



Research Paper: Predicting Attitudes toward Marital Infidelity Based on Attachment and Perfectionism Styles

Maryam Soltanzadeh Rezamahalleh^{1*}

¹M.A. in General Psychology, Rahman Institute of Higher Education, Ramsar, Iran

Citation: Soltanzadeh Rezamahalleh, M. (2021). Predicting Attitudes toward Marital Infidelity Based on Attachment and Perfectionism Styles. *Journal of Modern Psychology*, 1(1), 51-64.

<https://doi.org/10.22034/JMP.2021.129775>

 <https://doi.org/10.22034/JMP.2021.129775>



Article info:

Received date:

1 Mar 2021

Accepted date:

28 Apr 2021

Keywords:

Attachment styles, Marital infidelity, Perfectionism

Abstract

The present study aims to predict the attitude towards marital infidelity based on attachment and perfectionism styles. The research method was correlational-descriptive and the statistical population was all married students of Islamic Azad University, Lahijan Branch. A sample of 369 students was selected by convenience sampling method. Adult Attachment Questionnaire, The Perfectionism Questionnaire and Attitude to Marital Infidelity Questionnaire were used to collect data. The research hypotheses were examined through Pearson correlation test and multiple regression and found that a significant correlation exists between marital infidelity with ambivalent attachment style (0.450), avoidant attachment style (0.348), safe style (-0.519), positive perfectionism (-0.403) and negative perfectionism (0.433). In addition, the multiple regression model indicated that attachment and perfectionism styles could accurately predict 34% and 25% of the variance of marital infidelity, respectively. The results indicated that creating a secure attachment style and positive perfectionism in individuals is related to reducing marital infidelity and consequently increasing family stability.

* Corresponding author:

Maryam Soltanzadehrezamahalleh

Address: Rahman Institute of Higher Education, Ramsar, Iran

Tel: 09117624604

E-mail: m.soltanzadeh2021@gmail.com

1. Introduction

The marriage contract is a special human issue, and since the existing human being is not fixed, human categories do not fit into a fixed definition. After the first marriage, most people expect themselves and their spouse to remain sexually and emotionally faithful during their marriage. In addition, most people condemn extramarital sex as a misconduct and consider marital fidelity as an important issue. The beliefs and behaviors of different people are negatively related to extramarital affairs, infidelity against spouse and its consequences; however, marital infidelity occurs in both women and men and its incidence varies based on its sampling and definition. In addition, it varies from approximately 12% to 75% of the opinions of married people who have been exposed to it at least once (Allen, & Baucom, 2004).

The recent statistics released from the United States indicated that 41% of American couples have been involved in extramarital affairs. The studies conducted in Iran indicated that extramarital affairs and attitudes toward infidelity are the strongest factors in predicting divorce rates. Accordingly, attachment styles and perfectionism play a significant role in the couples' attitudes. Attachment is considered as a special emotional relationship that requires calm and exchange of pleasure-care which includes three safe insecure, avoidant insecure and anxiety insecure styles. More accurately, attachment is the deep emotional connection we make with certain people in our lives that makes us feel cheerful and happy when interacting with them, and feel comfortable having them with us when we

are stressed (Rajabi, Mousaviannejad, & Taghipour, 2014). Individuals' attachment styles determine the emotional, cognitive principles and strategies that guide emotional reactions in individuals and interpersonal relationships (Cohen, 2005). Bowlby (1969, cited in Akbari, Shafiabadi, & Honarparvaran, 2011) argues that many forms of psychological distress and personality disorders are due to the fact that the child is deprived of maternal care or the child is not stable to have a relationship with attachment. Bowlby has clearly predicted that disrupting the attachment relationship by creating distrust in the child leads to psychological disorders. Accordingly, when a child forms negative perceptions of himself and others or when he/she adopts unrealistic strategies for processing thoughts and feelings related to attachment, they become more vulnerable in social, especially marital life (Hadi, Eskandari, Sohrabi, & Farokhi, 2017). Therefore, attachment styles are operational patterns that are passed on from caregivers to children, and the type of mother-child relationship is influenced by such patterns (Platts, Tyson, & Mason, 2002). Thus, attachment experiences in childhood have a profound effect on personality development and subsequent attachment relationships in married life (Wearden, Peters, Berry, Barrowclough, & Liversidge, 2008).

Allen and Baucom (2004) found that avoidance style presents the relationship with the original couple as an inappropriate intimacy and forces one to enter into a relationship outside of his original attachment. Such people often experience mistrust of the couple, which creates their

distance and they are less worried about losing their relationship. Because people with an avoidant style cannot establish deep and intimate relationships with co-workers, they are less satisfied with their sexual and marital relationships and experience more interpersonal conflicts, especially with their spouse, which is itself a strong factor for marital infidelity. According to [Sayadpour \(2007\)](#), people with insecure attachment styles are afraid of supportive resources because they have a relationship based on distrust, have inappropriate social relationships, and a higher emotional vulnerability to stress. [Abdi, Khosh Konesh, Poorabrahim, and Mohammadi \(2012\)](#) found that people with insecure attachment style usually have more extramarital relationships, they can have sex without love and affection for the other person and suddenly have a relationship with people outside the marital relationship. However, people who have an ambivalent attachment style have a negative image of others and engage in inappropriate self-disclosure due to fears of rejection by their spouse. Such people may fall in love at a glance and experience a lot of anger and reconciliation. Additionally, [\(Hadi et al., 2017\)](#) believed that attachment styles have a significant effect on couples' attitudes toward marital cheating. People with insecure attachment styles had lower levels of marital commitment. Perfection refers to a desirable state which is far from the status quo.

Considering the extent of this distance and what reference determines the desired state, perfectionism is of different types, some of which are healthy and some are pathological. [Rice and DeLove \(2002\)](#) believed that perfectionism can be divided

into positive and negative perfectionism. People with negative perfectionism make fundamental mistakes and have high levels of self-doubt and self-criticism. Such factors predict problematic psychological consequences such as anxiety, depression, lack of self-esteem and inner shame. Conversely, positive perfectionism has a significant correlation with high personal criteria, good performance and positive adaptation.

The results [\(Tahoor, Jafari, Karaminia, Akhavan, 2019\)](#) indicated that a relationship exists between perfectionism and different dimensions of mental health. In addition, Perfectionism has a high potential for communicating with various attitudinal variables, such as a high potential for bonding with life and family satisfaction [\(Park, Heppner, & Lee, 2010\)](#). Spouses with perfectionist tendencies and features have special expectations from themselves and their spouses related to marital relations and consider their relationship based on perfectionism level. Therefore, it seems that as the levels of perfectionism increase, the amount of marital differences increases. Some studies were carried out such as "Studying the factors affecting marital infidelity" by [Tau, Coates, and Maycock. \(2012\)](#), "the relationship between perfectionism and marital satisfaction" by [Gol, Rostami, and Goudarzi \(2013\)](#); "infidelity, Trust, Commitment and Marital Satisfaction" by [McCray \(2015\)](#). Furthermore, the studies conducted in Iran are "studying the attachment style and marital satisfaction of married people involved in internet infidelity" by [Abdi et al. \(2012\)](#); "The factors underlying female marital infidelity" by [Fathi, Fekr Azad, Ghaffari,](#)

and Boalhari, (2013); "Multiple Relationships of Attachment Styles, Personality Dimensions and Marital Satisfaction with Marital Breach" by Sami, Mohammad Nazari, Mohsenzadeh, and Taheri (2014); "Investigating the causes of couple infidelity in Bushehr" by Aghajan Begloo and Motaharnia (2014); and "Structural model of predicting marital commitment based on attachment styles and mediating variables of self-control and early maladaptive schemas" by Hadi et al., (2017) Since understanding the causes of marital infidelity and its influential factors is very important for both couples regarding some benefits such as reducing misunderstandings, the benefits include increasing awareness of the extent of the problem and helping to feel the ability prevent such issues in the future. Numerous personality, social and family factors are the reasons for marital infidelity. Therefore, this study aims to predict the attitude towards marital infidelity based on attachment and perfectionism styles.

2. Method

The research method is descriptive-correlational and cross-sectional due to investigating the relationships between research variables. The statistical population consisted of all married students of Lahijan Islamic Azad University. The sample included 369 married students of Lahijan Islamic Azad University who were selected by the convenience sampling method. A questionnaire was distributed among married students of different fields through available sampling. It is worth noting that after obtaining the subjects' consent, the questionnaires were given and the respondent's personal details were kept

confidential. It took two months, from May 1st to the end of June, to complete the questionnaires. Additionally, the average time for filling in the questionnaires by the subjects was 35 minutes in the university.

To test the research hypotheses and analyze the data, SPSS software version 25 was used. Dispersion and central tendency measures were used for descriptive statistics. Multivariate regression and Pearson correlation test were used to test the hypotheses.

The statistical data were collected by survey method related to field research and questionnaire distribution. Three questionnaires were used to collect data as follows:

Adult Attachment Questionnaire, developed by Hazen and Shaver (1987) to measure adult attachment, which has 21 questions consisting of 2 sections. The scoring of the first part of this questionnaire is based on the mark that each subject made on a 7-point Likert scale in his/her response to each description; by which the option "I completely disagree" is given a score of zero, the option "Somewhat disagree" is given a score of 6, and the option "I completely agree" is given a score of 6. Accordingly, the Likert scale is used by converting scores and using the distance scale. Considering three descriptions that should be judged by the subject in this section, three scores are obtained, in which the first to three scores describe the avoidant attachment, anxiety-ambivalent attachment and secure attachment rates, respectively. Second, one out of three options is to be selected. The subject should choose which of the three descriptions he / she considers best in line with his / her

characteristics. Therefore, No. 1, 2 and 3 as nominal scales representing avoidance, anxiety-ambivalent and safe attachments which are used separately in the analysis.

The Attitude to Infidelity Questionnaire: This Questionnaire was developed by [Watley \(2008\)](#). This scale includes 12 phrases, each indicates the negative and positive feelings towards the category of betrayal, to which the subject gives a score from 1 to 7 based on their feelings. In the betrayal questionnaire, the amount of desire and acceptance or rejection from the perspective of different people is measured. The highest and lowest scores were 84 and 12, indicating acceptance and rejection of betrayal. In the study conducted by [Watley \(2008\)](#), the reliability of the scale using Cronbach's alpha coefficient was reportedly 84%.

The Perfectionism Questionnaire: This Questionnaire was developed by [Terry-Short, Owens Glynn, Slade and Dewey in 1995](#) to measure positive and negative perfectionism, which consists of 40 items, 20 of which measure positive and the other 20 items measure negative perfectionism, according to responses on a 5-point Likert scale from strongly agree to strongly disagree. 20 items measured positive perfectionism and twenty other items measure negative perfectionism. The items on a 5-point Likert scale measure subjects' perfectionism on a scale of one to five in both positive and negative contexts. The minimum and the maximum scores of the subjects in each test scale are 40 and 200, respectively. To determine the validity of this scale, the alpha coefficient for positive and negative perfectionism

subscales for all subjects and female and male students were 0.90 and 0.87, 0.91 and 0.88, and 0.89 and 0.86, respectively, which indicates high internal consistency of this scale. Additionally, the correlation coefficients between the scores of 90 subjects in two shifts with 4 weeks interval for all subjects, female subjects and male subjects were $r = 0.86$, $r = 0.84$ and $r = 0.87$, respectively, indicating high validity of the scale. [Besharat \(2009\)](#) used this test to determine the validity of the scale through calculating the correlation coefficient between the subscales of this test with those of Goldberg General Health Questionnaire (1972) and Cooper-Smith Self-Esteem Scale (1967), as well as analyzing the main components of the test. The coefficients and the results confirmed the validity of [Short et al.'s \(1995\)](#) Positive and Negative Perfectionism Questionnaire.

3. Results

The findings of data analysis including descriptive statistics indicators and test results are presented. First, the statistical population of the study based on gender, age and level of education is as follows: 51% of the respondents are men and 49% are women. In addition, 26.8% of the respondents are under 25 years old, 43.6% are between 25-30 years old and 29.6% are over 30 years old. Furthermore, 3.35% of the respondents are bachelors, 2.56% are M.A and 5.8% are Ph. D

In the following tables show the descriptive statistics of attachment, perfectionism and marital infidelity, respectively.

Table 1. Status of descriptive statistics of attachment styles index

Variable	Mean	SD	lowest score	Highest score
Ambivalent style	18.45	6.46	3	36
Avoidance style	18.28	7.45	1	34
Safe style	17.10	7.02	1	35

Table 1 shows the mean and standard deviation of ambivalent styles are $18.45 \pm$

6.46 , avoidance is 18.28 ± 7.45 and safety was 17.10 ± 7.02 .

Table 2. The descriptive status of the perfectionism index

Variable	Mean	SD	lowest score	Highest score
Marital infidelity	52.04	15.32	24	90
Negative perfectionism	48.15	15.38	21	89

Table 2 shows the mean and standard deviation of positive perfectionism is

15.32 ± 52.04 and negative perfectionism is 48.15 ± 15.38

Table 3. The descriptive status of marital infidelity index

Variable	Mean	SD	Lowest score	Highest score
Marital infidelity	52.04	15.32	15	72

Table 3 shows the mean and standard deviation of the marital infidelity index is 52.04 ± 15.32 .

Table 4 shows correlation coefficients of attachment styles with spouses' infidelity.

Table 4. Correlation coefficients of attachment styles with spouses' infidelity

Variable	Spouses' infidelity	Ambivalent style	Avoidant style	Safe style
spouses' infidelity	1.000			
Ambivalent style	.450**	1.000		
Avoidant style	.348**	.449**	1.000	
Safe style	-.519**	-.521**	-.268**	1.000

** Significance level: 99%; * significance level: 95%

As shown in Table 4, a significant correlation exists between couples' marital infidelity with ambivalent style (correlation coefficient: 0.450), avoidance style (correlation coefficient: 0.348) and safe style (correlation coefficient: -0.519). In addition, as insecure attachment - ambivalent and avoidant styles increases,

the respondents' marital infidelity rate increases, and vice versa, as the levels of marital infidelity decreases, secure attachment style also decreases.

In Table 5 is presented correlation coefficients of perfectionism and marital infidelity

Table 5. Correlation coefficients of perfectionism and marital infidelity

Variable	Rumination	Positive perfectionism	Negative perfectionism
Rumination	1.000		
Positive perfectionism	-.403**	1.000	
Negative perfectionism	.433**	-.378**	1.000

** Significance level: 99%; * significance level: 95%

As shown in [Table 5](#), a significant correlation exists between rumination with positive perfectionism (correlation coefficient: -0.403) and negative perfectionism (correlation coefficient: 0.433). That is, as positive perfectionism increases, the rate of marital infidelity

decreases, and conversely, as negative perfectionism increases, the rate of marital infidelity increases too.

[Table 6](#) shows the regression test of the effect of attachment styles on marital infidelity.

Table 6. The regression test of the effect of attachment styles on marital infidelity

Model	Correlation coefficient	Coefficient of determination	Standardized coefficient of determination	Degree of freedom	Mean squares	F coefficient	Significance level	Durbin-Watson coefficient
Enter	.580	.336	.331	3	4978.18	60.928	.000	1.367
Model	Non-standard coefficient		Standard coefficient	T	Significance level	Multi-collinearity coefficient		
	b coefficient	Error estimation	β			Tolerance coefficient	Inflation coefficient	
Intercept value	40.283	2.704			14.899	.000		
Ambivalent style	.300	.093	.175		3.233	.001	.625	1.601
Avoidance style	.248	.071	.167		3.475	.001	.797	1.255
Safe style	-.602	.079	-.383		-7.616	.000	.727	1.376

The Durbin-Watson Test ([Table 7](#)) was used to investigate the error independence. If its value ranged 1.5-2.5, no correlation exists between errors. As shown by Durbin-Watson coefficient (1.637), the regression model coefficient is in the desired range.

Multi-collinearity refers to the high-level and unacceptable cross-correlation of independent research variables, indicating that the effects of independent variables on the dependent variable cannot be separated. Therefore, the tolerance coefficients and variation-inflation factor were used to study the multi-collinearity of predictor variables.

Numerous score were reported regarding the acceptable number of the tolerance coefficient, which 0.1 is considered as the most consistent coefficient for non-multicollinearity, although 0.2 have been reported in other sources. In addition, the values accepted in research literature varies regarding the variance coefficient of inflation, among which the minimum acceptance score was 10 and score coefficient 5, 4, and even 2.5 have been identified as acceptable levels. As the multi-collinearity coefficients (tolerance coefficient and inflation variance

coefficient) show, assuming the multi-collinearity of independent variables is rejected. The simultaneous regression model indicates that the coefficient of determination of the model is 0.336 (standard coefficient: 0.331). That is, the regression test indicated that the regression model could predict 0.34% of the variance of marital infidelity. The significance level of F statistic is less than 0.05, representing

that the change shown by the model is not accidental. In addition, the reported beta coefficients indicate that the best predictors of marital infidelity are safe style (beta: 0.383), ambivalent style ($\beta = -0.175$) and avoidance style ($\beta = -0.167$), respectively.

Table 7 shows the regression test of the effect of perfectionism on marital infidelity.

Table 7. The regression test of the effect of perfectionism on marital infidelity

Model	Correlation coefficient	Coefficient of determination	Standardized coefficient of determination	Degree of freedom	Mean squares	F Significance coefficient level	Durbin-Watson coefficient
Enter	.504	.254	.250	2	5643.71	61.643	1.558
Model		Non-standard coefficient b coefficient	Standard coefficient B			T Significance coefficient level	Multi-collinearity coefficient Tolerance Inflation coefficient
Intercept value		39.179	2.980		13.150	.000	
Positive perfectionism		-.201	.035		-5.688	.000	1.167
Negative perfectionism		.235	.035		6.675	.000	1.167

The simultaneous regression model (Table 7) indicates that the coefficient of determination of the model is 0.254 (standard coefficient: 0.250). That is, the regression test shows that the regression model could predict 0.25% of the variance of marital infidelity. The significance level of F statistic is less than 0.05, indicating that the change shown by the model is not accidental. Additionally, the reported beta coefficients indicated that the best predictors of marital infidelity are positive perfectionism ($\beta = 0.327$) and negative perfectionism ($\beta = -0.279$), respectively.

4. Discussion

As represented by correlation coefficients, a significant correlation exists between couples' marital infidelity and ambivalent

style (correlation coefficient: 0.450), avoidance style (correlation coefficient: 0.348) and safe style (correlation coefficient: -0.519). That is, as insecure attachment styles - ambivalent and avoidant - increases, the rate of respondents' marital infidelity increases, and vice versa, as the secure attachment style increases, the level of marital infidelity decreases. The regression model could predict 0.34% of the variance of marital infidelity. Safe (beta: 0.383); ambivalence (beta: -0.175) and avoidance styles (beta: -0.167) are considered as the best predictors of marital infidelity, respectively. Therefore, it is confirmed that a relationship exists between attachment styles and infidelity. Such a finding is in line with the studies

conducted by Sami et al., (2014), Abbasi, Nazari, Mohsenzadeh and Taheri (2014), Hadi et al., (2015), Abdi et al., (2012). Accordingly, attachment experiences in childhood have a profound effect on personality development and subsequent attachment relationships in married life (Wearden et al., 2008). Abdi et al., (2012) found that attachment behaviors and their consequences are active throughout the life cycle and are limited to childhood. According to Akbari et al., (2011) the theory of attachment styles is considered as one of the most important explanations for couples' involvement in extramarital relationships. The studies indicated that attachment dynamics shapes adult emotional relationships (Hazan, & Shaver, 1987), and children with insecure attachment patterns experience difficulty in romantic-friendly -sexual and collective adaptive behaviors in adulthood. Researchers considered the creation of attachment schema in the child as a factor that interacting with the environment determines the type of one's future behavior (Pereira, Taysi, Orcan, & Fincham, 2014). Unlike child-parent relationships, attachment is usually reciprocal in adult relationships, i.e. peers play the role of an attachment image to each other, and their sexual or emotional relationships usually act as an initial attachment image (Parker, & Campbell, 2017). Cassidy and Berlin (1994) reported that people with a safe style have more self-confidence, a positive self-image, and higher self-awareness. Therefore, such people are less likely to have extramarital affairs as abnormal and harmful relationships. Since the relationship with the spouse is regarded as one of the longest

and most important human relationships, the important and determining role of a secure attachment style in maintaining and promoting it is clearer and more specific. According to Feeney (2017), avoidant individuals tend to report activities that indicate low psychological intimacy; e.g. overnight sex, having a sexual relationship outside the family and a love-free sex. Avoidant individuals tend to report activities that indicate low psychological intimacy; e.g. overnight sex, having a sexual relationship outside the family and a love-free sex. According to Allen and Bucham (2004), avoidance style presents the relationship with the original couple as an inappropriate intimacy and forces him to enter into a relationship outside of his original attachment. Such people often experience distrust of the couple, creating a distance between them and are less worried about losing their relationship. Since people with an avoidant style cannot establish deep and intimate relationships with co-workers, they are less satisfied with their sexual and marital relationships and experience more interpersonal conflicts, especially with their spouse, which is itself a strong factor for marital infidelity. According to Sayadpour (2007), people with insecure attachment styles are afraid of support sources because they have a relationship based on mistrust, have inappropriate social relationships and a higher emotional vulnerability to stress. According to Abdi et al., (2012), people with insecure attachment style usually have more extramarital affairs, they can have sex without love and affection for the other person and suddenly have a relationship with people outside the marital relationship. However, people with ambivalent attachment styles have a negative image of

others and engage in inappropriate self-disclosure due to fears of rejection by their spouse. Such people may fall in love at a glance and experience a lot of violence and reconciliation. Further [Hadi et al., \(2017\)](#) found that attachment styles have a significant effect on couples' attitudes toward marital infidelity. Reportedly, people with insecure attachment styles have lower levels of marital commitment. As indicated by the correlation coefficients, a significant correlation exists between rumination and positive (correlation coefficient: -0.403) and negative perfectionism (correlation coefficient: 0.433). That is, as positive perfectionism increases, the rate of marital infidelity decreases, and vice versa, as the negative perfectionism increases, marital infidelity increases.

The regression model could predict 0.25% of the variance of marital infidelity. The reported beta coefficients indicated that the best predictors of marital infidelity are positive perfectionism (beta: 0.327) and negative perfectionism, respectively (beta: 0.279). Accordingly, a relationship exists between perfectionism and marital infidelity. Such a finding is in line with the results of research [Golparvar and Satayesh Manesh \(2014\)](#), [Gol, Rostami, and Goudarzi \(2013\)](#). According to [Stoeber, Harris, and Moon \(2007\)](#), [Stoeber, Kempe, and Keogh \(2008\)](#) positive (normal) perfectionists are defined as those who show high levels of perfectionistic endeavor with a low level of perfectionistic concern. The studies indicated that the perfectionists suffer from many psychological problems such as feelings of failure, guilt, indecision, shame, slowness,

low self-esteem, anorexia nervosa, depression and personality disorders. Perfectionists are defined as those who show high levels of perfectionistic endeavor with a low level of perfectionistic concern. However, negative (abnormal) perfectionists have high levels of perfectionistic effort and concerns. It was found that negative perfectionists have higher marital problems ([Sharabaf, Ghannad, Hakmabadi, 2014](#)). The study by [Golparvar and Setayeshmanesh \(2014\)](#) indicated that as the levels of perfectionism increases, the level of marital satisfaction decreases. Furthermore, perfectionism has a high potential for relating to various attitudinal variables, including a high capacity to bond life and family satisfaction ([Park et al., 2010](#)). In addition, spouses with perfectionist tendencies and features have special expectations from themselves and their spouses considering marital relations, and consider their relationship based on their level of perfectionism. Therefore, as the levels of perfectionism increases, the amount of marital differences increases. As the coefficients of determination in the regression test showed, attachment and perfectionism styles can accurately predict 34% and 25% of the variance of marital infidelity, respectively. Therefore, attachment and perfectionism styles predict the attitude towards marital betrayal, which confirms the third hypothesis. Such a finding is in line with the studies conducted by [Golparvar and Satayesh Manesh \(2014\)](#), [Sami, Mohammad Nazari, Mohsenzadeh, and Taheri \(2014\)](#), [Abbasi et al. \(2014\)](#), [Hadi et al. \(2017\)](#), [Abdi et al. \(2012\)](#), [Gol et al. \(2013\)](#). Therefore, people with insecure attachment styles tend to have more extramarital affairs, have love-free sex and

to have sex outside the marital relationship. However, people with ambivalent attachment styles have a negative image of others and engage in inappropriate self-disclosure due to fears of rejection by their spouse. Such people may fall in love at a glance and experience a lot of violence and reconciliation. Generally, attachment styles have a significant effect on couples' attitudes toward marital infidelity. People with insecure attachment styles have lower levels of marital commitment. However, infidel women scored higher in the dimensions of perfectionism (self-oriented, other-oriented, and community-oriented) than those of ordinary women. In addition, considering marital relations, spouses with perfectionist tendencies and features have special expectations of themselves and their spouses, and focus on their perfectionism level in their relations. Therefore, as the levels of perfectionism increase, the amount of marital differences increases. Accordingly, the future researchers are suggested using longitudinal studies due to the cross-sectional method in the present study. Besides, since not using other methods of data collection such as interviews has been another research limitation. It is suggested that researchers use survey method and its generalizability power through methods such as group and in-depth interviews to give more depth to the research findings and add to the accuracy of the findings in two dimensions of generalizability and in-depth findings. Finally, they should examine the role of moderator variables such as duration of marriage, marital satisfaction, marital conflicts, and intellectual differences.

5. Conclusion

Therefore, it can be concluded that having a secure attachment style as well as a positive perfectionism style can be associated with less marital infidelity in couples. Consequently, the parents had better learn the proper parenting skills which can help their children develop secure attachment and positive perfectionism. This can, in turn, protect them from marital relationship issues.

Acknowledgments

The author is warmly thankful of all those who participated in the present study as subjects, professors and authorities at Rahman Ramsar Institute of Higher Education who helped perform this study through their sincere cooperation.

Conflict of interest

The author declares that there is no conflict of interest.

References

- Abbasi, S., Nazari, A., Mohsenzadeh, F., Taheri, M. (2014). Multiple Relationships of Attachment Styles, Personality Dimensions and Marital Satisfaction with Marital Infidelity. *Cultural-Educational Quarterly of Women and Family*, 29, 79-94. <http://ensani.ir/fa/article/345862/>
- Abdi, M., Khosh Konesh, A., Poorabrahim, T., Mohammadi, R. (2012). A Study of Attachment Style and Marital Satisfaction of Married People Involved in Internet Infidelity. *Psychological Studies*, 8 (3): 135-159. https://psychstudies.alzahra.ac.ir/article_1726_en.html.
- Aghajan Begloo, S.; Motaharnia, S. (2014). Investigating the causes of couple infidelity in Bushehr, International view of religious culture and thought. *Cultural Engineering*

- Steering Center of Bushehr Public Culture Council. <https://civilica.com/doc/300704/>
- Ahmadi Tahoer, M., Jafari, I., Karaminia, R., Akhavan, H. (2019). Investigating the Relationship between Positive and Negative Perfectionism and Personality Type D with General Health of the Elderly. *Scientific Journal of Hamadan University of Medical Sciences and Health Services*, 17(30), 64-70. http://sjh.umsha.ac.ir/browse.php?a_id=271&sid=1&slc_lang=en
- Akbari, Z.; Shafiabadi, A.; Honarparvaran, N. (2011). Comparing the attachment styles in married men with extramarital relationships and those without extramarital affairs. *Quarterly Journal of Thought and Behavior*, Fifth, Issue. 20: 25-31. <https://www.sid.ir/en/journal/ViewPaper.aspx?id=208320>
- Allen, E. S., & Baucom, D. H. (2004). Adult attachment and patterns of extradyadic involvement. *Family Process*, 43(4), 467-488. [DOI: 10.1111/j.1545-5300.2004.00035.x]
- Amanollahi, A., Aslani, Kh., Tashakor, H., Neguie, S. (2012). Investigating the Relationship between Romantic Attachment Styles and Love with Marital Satisfaction. *Social and Psychological Studies of Women*, 10(3), 67-86. <https://www.sid.ir/fa/journal/ViewPaper.aspx?id=187264>
- Berry, K., Barrowclough, C., & Wearden, A. (2010). Attachment theory: a framework for understanding symptoms and interpersonal relationships in psychosis. *Behaviour research and therapy*, 46(12), 1275-1282. [DOI: 10.1016/j.brat.2008.08.009]
- Besharat, M. A. (2009). The Farsi version of the Positive and Negative Perfectionism Scale: Reliability, validity, and psychometric properties. *Psychological Reports* 105(1):99-110. [Doi: 10.2466/PR0.105.1.99-110]
- Cassidy, J., & Berlin, L. J. (1994). The insecure/ambivalent pattern of attachment: Theory and research. *Child development*, 65(4), 971-991. <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/7956474/>
- Cohen, A. B. (2005). *The relation of attachment to infidelity in romantic relationships: An exploration of attachment style, perception of partner's attachment style, relationship satisfaction, relationship quality and gender differences in sexual behaviors*. Doctoral dissertation. Adelphi University, The Institute of Advanced Psychological Studies. <https://www.proquest.com/openview/3116d75dec2027fed36a147404979108/1?pq-origsite=gscholar&cbl=18750&diss=y>
- Fathi, M., Fekr Azad, H., Ghaffari, Gh., Boalhari, J. (2013). Underlying Factors in Women's Marital Biofeedback. *Consensus Welfare Quarterly*, 13(51), 109-129. <https://www.magiran.com/paper/1253561>
- Feeney, J. A. (2017). Understanding couple conflict from an attachment perspective. In J. Fitzgerald (Ed.), *Foundations for couples' therapy: Research for the real world* (p. 71–81). Routledge/Taylor & Francis Group. [DOI: 10.4324/9781315678610-8]
- Gol, H. C., Rostami, A. M., & Goudarzi, M. (2013). Prediction of marital satisfaction based on perfectionism. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 89, 567-571. [DOI: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.08.896]
- Golparvar, M., Setayeshmanesh, S. (2014). Predictability of marital satisfaction components based on the components of perfectionism of married women. *Quarterly Journal of Women and Family Social and Cultural Council*, 7(65), 4-9. http://www.jwss.ir/article_12233_f41cd096048a6ef10af877d52cebab7a.pdf

- Hadi, S., Eskandari, H., Sohrabi, F., Farokhi, N. A. (2017). Structural model of marital commitment prediction based on attachment styles and mediating variables of self-control and early maladaptive strains. *Journal of Counseling and Psychotherapy Culture*, 7(28), 33-60. https://qccpc.atu.ac.ir/article_7090.html
- Haghi, F., Allahverdipour, H., Nadrian, H., Sarbakhsh, P., Hashemiparast, M., & Mirghafourvand, M. (2017). Sexual problems, marital intimacy and quality of sex life among married women: A study from an Islamic country. *Sexual and Relationship Therapy*, 1-14. <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/14681994.2017.1386302?journalCode=csm20>
- Hazan, C., & Shaver, P. (1987). Romantic love conceptualized as an attachment process. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 52(3), 511. <https://adultattachmentlab.human.cornell.edu/HazanShaver1987.pdf>.
- Jeanfreau, M. M., Jurich, A. P., & Mong, M. D. (2014). Risk factors associated with women's marital infidelity. *Contemporary Family Therapy*, 36(3), 327-332. [DOI: 10.1007/s10591-014-9309-3]
- Khodabaskhsi Kolai, A., Bahrami, S., Rustak, H., Eqlima, M. (2017). Evaluating the quality of love and sexual satisfaction in men with a history of breach of contract and no history of breach of contract, *Social Welfare Quarterly*, 5 (4), 5-12. http://socialworkmag.ir/browse.php?a_id=177&sid=1&slc_lang=fa
- McCray, M. L. (2015). *Infidelity, Trust, Commitment, and Marital Satisfaction Among Military Wives During Husbands' Deployment*. Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy Psychology Walden. <https://scholarworks.waldenu.edu/dissertations/758/>
- Park, H.-j., Heppner, P. P., & Lee, D.-g. (2010). Maladaptive coping and self-esteem as mediators between perfectionism and psychological distress. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 48(4), 469-474. [DOI: 10.1016/j.paid.2009.11.024]
- Parker, M., & Campbell, K. (2017). Infidelity and Attachment: The Moderating Role of Race/Ethnicity. *Contemporary Family Therapy*, 39(3), 172-183. [DOI: 10.1007/s10591-017-9415-0]
- Pereira, M. G., Taysi, E., Orcan, F., & Fincham, F. (2014). Attachment, infidelity, and loneliness in college students involved in a romantic relationship: The role of relationship satisfaction, morbidity, and prayer for partner. *Contemporary Family Therapy*, 36(3), 333-350. [DOI: 10.1007/s10591-013-9289-8]
- Platts, H., Tyson, M., & Mason, O. (2002). Adult attachment style and core beliefs: are they linked? *Clinical Psychology & Psychotherapy*, 9(5), 332-348. [DOI: 10.1002/cpp.345]
- Rafiei, S., Hatami, A., Foroughi, A. (2011). Relationship between early maladaptive schemas and attachment style in women with marital infidelity. *Journal of Sociology of Women*, 2(1), 21-36. http://jzvjmiau.ac.ir/article_1207.html?lang=en
- Rajabi, Gh., Mousaviannejad, K., Taghipour, M. (2014). The Relationship between Attachment Styles and Emotional Intelligence with Marital Satisfaction and Conflict in Married Female Teachers, *Bi-Quarterly Journal of Applied Counseling*, 4 (1), 49-66. [DOI: 10.22055/JAC.2014.12562]

- Rice, K. G., & Dellwo, J. P. (2002). Perfectionism and self-development: Implications for college adjustment. *Journal of counseling & development*, 80(2), 188-196. [DOI: 10.1002/j.1556-6678.2002.tb00182.x]
- Sami, A., Mohammad Nazari, A., Mohsenzadeh, F., Taheri, M. (2014). Multiple Relationships of Attachment Styles, Personality Dimensions and Marital Satisfaction with Marital Infidelity, *Cultural-Educational Quarterly of Women and Family*, 9(29), 79-94. https://cwfs.ihu.ac.ir/article_201651.html
- Sayadpour, Z. (2007). The Relationship between Self-Esteem and Attachment Style, *Transformational Psychology*, 3 (12), 311-321. <https://www.sid.ir/en/Journal/ViewPaper.aspx?ID=106791>
- Sharabaf, H., Ghannad, M., Hakmabadi, M. (2014). Investigating the relationship between the dimensions of perfectionism and sexual function of infertile women, *Journal of Women, Midwifery and Infertility*, 17 (97), 9-18. <https://www.sid.ir/fa/journal/ViewPaper.aspx?ID=222995>
- Stoeber, J., Harris, R. A., & Moon, P. S. (2007). Perfectionism and the experience of pride, shame, and guilt: Comparing healthy perfectionists, unhealthy perfectionists, and non-perfectionists. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 43(1), 131-141. [DOI:10.1016/j.paid.2006.11.012]
- Stoeber, J., Kempe, T., & Keogh, E. J. (2008). Facets of self-oriented and socially prescribed perfectionism and feelings of pride, shame, and guilt following success and failure. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 44(7), 1506-1516. [DOI: 10.1016/j.paid.2008.01.007]
- Tao, P., Coates, R., & Maycock, B. (2012). Investigating marital relationship in infertility: a systematic review of quantitative studies. *Journal of reproduction & infertility*, 13(2), 71. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3719332/>
- Terry-Short, L., A. & Owens, Glynn, R., Slade, P. D., & Dewey, M.E. (1995). Positive and negative perfectionism. *Personality and Individual Differences*. 18. 663-668. [DOI: 10.1016/0191-8869(94)00192-U]
- Wearden, A., Peters, I., Berry, K., Barrowclough, C., & Liversidge, T. (2008). Adult attachment, parenting experiences, and core beliefs about self and others. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 44(5), 1246-1257. [DOI:10.1016/j.paid.2007.11.019]
- Whatley M. (2008). *Attitudes toward infidelity scale: Ed: D. Knox, ve C. Schacht. Choices in relationships*. Belmont, California: Thompson Wadsworth publishing.