressed in the following words: 1) Openness to experience: Appreciation for art, emotion, adventure, unusual ideas, curiosity, and variety of experience. Openness reflects the degree of intellectual curiosity, creativity and a preference for novelty and variety a person has. 2) Conscientiousness: A tendency to be organized and dependable, show self-discipline, act dutifully, aim for achievement, and prefer planned rather than spontaneous behavior. 3) Extraversion: Energy, positive emotions, surgency, assertiveness, sociability and the tendency to seek stimulation in the company of others, and talkativeness. 4) Agreeableness: A tendency to be compassionate and cooperative rather than suspicious and antagonistic towards others. It is also a measure of one's trusting and helpful nature, and whether a person is generally well-tempered or not. 5) Neuroticism: The tendency to experience unpleasant emotions easily, such as anger, anxiety, depression, and vulnerability. Neuroticism also refers to the degree of emotional stability and impulse control and is sometimes referred to by its low pole, "emotional stability" [7-9].

But, wherever it is about relations between spouses, discussion and research, has the role of attachment styles coordination or lack of harmony among couples and couples style with each other, much has been said. Within attachment theory, attachment means "a biological instinct in which proximity to an attachment figure is sought when the child senses or perceives threat or discomfort" [10-11].

According to John Bowlby (1966), attachment product development and child care guarantee for children because it causes protect him and be his underlying growth [12]. Ainsworth also demonstrated its attachment to help reduce anxiety. She calls it consistent with the safety effects to a person's attachment enables children to leave and pay to search in their environment [13-17]. Caregivers and care in early childhood pairing process is almost always a natural process and there is no chance of selection. But "adult attachment" relationship for both parties, accompanied by a selection. Attachment system in infants and children in terms of the final outcome of neonatal survival in the service operated. While adults provide the optimal level of regulation in stable family unit "neighborhood – away" with his wife, which usually leads to increased survive tremble [18]. In general, all children find their feelings of attachment. Infrastructure development and healthy social emotional attachment in adulthood and underpins the successful formation of identity that is associated with mental health affects [19-20].

Following researches by Bowlby, Ainsworth, Blehar, Waters and Wall (1987), three styles of attachment have been distinguished: 1) Secure Attachment: Securely attached people tend to agree with the following statements: "It is relatively easy for me to become emotionally close to others. I am comfortable depending on others and having others depend on me. I don't worry about being alone or others not accepting me". This style of attachment usually results from a history of warm and responsive interactions with their attachments [22]. Securely attached people tend to have positive views of themselves and their attachments. They also tend to have positive views of their relationships [23]. 2) Avoidant Attachment: It can take two forms; Dismissive–Avoidant: People with a dismissive style of avoidant attachment tend to agree with these statements: "I am comfortable without close emotional relationships", "It is important to me to feel independent and self-sufficient", and "I prefer not to depend on others or have others depend on me". People with this attachment style desire a high level of independence. The desire for independence often appears as an attempt to avoid attachment altogether. They view themselves as self-sufficient and invulnerable to feelings associated with being closely attached to others [24]. Fearful–Avoidant: People with losses or other trauma, such as sexual abuse in childhood and adolescence may often develop this type of attachment and tend to agree with the following statements: "I am somewhat uncomfortable getting close to others. I want emotionally close relationships, but I find it difficult to trust others completely, or to depend on them. I sometimes worry that I will be hurt if I allow myself to become too close to others". People with this attachment style have mixed feelings about close relationships. On the one hand, they desire to have emotionally close relationships. On the other hand, they tend to feel uncomfortable with emotional closeness. These mixed feelings are combined with sometimes unconscious, negative views about themselves and their attachments [25]. 3) Ambivalent Attachment: Also known as Anxious–Preoccupied: People with anxious-preoccupied attachment type tend to agree with the following statements: "I want to be completely emotionally intimate with others, but I often find that others are reluctant to get as close as I would like", and "I am uncomfortable being without close relationships, but I sometimes worry that others don't value me as much as I value them". People with this style of attachment seek high levels of intimacy, approval, and responsiveness from their attachment figure. They sometimes value intimacy to such an extent that they become overly dependent on the attachment figure [22].

According to the research literature, the first aim of this study is to investigate the relationship between the big five personality dimensions (OCEAN), and attachment styles, with emotional divorce. The second aim of the study is to predict statistically emotional divorce based on the personality dimensions and attachment styles. Since the research literature, not to mention sex differences, in this study, using a sample with the participation of both sexes in the differences sex also be addressed.

Material and Methods

This research is descriptive research (correlation) is placed. That was the main objective of achieving the relationship between the predictor variables (big five personality dimensions & Attachment Styles), with the predicted variable (emotional divorce). The relationship between variables was assessed using correlation and regression method. The target population included all married adults personnel in Kermanshah University of Medical Sciences (hospitals & faculties) to work. In this study, choosing of the required sample did in several ways. First, by using cluster random samplings of 3 hospitals of the 7 hospitals of Kermanshah University of Medical Sciences were selected (Farabi, Imam Khomeini, Imam Reza). Since the "gender" and "education level" desired, because the literature [22] suggest that emotional divorce can be different according to gender and educational level, quota sampling method was used. Thus, the gender on two category (female - male) and education level in three classes (diploma and High school diploma - BA - MA and above) were quota. Using convenience sampling procedure, sampling so that any quota to be filled. Using this method, at least 300 subjects who met the inclusion criteria (They have at least three years of marriage, Working in one of the hospitals of Kermanshah University of Medical Sciences, Lack of mental disorders based on DSM-5, and They informed consent to participate in research) were selected.

Measures:

1) Neo Five Factor Inventory (NEO-FFI): This questionnaire is the short form of "NEO Personality Inventory (NEO-PI-R)"; that is developed in 1992 and has 240 questions. Neo is the short form has 60 questions and the measures of personality traits. All subjects based on a 5-point Likert scale (strongly disagree, disagree, neutral, agree and strongly agree) report their status on each question. There are 12 questions for each factor. McCrae and Costa (1989) suggest that short form of NEO is an exact match with its full form. "Concurrent validity" of this questionnaire was acceptable. Cronbach's alpha for the big factors, "Neuroticism", "Extraversion", "Agreeableness", "Openness to Experience" and "Conscientiousness" were respectively as follows: 0/84, 0/75 0/74, 0/75 and 0/83. Researchers in Iran, "validity" and "reliability" have confirmed the above-mentioned questionnaire [26].

2) Gottman's Emotional Divorce Questionnaire: Emotional Divorce Questionnaire from the book by John Gottman; "Why Marriages Succeed or Fail: And How You Can Make Yours Last" taken [27]. The questionnaire was written in 2008 and includes statements about different aspects of life that one person may agree or disagree with it. The scale has 24 questions and should be answered "Yes or No" way. Yes rating 0 and No get point 1. Whatever the answer is yes, more emotional divorce more likely. A minimum score of 0 and a maximum of 24 will be possible. The final judgment about the status of the couple do based on 3 following positions: "A score between 0 to 8: the possibility of separation in life is poor". "A score between 8 and 16: the possibility of separation in life is average". "Score higher than 16: the possibility of separation in life is strong". After collecting the responses Yes, if the number equal to eight (8) and higher boost, the marital life is in danger and separation from expert help. Mami & Asgari have reported Cronbach's alpha for the questionnaire listed 83%. Validity of the questionnaire was reported by Professors is also desirable.

3) Adult Attachment Scale (AAS): The Adult Attachment Scale (AAS) was officially developed in 1990 but built on the earlier work of Hazen & Shaver (1987) and Levy & Davis (1988). The scale was developed by decomposing the original three prototypical descriptions (Hazen & Shaver, 1987) into a series of 18 items [28]. The scale consists of 18 items scored on a 5 point likert-type scale. It measures adult attachment styles named "Secure", "Anxious" and "Avoidant", defined as: Secure = high scores on Close and Depend subscales, low score on Anxiety subscale. Anxious = high score on Anxiety subscale, moderate scores on Close and Depend subscales. Avoidant = low scores on Close, Depend, and Anxiety subscales. Collins & Read (1990) reported Cronbach's alpha coefficients of 0/69 for Close, 0/75 for Depend, and 0/72 for Anxiety.

Results

Demographic information of the sample presented on table 1. According to Table 1, 53% of the participants were women and 47% of respondents were male. On the other hand, higher education respondents (55%) were at the undergraduate level. The mean age of the subjects is 34/86. Also, the average age of women, 33/32, and the mean age of the men was 36/67.

Table 1: Demographic information of the research sample

Variables		Education			Mean
		Diploma	BS	MS	
Gender [N (%)]	Female	38 (12/6%)	104 (34/6%)	17 (5/6%)	159 (53%)
	Male	56 (18/3%)	62 (20/6%)	23 (7/6%)	141 (47%)
Total Gender Number		94 (32%)	166 (55%)	40 (13%)	300 (100%)
Age [M (SD)]	Female	35/22 (7/54)	32/68 (7/14)	33/24 (8/21)	33/32 (8/3)
	Male	37/33 (8/14)	35/09 (7/32)	39/00(7/11)	36/67 (8/7)
Total Age Mean		36/49 (8/24)	33/53 (7/14)	36/55 (6/47)	34/86 (8/86)

Table 5. Regression analysis of The Big Five Personality Dimensions and Emotional Divorce

Variable	B	β	t	P Value	R	R ²	F	P Value
Neuroticism	0.220	0.255	3.645	0.001	0.371	0.138	9.404	0.001
Extraversion	0.051	0.053	0.815	0.416				
Openness To Experience	0.028	0.024	0.441	0.660				
Agreeableness	-0.062	-0.065	-2.879	0.280				
Conscientiousness	-0.130	-0.159	-2.211	0.028				

According to table 4, shows only the personality traits of Neuroticism and Conscientiousness are significantly predictors of emotional divorce. Neuroticism is positively most predictor of emotional divorce ($\beta = 0/25$, $P > 0/01$). Indeed, with one change in point of Neuroticism, 0/25 point changes done in emotional divorce. Other analysis showed that Conscientiousness is negatively predictor of emotional divorce ($\beta = -0/21$, $P > 0/05$). In this case, with one change in point of Conscientiousness, -0/21 point changes done in emotional divorce. Other personality traits could not significantly predict emotional divorce.

Discussion

According to this study, Attachment styles can predict total score of emotional divorce in the ground of marital and interpersonal psychology. As the table 1 showed, there is a positive significant relation between total emotional divorce and only one of subgroups of attachment styles (i.e. avoidant style). Among the subgroup of Attachment styles, secure attachment showed negative insignificantly correlated with emotional divorce. Ambivalent style showed a positive insignificant relation with emotional divorce. Moreover, avoidant style had shown positively significant correlation with emotional divorce. As a review; Marriage is a long-term relationship that can be viewed through attachment theory. Attachment refers to the bond formed with primary caregivers in infancy and affects relationships throughout life [29-31]. The internal working model formed by attachment is the representation we have about the world around us and ourselves and provides a useful framework to understand the motivation or stimuli that affect our responses and emotions. Attachment affects marriage at its foundation: the development of a relationship. Many studies have explored attachment as an explanatory factor in satisfaction with romantic relationships or marriage [32].

The results of table 4 show that all three attachment styles can significantly predict emotional divorce. In a more precise level, Secure Style can significantly and negatively predict emotional divorce. Individuals with the secure attachment style establish close relationships with ease and are defined as individuals who can trust others and have low separation anxiety. Studies conducted with individuals with the secure attachment style have revealed these people to display behaviors that are associated with a healthy lifestyle and to have a higher level of self-respect [33]. They were also found to have a higher capacity for self-regulation [34-35]. Results of the research well showed that formation of secure attachment can be a suitable ground for developing health marital/interpersonal relation. Because a close relationship forms based on quality of attachment style, thus, having secure attachment is a protective resource against happening emotional divorce in a supposed marital relation.

The results of table 4 also showed that ambivalent attachment style can significantly and negatively predict emotional divorce. Those with the anxious-ambivalent attachment style have an intense desire for establishing intimacy but at the same time experience fear of rejection and not being loved enough. Ambivalent attachment style is characterized by a negative view of the self, hypersensitivity to rejection, difficulty trusting others in a relationship, as well as heightened concerns about the partner's responsiveness. Conversely, individuals who are prone to attachment avoidance hold a negative view of others, value autonomy and independence, and demonstrate a typical inclination towards social isolation and withdrawal [25]. But the results of this research showed high level of ambivalent style can predict negatively emotional divorce. With attention to negative nature of this two variable (ambivalent style & emotional divorce), maybe it is been expected the prediction was positively. This strange result can be explained in this way; person with ambivalent style have intense desire to establish intimacy, but experience fear of rejection. This fear may result in deprivation of intimate relation and be a buffer for getting married. But, the persons (with ambivalent style) that have married in a traditional style, May for prevent of experience anxiety and fear of rejection, actively strengthen the quality of the relations between couples. Subsequently, existence of ambivalent attachment style can promote marital satisfaction and rebound to decreasing emotional divorce.

The results of table 4 also showed that avoidant attachment style can significantly and positively predict emotional divorce. Those with the avoidant attachment style are nervous about intimacy and commitment. Avoidant attachment evolved to promote short-term mating and low investment parenting; this argument is similar to his original theory. Attachment style is associated with various aspects of interpersonal regulation (i.e., the processes that regulate a person's interactions with others) and influences people's feelings, thoughts, attitudes, and behaviors in social interactions. Several studies that have explored associations between attachment measures and interpersonal dispositions have described people with avoidant attachment as somewhat introverted, cold, and emotionally inexpressive [21]. Avoidant individuals consistently express a preference for being alone rather than affiliating with others [19]. These findings suggest that the lack of sociability typical of avoidant people reflects high levels of social anhedonia. As a conclusion, it's been showed that persons with avoidant style not desire to experience intimacy with others and preference to be alone.

About the role of personality dimensions in emotional divorce, the results of table 5 also showed that neuroticism can significantly and positively predict emotional divorce. Individuals who score high on neuroticism are more likely than average to be moody and to experience feelings as anxiety, worry, fear, anger, frustration, envy, jealousy, guilt, depressed mood, and loneliness. They are often self-conscious and shy, and they may have trouble controlling urges and delaying gratification. High neuroticism indexes a risk constellation that exists prior to the development and onset of any of the "common mental disorders", such as depression, phobia, panic disorder, other anxiety disorders, and substance use disorder—symptoms that traditionally have been called neuroses [8]. At the opposite end of the spectrum, individuals who score low in neuroticism are more emotionally stable and less reactive to stress. They tend to be calm, even-tempered, and less likely to feel tense or rattled. Although they are low in negative emotion, they are not necessarily high on positive emotion. So, it does can be inferences that neuroticism has a body of characteristics all are inappropriate for keeping marital relationships. High levels of neuroticism redound to decreasing in abilities and desires to starting an intimate relation and keeping it, and probably getting married. As a conclusion, if a neurotic person get married, is more likely to have problem to manage the marital relation, and may approaching to emotional divorce.

Other results of table 5 also showed that conscientiousness can significantly and negatively predict emotional divorce. Conscientiousness is the personality trait of being careful, or vigilant. Conscientiousness implies a desire to do a task well. Conscientious people are efficient and organized as opposed to easy-going and disorderly. They exhibit a tendency to show self-discipline, act dutifully, and aim for achievement; they display planned rather than spontaneous behavior; and they are generally organized and dependable. They have a more functional anterior cingulate cortex (ACC) than the average person. It is manifested in characteristic behaviors such as being neat and systematic; also including such elements as carefulness, thoroughness, and deliberation (the tendency to think carefully before acting). Conscientiousness is one of the five traits of the Five Factor Model of personality and is an aspect of what has traditionally been referred to as having character. Conscientious individuals are generally hard-working and reliable. They are also likely to be conformists. When taken to an extreme, they may also be "workaholics", perfectionists, and compulsive in their behavior. People who score low on conscientiousness tend to be laid back, less goal-oriented, and less driven by success; they also are more likely to engage in antisocial and criminal behavior [5]. One of most important elements of conscientiousness is commitment in all of aspects of life. This Commitment results in to do all of responsibilities on the best quality. Thereupon, a conscientiousness person will be committed to his/her interpersonal relations (specialized marital relation). As a result, conscientiousness is a personality trait playing a protective role for marital relation against all of pathologies. Summarizing, high levels of conscientiousness can promote the quality of the relations and protect marital relation from emotional divorce.

Conclusion

As a global conclusion of the research, marital satisfaction can influence by different factors. Emotional divorce is just a quality of the relation between couples. Its means, emotional divorce is just decrease of marital attraction between couple because of many effective factors. In this research, it's been shown that attachment styles and personality traits have determinant role on emotional divorce. And with training relation management strategies, can decrease emotional divorce in all of fields of society.

Acknowledgments

We would like to thank all of Personnel of Kermanshah University of Medical Sciences, Iran, that cooperated with us in the process of data collection.

Conflict of interest

The authors declare no conflict of interests.

References

1. Zamani S, Ahadi H, Asgari P. The relationship between emotional divorce with body image and perfectionism. *Psychol Res.* 2014; 10, 4: 119-136.
2. Kenneth E, Prather SR. Paradigm for affective divorce case management. Advance level family law seminar in Michigan; 2000. Birmingham, Michigan.
3. Bastani S, Golzari M, Roushani S. The consequences of emotional divorce and strategies to deal with it. *J of Fam Res.* 2011; 7, 2: 241-257.
4. Buss DM, Shackelford TD. How to Save A Marriage: Different Gender Strategies To Save Relationship. *J Pers Soc Psychol.* 2005; 72, 2: 346-361.
5. Schultz DP, Schultz SE. *Theories of personality.* Thomson/Wadsworth: 2005.
6. Eysenck HJ. Dimensions of personality: 16, 5, 3? Criteria for a taxonomic paradigm. *Pers Individ Dif.* 1992; 13, 667-673.
7. Costa PT, McCrae RR. *NEO-PI professional manual.* Odessa, Florida: Psychological Assessment Resources: 1992.
8. McCrae RR & Costa PT. Toward a new generation of personality theories: Theoretical contexts for the five factor model. In Wiggins JS, Editors. *The five factor model of personality: Theoretical perspectives.* New York: Guilford Press: 1992. PP. 51-87.

9. Toegel G & Barsoux JL. How to become a better leader. *Sloan Manage Rev.* 2012; 53, 3: 51-60.
10. Ates S, Turkcan A. Temperament, Attachment Styles and Trait Anger of Parents to Adolescents Diagnosed with Conduct Disorder. *Eur Psychiatry.* 2015; 30, 1, 28–31.
11. Blalock DV, Franzese AT, Machell KA, Strauman TJ. Attachment style and self-regulation: How our patterns in relationships reflect broader motivational styles. *Pers Individ Dif.* 2015; 87, 90-98.
12. Soponarua C, Dirua MC. Antheus' effect in the intergenerational transmission of attachment styles and its importance for adult education. *Procedia Soc Behav Sci.* 2014; 142: 564 – 569.
13. Doinita NE, Maria ND. Attachment and Parenting Styles. *Procedia Soc Behav Sci.* 2015: 203, 199-204.
14. Erikson EH. *Childhood and society.* 1963. New York: W. W. Norton & Company. (Original work published 1950)
15. Pistole MC. Attachment theory: contributions of group work. *J Specialists of Group Work.* 1997; 22: 7-21.
16. Kogut E. Adult attachment styles, self-efficacy, and causal attributional style for achievement-related failures. *Learn Individ Differ.* 2016; 50, 64-72.
17. Gillath O, Karantzas GC, Fraley RC. Chapter 6 - How Stable Are Attachment Styles in Adulthood? *Adult Attachment.* 2016: 129-157.
18. Chung K, Choi E. Attachment styles and mother's well-being among mothers of preschool children in Korea: The mediating role of marital satisfaction. *Pers Individ Dif.* 2014: 69. 135-139.
19. Meredith P, Strong O, Jenny D. A review of psychology presenting a conceptual model, clinical theory and chronic pain. The evidence linking adult attachment theory styles of adult. 2008: 280: 407-429.
20. Koweleski R, Weston D. *Psychology (4 th ed.)*. Exploratory interest in university student. *Asian J Soc Psychol.* 2005, 3, 11: 302-310.
21. Dunkel CS, Lukaszewski AW, Chua K. the relationships between sex, life history strategy, and adult romantic attachment style. *Pers Individ Dif.* 2016: 98, 176-178.
22. Tagay Ö, Karataş Z. An Investigation of Attachment Styles of College Students. *Procedia Soc Behav Sci.* 2012: 47, 745-750.
23. Scrima F, Stefano G, Guarnaccia C, Lorito L. The impact of adult attachment style on organizational commitment and adult attachment in the workplace. *Pers Individ Dif.* 2015: 86, 432-437.
24. Kaya N, Attachment styles of nursing students: A cross-sectional and a longitudinal study. *Nurse Educ Today.* 2010: 30, 7, 666-673.
25. Schater DL. *Psychology, second Edition.* New York: Worth Publishers.
26. Amiri M, Farhoodi F, Abdolvand N, Rezaie Bidakhavidid A. A study of the relationship between Big-five personality traits and communication styles with marital satisfaction of married students majoring in public universities of Tehran. *Procedia Soc Behav Sci,* 2011: 30, 685 – 689.
27. Gottman J. *Why marriages succeed or fail, and how you can make yours last.* 1995. Simon & Schuster.
28. Hazan C & Shaver P. Conceptualizing romantic love as an attachment process. *J Pers Soc Psychol,* 1987; 52, 511-524.
29. Donnellane MB, Conger RD, & Bryant CM. The big five and Enduring marriage. *J Res Pers,* 2004; 38, 481-504.
30. Fletcher GJO. *The news science of intimate relationships.* Malden, Massachusetts: Blackwell. 2002.
31. Bowlby J. The making and breaking of affectional bonds: Aetiology and psychopathology in the light of attachment theory. *Br J Psychiatry,* 1977; 130, 201–210.
32. Lawler-Row KA, Hyatt-Edwards L, Wuensch K, Karremans JC. Forgiveness and health: The role of attachment. *Pers Relatsh.* 2011; 18(2):170–183.
33. Huntsinger ET & Luecken LJ. Attachment relationships and health behavior: The mediational role of self-esteem. *Psychol Health,* 2004; 19(4), 515–526.
34. Kobak RP, & Sceery A. Attachment in late adolescence: Working models, affect regulation, and representations of self and others. *Child Dev,* 1988; 59(1), 135–146.
35. Simpson JA. Influence of attachment styles on romantic relationships. *J Pers Soc Psychol,* 1990; 59(5), 971–980.