

THE PREDICTION OF EXTRAMARITAL RELATIONS BY COMMUNICATION PATTERNS, PERSONALITY TRAITS, AND ATTACHMENT STYLES IN MARRIED STAFF WORKING IN HOSPITAL, FEREYDUNKENAR, IRAN

Mehrangiz Sarmadi* and Abdol Ali Yaghubi**

Abstract: This article aimed to predict extramarital relations by attachment styles, communication patterns, and personality traits of married employees working in Imam Khumeini hospital of Fereydunkenar, Iran. The subjects were randomly selected among the morning-shift staff working in Imam Khumeini hospital of Fereydunkenar, Iran. Data were collected using four questionnaires: NEO Five Factor Personality Inventory (Short Form 60), Christensen & Sullaway Communication Pattern Questionnaire (CPQ), Revised Adult Attachment Scale (RAAS), and Infidelity Questionnaire (INFQ). Data were analyzed using Pearson correlation test. The results showed that insecure or avoidant attachment styles, ambivalent insecure attachment style, mutual avoidance communication patterns, and demand/withdrawal communication patterns had a direct, significant relationship with extramarital relations ($P < 0.05$ and $P < 0.01$). Neuroticism, extraversion, openness to experience, agreeableness, and secure attachment style had a significant relationship with extramarital relations ($P < 0.05$) and ($P < 0.01$). Conscientiousness and Mutual Constructive Communication pattern had an inverse, significant relationship with extramarital relations ($P < 0.05$).

Keywords: Attachment Styles, Extramarital Relations, Couple Communication Patterns, Personality Traits.

INTRODUCTION

Marital life is certainly associated with many challenges. Infidelity is, however, the most important challenge. Infidelity is considered a shocking issue for many couples and families. Almost all married individuals or those who live with their intimate partner expect sexual and emotional loyalty (Sami, Nazari, Mohsen Zadeh, Taheri, 2014). Infidelity is relations with someone other than the spouse. Any kind of secrecy concerning relationships outside of marriage is considered a form of infidelity even if one shares personal information with a second person and hides it from the spouse (Khedmatgozar, Bovalhori, and Karamlou, 2008). In recent years, the definition of marriage has been extended, covering a wide range of behaviors. For example, certain behaviors such as illicit relationship, deceiving, sex, watching pornography (sexy photos, videos, drawings or writing), intense physical intimacy with someone other than the spouse such as holding hands, caressing, and even emotional intimacy beyond the ordinary friendship with someone other than the spouse. Therefore, every behavior that causes the violation of marriage is

* Department of Psychology, Sari Branch, Islamic Azad University, Sari, Iran

** Ph.D. Department of Psychology, Sari Branch, Islamic Azad University, Sari, Iran

classified as infidelity (Hertlein et. al., 2005; Quoted by Momeni, Javid, Naderi, and Nobandegani, 2014). Studies concerning infidelity and extramarital relations indicate that there are many reasons for such act including dissatisfaction with the current relationship, desire and passion for the diversity or sexual excitement, revenge, anger or jealousy, insecurity or uncertainty about the relationship of companionship and intimacy, lack of maturity and lack of commitment, extreme interest to establish a romantic relationship with a person outside marriage, sexual dissatisfaction, increased self-esteem, inability to control the temptations, drugs and alcohol, etc. (Buunk, 1980; Enrique Tos et. al., 1999; quoted by Sami et. al., 2014). One of the most effective theories for extramarital relations is attachment theory. Individuals' attachments styles can widely affect their relationships with others. Different people with different attachment styles experience various romantic relationships (Sami et. al., 2014). In general, attachment can be considered a certain behavioral pattern which is vital and essential for healthy growth. Attachment is a deep emotional affection with certain individuals over the course of life. Bowlby defines attachment as follows: Psychological relationship between two human beings. Generally, attachment can be defined as the excitement governing the child's relationships with care giver. Infants begin to attach when they are almost six years old and show fear of strangers. Bowlby believes that if attachment does not occur in the first of second year of life, then it is very late and forms hard (Shaeabi, 2013). There are three types of attachment styles: Secure, Avoidant or Insecure, Ambivalent or Anxious. Individuals with secure attachment style tend to see others a reliable ones and themselves as those who can be loved and cared. In avoidant or insecure attachment style, individuals claim that they do not need close relationships and they tend to fear of intimacy. They have difficulty relying on others and are afraid of being close to others. Individuals with ambivalent/anxious attachment style are inclined to have weak pattern of relationships with others. They are afraid of not being loved. They always look for negative emotional experience. They seek intimacy but are afraid of being left alone (Rafee, Hatami, and Foroughi, 2001). Findings showed that insecure attachment styles (avoidant and ambivalent) had a relationship with extramarital relationships (Rezaee, 2001).

METHOD

Statistical Population, Sample Size, and Method

Simple random sampling was employed. In this method, the probability is equal for all participants, meaning that selection of every member does not affect other members (Seif, 2013). The subjects were selected in three shifts (morning, afternoon, and night). A total of 100 out of 140 male and female married personnel were

randomly selected in the morning shift. RAAS, Christensen & Sullaway CPQ, NEO-FFI, and INFQ were forwarded to them.

QUESTIONNAIRES

Revised Adult Attachment Scale (RAAS)

RAAS is used to measure adult attachment styles. It was first developed in 1990 by Collins and Reid. It was, then, revised in 1996. The theoretical basis of RAAS is attachment theory. RAAS, which measures one's assessment of communication skills and intimate relationship style, has 18 items which state responses on a 5-option Likert scale. The questionnaire has three sub-scales. Attachment sub-scale has 6 terms, showing the subject's trust and reliance. Intimacy sub-scale evaluates the emotional intimacy with others. It has 6 sub-scales. Anxiety sub-scale assesses one's concern about being ignored. It also has 6 items. In order to obtain the scores in each sub-section, total sum of scores are calculated and then divided by the number of items. According to the scores, the subjects are then placed in one of three attachment style groups (secure anxiety, and avoidant). The subjects with scores greater than medium in intimacy and dependence and lower than medium in anxiety sub-scale are called secure attachment style. The subjects with scores greater than medium in anxiety sub-scale and medium score in intimacy and dependence are called anxiety attachment style. Subjects with scores less than medium in all three sub-scales are avoidant attachment style. The retest reliability is as follows for each of sub-scales: Intimacy, 0.68; Dependence, 0.71, and Anxiety, 0.52. Cronbach's Alpha was equal or greater than 0.80 in all cases. In Iran, the reliability was verified using test-retest method on a sample of 100 subjects. The results which were assessed in a one-month interval indicated that the difference was not significant among C, D, and A scales in RAAS. At 95% confidence level, the questionnaire was reliable. According to the correlation between two tests, A sub-scale was the most reliable ($r = 0.75$) followed by C sub-scale ($r = 0.57$) and trust ($r = 0.47$). Cronbach's Alpha showed that sub-scale A was the most reliable (0.74) and sub-scale D was the least reliable (0.28). Sub-scale C had a medium reliability (0.52) (Mahdavi, 2013).

NEO Five Factor Personality Inventory (Short Form)

NEO personality inventory was employed (60-item short form) was used to assess the personality traits. The scale, known as NEO Five-Factor Inventory (NEO-FFI), was introduced by Costa and McCrae in 1985 in order to assess big five personality traits: Neuroticism, Extraversion, Openness to Experience, Agreeableness, and Conscientiousness (Mahdavi, 2013).

The results of studies by Costa and McCrae (1992) showed that the correlation of 5 sub-scales ranges between 0.77 and 0.92 in the short form and long form. The internal consistency is estimated to be between 0.68 and 0.86. In Iran, the long form was verified by Garousi, Mehryar, and Tabatabee (2001). The results were similar to the original one. The items are scored on 5-point Likert scale (0 = Strongly Disagree, 1 = Disagree, 2 = Neutral, 3 = Agree, and 4 = Strongly Agree). Some items are scored on an inverse model. The self-report administration of the scale takes from 10 to 15 minutes. The short form was normalized by Rasoul Roshan (Ph.D.). The study by Farnam et. al., (2006) on an Iranian student sample showed the following mean and standard deviation:

<i>Sub-Scale</i>	<i>Standard Deviation</i>	<i>Mean</i>
Openness to Experience	4.87	27.94
Conscientiousness	5.64	31.62
Extraversion	6.15	26.89
Agreeableness	7	32.90
Neuroticism	9.54	22.92

Christensen & Sullaway Communication Pattern Questionnaire (CPQ)

CPQ is used to assess the Christensen & Sullaway (1984) spouse communication patterns quoted by Ebadat Pour (2000). This is a self-assessment toll with 35 items designed to assess the marital relationship. The scale asks spouses to identify their typical communication patterns for two of the original three time periods: (1) When an issue or problem arises, (2) during discussions of the issue or problem and (4) After a discussion of a relationship problem. The spouse score each problem on a 9-point Likert scale (from 1 = Impossible to 9 = Very Possible) (Fatehi Zadeh and Ahmadi, 2005). In Iran, Ebadat Pour normalized the questionnaire and the correlation coefficients are as follows: Mutual Constructive Communication, 58%; Mutual Avoidance of Communication, 58%; and Demand/Withdrawal, 35%. They were all significant at 1% Alpha (Fatehi Zadeh and Ahmadi, 2005).

Infidelity Questionnaire (INFQ)

INFQ was first designed by Ynchry and Kak Demir (2006). The questionnaire was first tested on a Turkish sample. The questionnaire has 24 items in 6 sub-scales, 4 items each. The sub-scales are legitimacy, seduction, normalization, sexual orientation, social background and passion for excitement and feeling of being. Ynchry and Kak Demir (2006) reported the following Cronbach's Alpha for each of the sub-scales: legitimacy, 83%; seduction, 80%; normalization, 74%; sexual orientation, 84%; social background, 73%; and passion for excitement and feeling of being, 84% (Momeni and Naderi, 2014).

Findings**TABLE 1: FREQUENCY OF SUBJECTS ACCORDING TO GENDER**

<i>Group</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percentage</i>
Male	52	52
Female	48	48
Total	100	100

TABLE 2: FREQUENCY OF SUBJECTS ACCORDING TO EDUCATIONAL QUALIFICATION

<i>Qualification</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percentage</i>
Diploma	8	8
Associate Degree	27	27
Bachelor Degree	48	48
Master Degree	17	17
Total	100	100

TABLE 3: NORMALITY TEST OF DATA DISTRIBUTION FOR EXTRAMARITAL RELATIONS, ATTACHMENT STYLES, PERSONALITY TRAITS, AND COMMUNICATION PATTERNS OF MARRIED EMPLOYEES WORKING IN IMAM KHUMEINI HOSPITAL OF FEREYDUNKENAR, IRAN

<i>Variable</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>St. Deviation</i>	<i>Z</i>	<i>Sig. Level</i>
Secure Attachment Style	3.41	0.61	1.27	0.081
Avoidant Insecure Attachment Style	2.81	0.68	1.26	0.084
Ambivalent Insecure Attachment Style	2.45	0.78	1.06	0.291
Extraversion Personality Traits	2.2	0.43	1.39	0.099
Openness to Experience Personality Traits	2.12	0.28	1.26	0.324
Neuroticism Personality Traits	2.17	0.44	1.06	0.333
Conscientiousness Personality Traits	1.79	0.28	1.97	0.019
Agreeableness Personality Traits	2.14	0.37	1.99	0.174
Mutual Constructive Communication	4.49	1.85	1.36	0.111
Demand/Withdrawal Communication	5.87	1.7	1.77	0.501
Mutual Avoidance of Communication	3.41	0.61	1.78	0.284
Extramarital Relations	3.22	0.81	1.66	0.222

As can be seen in Table 3, in Kolmogorov-Smirnov test, the significance level is greater than 0.05 for extramarital relations, attachment styles, personality traits,

and communication patterns. Therefore, the difference of data distribution was not significant with normal distribution. As a result, the data are normal.

TABLE 4: PEARSON CORRELATION TEST TO STUDY THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SECURE ATTACHMENT STYLE AND EXTRAMARITAL RELATIONS

<i>Secure Attachment Style</i>	<i>Extramarital Relations</i>	
	<i>Correlation Coefficient (r)</i>	<i>Significance Level (p)</i>
	-0.145	0.135 ns

Ns Non-Significance *Significance Level at 5% **Significance Level at 1%

As it can be seen in Table 4, secure attachment style had a weak, negative correlation ($r = -0.145$) with extramarital relations ($P < 0.01$). Therefore, the hypothesis was not verified. At 99% confidence, it is concluded that secure attachment style had no significant relationship with extramarital relations.

TABLE 5: PEARSON CORRELATION TEST TO STUDY THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN AVOIDANT INSECURE ATTACHMENT STYLE AND EXTRAMARITAL RELATIONS

<i>Avoidant Insecure Attachment Style</i>	<i>Extramarital Relations</i>	
	<i>Correlation Coefficient (r)</i>	<i>Significance Level (p)</i>
	0.231	0.005**

Ns Non-Significance *Significance Level at 5% **Significance Level at 1%

As it can be seen in Table 5, avoidant insecure attachment style had a weak, positive correlation ($r = 0.231$) with extramarital relations ($P < 0.01$). Therefore, the hypothesis was verified. At 99% confidence, it is concluded that avoidant insecure attachment style had a direct, significant relationship with extramarital relations. As avoidant insecure attachment style rises, extramarital relations increase.

TABLE 6: PEARSON CORRELATION TEST TO STUDY THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN AMBIVALENT INSECURE ATTACHMENT STYLE AND EXTRAMARITAL RELATIONS

<i>Ambivalent Insecure Attachment Style</i>	<i>Extramarital Relations</i>	
	<i>Correlation Coefficient (r)</i>	<i>Significance Level (p)</i>
	0.156	0.015*

Ns Non-Significance *Significance Level at 5% **Significance Level at 1%

As it can be seen in Table 6, ambivalent insecure attachment style had a weak, positive correlation ($r = 0.156$) with extramarital relations ($P < 0.01$). Therefore, the hypothesis was verified. At 99% confidence, it is concluded that ambivalent insecure attachment style had a direct, significant relationship with extramarital relations. As ambivalent insecure attachment style rises, extramarital relations increase.

TABLE 7: PEARSON CORRELATION TEST TO STUDY THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN NEUROTICISM PERSONALITY TRAITS AND EXTRAMARITAL RELATIONS

<i>Neuroticism Personality Traits</i>	<i>Extramarital Relations</i>	
	<i>Correlation Coefficient (r)</i>	<i>Significance Level (p)</i>
	0.18 ns	0.105

Ns Non-Significance *Significance Level at 5% **Significance Level at 1%

As it can be seen in Table 7, Neuroticism Personality Traits had a weak, positive correlation ($r = 0.156$) with extramarital relations ($P < 0.01$). Therefore, the hypothesis was not verified. At 99% confidence, it is concluded that Neuroticism Personality Traits had no significant relationship with extramarital relations.

TABLE 8: PEARSON CORRELATION TEST TO STUDY THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN EXTRAVERSION PERSONALITY TRAITS AND EXTRAMARITAL RELATIONS

<i>Extraversion Personality Traits</i>	<i>Extramarital Relations</i>	
	<i>Correlation Coefficient (r)</i>	<i>Significance Level (p)</i>
	0.04 ns	0.695

Ns Non-Significance *Significance Level at 5% **Significance Level at 1%

As it can be seen in Table 8, Extraversion Personality Traits had a very weak, positive correlation ($r = 0.04$) with extramarital relations ($P < 0.01$). Therefore, the hypothesis was not verified. At 99% confidence, it is concluded that Extraversion Personality Traits had no significant relationship with extramarital relations.

TABLE 9: PEARSON CORRELATION TEST TO STUDY THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN CONSCIENTIOUSNESS PERSONALITY TRAITS AND EXTRAMARITAL RELATIONS

<i>Conscientiousness Personality Traits</i>	<i>Extramarital Relations</i>	
	<i>Correlation Coefficient (r)</i>	<i>Significance Level (p)</i>
	-0.16	0.049*

Ns Non-Significance *Significance Level at 5% **Significance Level at 1%

As it can be seen in Table 9, Conscientiousness Personality Traits had a very weak, negative correlation ($r = -0.16$) with extramarital relations ($P < 0.05$). Therefore, the hypothesis was verified. At 99% confidence, it is concluded that Conscientiousness Personality Traits had an inverse, significant relationship with extramarital relations. As Conscientiousness Personality Traits rises, extramarital relations decline.

TABLE 10: PEARSON CORRELATION TEST TO STUDY THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN OPENNESS TO EXPERIENCE PERSONALITY TRAITS AND EXTRAMARITAL RELATIONS

<i>Openness to Experience Personality Traits</i>	<i>Extramarital Relations</i>	
	<i>Correlation Coefficient (r)</i>	<i>Significance Level (p)</i>
	0.06 ns	0.249*

Ns Non-Significance *Significance Level at 5% **Significance Level at 1%

As it can be seen in table 10, Openness to Experience had a very weak, positive correlation ($r = 0.06$) with extramarital relations ($P < 0.05$). Therefore, the hypothesis was not verified. At 99% confidence, it is concluded that Openness to Experience had no relationship with extramarital relations.

TABLE 11: PEARSON CORRELATION TEST TO STUDY THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN AGREEABLENESS AND EXTRAMARITAL RELATIONS

<i>Agreeableness Personality Traits</i>	<i>Extramarital Relations</i>	
	<i>Correlation Coefficient (r)</i>	<i>Significance Level (p)</i>
	0.11 ns	0.109*

Ns Non-Significance *Significance Level at 5% **Significance Level at 1%

As it can be seen in Table 11, Agreeableness had a very weak, positive correlation ($r = 0.11$) with extramarital relations ($P < 0.05$). Therefore, the hypothesis was not verified. At 99% confidence, it is concluded that Agreeableness had no relationship with extramarital relations.

TABLE 12: PEARSON CORRELATION TEST TO STUDY THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN MUTUAL CONSTRUCTIVE COMMUNICATION AND EXTRAMARITAL RELATIONS

<i>Mutual Constructive Communication</i>	<i>Extramarital Relations</i>	
	<i>Correlation Coefficient (r)</i>	<i>Significance Level (p)</i>
	-0.339	0.045*

Ns Non-Significance *Significance Level at 5% **Significance Level at 1%

As it can be seen in Table 12, Mutual Constructive Communication had a very weak, inverse correlation ($r = 0.339$) with extramarital relations ($P < 0.05$). Therefore, the hypothesis was verified. At 99% confidence, it is concluded that Mutual Constructive Communication had an inverse, significant relationship with extramarital relations.

TABLE 13: PEARSON CORRELATION TEST TO STUDY THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN DEMAND/WITHDRAWAL COMMUNICATION AND EXTRAMARITAL RELATIONS

<i>Demand/Withdrawal Communication</i>	<i>Extramarital Relations</i>	
	<i>Correlation Coefficient (r)</i>	<i>Significance Level (p)</i>
	0.239	0.045*

Ns Non-Significance *Significance Level at 5% **Significance Level at 1%

As it can be seen in Table 13, Demand/Withdrawal Communication had a very weak, positive correlation ($r = 0.239$) with extramarital relations ($P < 0.05$). Therefore, the hypothesis was verified. At 95% confidence, it is concluded that Demand/Withdrawal Communication had a direct, significant relationship with extramarital relations.

TABLE 14: PEARSON CORRELATION TEST TO STUDY THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN MUTUAL AVOIDANCE OF COMMUNICATION AND EXTRAMARITAL RELATIONS

<i>Mutual Avoidance of Communication</i>	<i>Extramarital Relations</i>	
	<i>Correlation Coefficient (r)</i>	<i>Significance Level (p)</i>
	0.131	0.041*

Ns Non-Significance *Significance Level at 5% **Significance Level at 1%

As it can be seen in Table 14, Mutual Avoidance of Communication had a very weak, positive correlation ($r = 0.131$) with extramarital relations ($P < 0.05$). Therefore, the hypothesis was verified. At 95% confidence, it is concluded that Mutual Avoidance of Communication had a direct, significant relationship with extramarital relations.

DISCUSSION

According to the results, secure attachment style had no significant relationship with extramarital relations of employees working in Imam Khumeini hospital of Fereydunkenar, Iran. Therefore, the first hypothesis was not verified. The result is inconsistent with those of studies by Sami et. al., (2015), Khoda Bakhshi Koulaee et. al., (2014), and Torabian et. al., (2013). These researchers showed that secure attachment style had a negative, significant relationship with extramarital relations.

According to the results of our study, avoidant insecure attachment style had a positive, significant relationship with extramarital relations of employees working in Imam Khumeini hospital of Fereydunkenar, Iran. Therefore, the second hypothesis was verified. The results of the second hypothesis was consistent with

the studies by Sami et. al., (2015), Bahdor et. al., (2015), Jicolins et. al., (2002), and McKillop et. al., (2012). They showed that avoidant attachment style was the dominant attachment style among all with extramarital relations.

According to the results of our study, ambivalent insecure attachment style had a positive, significant relationship with extramarital relations of employees working in Imam Khumeini hospital of Fereydunkenar, Iran. Therefore, the third hypothesis was verified.

According to the results, neuroticism had no significant relationship with extramarital relations of employees working in Imam Khumeini hospital of Fereydunkenar, Iran. Therefore, the fourth hypothesis was not verified.

According to the results, Extraversion had no significant relationship with extramarital relations of employees working in Imam Khumeini hospital of Fereydunkenar, Iran. Therefore, the fifth hypothesis was not verified.

According to the results, Conscientiousness had a negative, significant relationship with extramarital relations of employees working in Imam Khumeini hospital of Fereydunkenar, Iran. Therefore, the sixth hypothesis was verified.

According to the results, Openness to Experience had no significant relationship with extramarital relations of employees working in Imam Khumeini hospital of Fereydunkenar, Iran. Therefore, the seventh hypothesis was not verified.

According to the results, Agreeableness had no significant relationship with extramarital relations of employees working in Imam Khumeini hospital of Fereydunkenar, Iran. Therefore, the eighth hypothesis was not verified.

According to the results, Mutual Constructive Communication had a negative, significant relationship with extramarital relations of employees working in Imam Khumeini hospital of Fereydunkenar, Iran. Therefore, the ninth hypothesis was verified.

According to the results, Demand/Withdrawal Communication had a positive, significant relationship with extramarital relations of employees working in Imam Khumeini hospital of Fereydunkenar, Iran. Therefore, the tenth hypothesis was verified.

According to the results, Mutual Avoidance of Communication had a positive, significant relationship with extramarital relations of employees working in Imam Khumeini hospital of Fereydunkenar, Iran. Therefore, the eleventh hypothesis was verified.

Concerning the 10th and 11th hypotheses, we can point out to the following issues:

According to the communication pattern theory between spouses, those with Demand/Withdrawal Communication try to control and inhibit their spouse's behavior. This way, the spouse has to show supportive reactions (Epstein, 2002).

Golsar (2000) believed that controlling behavior is caused by Demand/Withdrawal Communication and Mutual Avoidance of Communication is caused by the devastating nature of joint life which causes extramarital relations. On the other hand, the study by Bookam et. al., (1996) showed that adopting Demand/Withdrawal and Avoidance Communication patterns which do not meet the communicative criteria increase active and devastating behaviors such as extramarital relations.

References

- Akbari, Z.; Shafee Abadi, A.; and Honarvaran, N. (2011). *Comparing Attachment Styles of Married Men with Extramarital Relations and without Extramarital Relations*, Journal of Kerman University of Medical Sciences, No. 20, pp 25-30.
- Atkinson, Rita L. et. al., (2013), *Hilgard's Introduction to Psychology*, Trans: Mohammad Naghi Barahani (Ph.D.) et. al., 1st Ed. Tehran: Roshd Press.
- Aviram, I & Y Amichai-Hamburger. (2005), "Online infidelity: Aspects of dyadic satisfaction, self-disclosure, and narcissism", Journal of Computer Mediated Communication, 10(3), article 1.
- Bahadori, M.; Talebi, M.M.; and Zabih Zadeh, A. (2015). *Comparing avoidant attachment and lack of empathy in sexual abusers and ordinary people*, Quarterly Journal of Thought and Behavior, No. 38, 27-36.
- Bahadori, F.; Fatehi Zadeh, M.; and Ahmadi, S.A. (2011), *The Effect of Spousal Communicative Skills on Marital Conflicts of Couples Seeking Divorce*, M.S. Thesis, Islamic Azad University, Arak Branch, Iran
- Baldwin, M.W & B Fehr. (1995), "On the instability of attachment style rating", Personal Relationships, 2, 247-261.
- Barazandeh, H. and others (2006), *The Relationship between Communicative Criteria and Marital Adjustment*, Quarterly Journal of Developmental Psychology, No. 8, 319-330.
- Bartholomew, K & R.J Cobb & J.A Poole. (1997), *Adult attachment patterns and social support processes*, New York: Plenum Press.
- Bartholomew, K & L Horowitz. (1991), "Attachment styles among young adults: A test of our category model", Journal of personality and social psychology, 61(2), 226-224.
- Baucom, D.H. & others. (1996), "Cognitions in Marriage: The Relationship between Standards and Attributions", Journal of Family Psychology, 10, 209-222.
- Bowlby, J. (1988), *A secure base*, New York: Basic Books.
- Bowlby, J. (1980), *Attachment and loss*, New York: Basic Books.
- Cloulow, C. (2001), *Adult attachment and couple psychotherapy: The secure base in practice and research*, East Sussex: Brunner-Routledge.
- Cohen, A.B. (2005), *The relation of attachment to infidelity in romantic relationship: an exploration of attachment style, perception of partner's attachment style, relationship satisfaction, relationship quality and gender differences in sexual behaviors*, Institute of advanced psychological studies, Adelphi university.
- Collins, N.L. & S.J. Read. (1990), "Adult attachment, working models, and relationship quality in dating couples", *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 58, 644-663.
- Crowe, Michael and Jane Ridley (2005). *Applied Couple Therapy with Systematic Approach*, Trans: Musavi, A. 1st Ed. Tehran: Mahr Kaviani Press.

- Dadestan, P. (1997). *Hypothetical Evolutionary Psychology*, Organization of Study and Compilation of Humanities Books, Samt, (1997).
- Fatehi Zadeh, M. and Ahmadi, S.A. (2005). *The Relationship between Marriage Communication Patterns and Marital Satisfaction of Employee Couples in Isfahan University*, Quarterly Journal of Family Studies, 1st Year, No. 2, 109-119.
- Fathi, E.; Etemadi, A.; and Gorji, Z. (2012). *The Relationship between Attachment Styles, Marital Commitment, and Marital Satisfaction of Married Students of Allameh Tabatabaee University*, Journal of Woman and Family Studies, No. 18, pp 63-82.
- Fraley, C.R. & P.R. Shaver. (2000), "Adult romantic attachment: Theoretical developments, emerging controversies and unanswered questions". Review of General psychology, 4, 132-154.
- Gallagher, J.A. (2002), *Academic integrity and personality* (Unpublished master's thesis). California State University, Sacramento.
- Hamilton, C.E. (2000), "Continuity and discontinuity of attachment from infancy through adolescence", Child development, 71 (3), 690-694.
- Husseini, Z. and Others (2013). *Comparing Personality Traits of Conflicting and Normal Couples using NEO Five Factor Personality Inventory*, Journal of Legal Medicine, Period 19, No. 1 and 4.
- Husseini, Sh. And Aram Nia, E. (2004). *Release from Infidelity*, 4th Ed., Tehran: No Andish Press.
- Johnson, S.M. and Valyria, V. (2009). *Attachment Processes in Couple and Family Therapy*, Trans: Bahrami, F. et. al., 1st Ed., Tehran: Danjeh Press.
- Karamlou, S.; Bovalheri, J.; Khedmantgozar, H. (2013). *Infidelity, Preventive Measures and Coping with Infidelity*, 2nd Ed., Tehran: Qatreh Press.
- Kaveh, S. (2008). *Spouses and Infidelity*, 1st Ed. Tehran: Sokhan Press.
- Larsen, R.J. & D.M. Buss. (2002), *Personality Psychology: Domains of Knowledge About Human Nature*, Boston: McGraw-Hill.
- Mahdavi, M. (2013). *Comparing Coping Styles and Attachment Styles and Five Dimensions of Personality Traits of people with substance abuse and ordinary people*, M.S. thesis, Khoy University of Research.
- Mansour, M. and Dadestan, P. (1990). *Genetic Psychologist 2*, Tehran: Darya Press.
- Momeni, Javid, M. and Naderi Nobandegani, Z. (2014). *Extramarital Relations: Causes, Consequences, Theory, and Treatment*, 1st Ed., Tehran: Shabhang Press.
- McKay, M.; Faning, P.; and Palg, K. (2010). *Marital Skills*, Trans: Rahimi, M.A., 2nd Ed. Tehran: Arjmand Press.
- McKillop, N & Others. (2012), "Offenders' Attachment and Sexual Abuse Onset A Test of Theoretical Propositions", Sexual abuse: a journal of research and treatment, 24(6), 591-610.
- Miller, S & D.B. Wackman & E W Nunnally. (1988), "Couples to be their own best problem solvers", Counseling psychologist, 11, 73-77.
- Miner, M.H. & others. (2014), "Anxious Attachment, Social Isolation, and Indicators of Sex Drive and Compulsivity Predictors of Child Sexual Abuse Perpetration in Adolescent Males?", Sexual abuse: a journal of research and treatment, 1079063214547585.
- Nazari, A.M.; Sahebdel, H.; and Asadi, M. (2010). *The Relationship between Attachment Styles and Marriage Instability of Males and Females*, Women and Family Studies, No. 8, pp 115-125.

- Olson, David H., Hohn Defrin, and Amy K. Olson (2009). *Marriage Skills and Efficient Sexual Relations*. Trans: Bahirae, A.R. and Fathi, N. (Ph.D.), 1st Ed., Tehran: Psychology and Art Press.
- Realo, A & J Allik. (2010), “*The Estonian self-consciousness scale and its relation to the five factor model of personality*”. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 70, 109-124.
- Shackelford, K & M Buss. (1997), “*cues to infidelity*”, *Society for personality and social psychology*, 1034-1045.
- Shackelford, T.K. & A Besser & A.T. Goetz. (2007), “*Personality, Marital Satisfaction, and Probability of Marital Infidelity*”. *Journal of Individual Differences Research*, 44, 29-34.
- Shakerian, A.; Fatemi, A.; Farhadian, M. (2011). *The Relationship between Personality Traits and Marital Satisfaction*, *Journal of Kurdistan University of Medical Sciences*. No. 59, 92-99.
- Shaughnessy, M.F. & Others. (2004), “*16PF personality profile of gifted children: Preliminary report of an international study*”, *North American Journal of Psychology*, 6 (1), 51-54.
- Twood, J. (2000). J. (2000), *Interpersonal Communication*, Trans: Firouz Bakht, M., 2nd Ed. Tehran: Mahtab Press.
- Torabian, L.; Ameri, F.; Khodabakhsh, R. (2011), *Comparing Attachment Styles and Personality Traits of Infidel and Ordinary Spouses*, *Quarterly Journal of Psychological Studies*, No. 3, 31-42.

