The mediating role of forgiveness in the relationship between attachment styles and marital conflict resolution styles
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Abstract: The purpose of the present study was the investigation of the mediating role of forgiveness in the relationship between attachment styles and marital conflict resolution styles. Population of this study included the married women visiting cultural centers and neighborhood centers of Tehran, and the sample of this study included 240 married women visiting these centers. The data of the study were collected through demographic questionnaire, organizational conflict scale, Adult attachment questionnaire, and Forgiveness scale. The results of correlation showed there is a negative significant correlation between avoidance attachment style and conflict resolution integration style. Avoidance attachment style had a moderate correlation with conflict resolution avoidance style and a positive significant correlation with conflict resolution dominant style. There was a positive significant correlation between safe attachment style and conflict resolution integration style. There is a positive significant correlation between ambivalent attachment style and conflict resolution avoidance style. There was a negative significant correlation between forgiveness and conflict resolution dominant style. There was a positive significant relationship between forgiveness and conflict resolution compromise style. According to the results, forgiveness can be considered a mediating factor between attachment styles and marital conflict resolution style.
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Introduction

Marriage is considered an important custom in all societies (Madathil & Beshoff, 2008). In recent decades, many researchers and clinical and family experts have focused on qualities of conjugal relationships, couples' satisfaction and their effects on family health (Fincham, Beach, 1999). The nature of conjugal relationships is the source of most of conjugal dissatisfactions and conflicts (Glasser, 1998). Research has shown that if couples could manage conflicts positively and could solve them, the numerous conflicts can not be harmful (Siffert & Schwarz, 2010). Some theoreticians believe that paying attention to oneself and others are separated dimensions which could be combined and create five styles of dominating, obligatory, avoiding, compromising and integrated for solving conflicts (Rahim 1983, Rahim & Bonoma, 1979). The integrity style needs much attention to selves and others. This style needs two people to cooperate like openness, transfer of information, study of differences and finding acceptable solutions for both partners (Goodwin, 2000). The obligatory style needs low attention to oneself and much attention to others. In this case people experience anxiety in a different way. These people are highly pessimistic and not normal and it is very important for them that others consider them very well (Ben-Ari & Hirsberg, 2009). The dominated style is recognized by much attention to oneself and low attention to others. This is recognized as a competitive style. This style is an imposing behavior style (Goodwin, 2000). The avoiding style is recognized by paying low attention to oneself and others. This is usually accompanied by withdrawal. In this style the responsibility is rendered to another person. These people have no hope to gain any benefits from solving conflicts, therefore they prefer withdrawing from it (Ben-Ari & Hirsberg, 2009). The compromising style has an average state. This style is chosen via a mutual decision and when two people have equal advantages, they use this method (Goodwin, 2000; Ben-Ari & Hirsberg, 2009).

Numerous researches show that many variables affect the styles of solving conflicts of couples. One of them is attachment. Attachment styles affect different styles of solving conflicts in close relationships (Karaimak & Duran, 2008, Ben-Ari & Hirsberg, 2009; Shay, 2003; Cresey & Hesson-Mcclinis, 2001; Scharfe & Bartholomew,1995; Levy & Davis, 1998; Pistole,1989; Simpson, Rholes & Phillips,1996;Corcoran & Mallinckrodt, 2000). The attachment style is and understood pattern from answers to intimate relationships of a person. Which it is imagined that it reflects the previous experiences of intimate relationships and is relatively consistent during time. Therefore the style of attachment of a person can have an important role in establishment and continuity of relationships of a person with others in youth and adulthood(Feeney, Noller & Callan, 1994; citing Yusefi, 2009).

Regarding that forgiveness is one of the variables which has meaningful relationships with both attachment styles (Khosravi, Beliad, Nahidpoor & Azadi, 2011) and the solving conflict ones(Donnoli & Werthime, 2012), this construct can be considered a mediating in the correlation between attachment styles and solving conflict ones. Forgiveness is one of the
constructs that is considered a social phenomenon and also a religious or philosophical one. For this reason it is very hard to test it experimentally. The definition of McCullough, Rachel and Worthington (1997) of forgiveness covers many other definitions. The interpersonal forgiveness is defined by them as a decrease in negative responses like wrath, revenge and increase in positive responses like compromise and agreements regarding the person who committed a flaw. These two categories of responses are aroused in the forgiveness process and shows itself in the level of behavior, excitement and cognition. Forgiveness assists victims to ease their emotional pain (Worthington, 1997), increase their positive excitement and self-confidence (McCullough et al. 1997) and result in decrease of anger, sorrow, anxiety and depression in individuals (Coyle and Enright, 1997). Unfortunately, nowadays, families are faced with tensions and numerous problems. The results of studies show that family problems and disagreements between partners are rising daily which results in decrease of satisfaction of couples of conjugal life(Taniguchi, Freeman, Taylor, & Malcarne, 2006). Divorces are the most common manifestation of serious conflicts which includes more than a half of marriages which are in the counseling phase (Bahari, Fatehizadeh, Seyedahmadi, Molavi & Bahrami, 2011). The method of confronting divorces differ among societies and is directly related to customs and culture of societies. One of the simple and also important parameters which simultaneously analyze the circumstances of marriage and divorce, is the parameter of the proportion of divorce to marriage. This states the proportion of divorces to 100 marriages in a certain period which was about 14.1 in 2012 (in Iran), and about 20.1 in 2013. In fact we can state that in 2013, about 20 divorces were recorded for 100 marriages (The annals of demographic statistics of the Iran registry office, 2013). In the previous studies, the correlations between variables of attachment style and the ones of solving conflicts and the relationship between attachments and forgiveness were analyzed. But so far, no study has analyzed the meditational role of forgiveness between the two variables of attachment styles and the ones of solving conflicts. So, in this study this role is dealt with.

**Method participants**

This study describes some kind of correlation and path analysis. The population in this study includes married women who go to culture centers and quarters of neighborhood of the first district of Tehran. The statistical sample of this study includes 240 married women who visit quarters of neighborhood and culture centers of the first district of Tehran who were selected via available sampling. At first, about 340 questionnaires and scales were distributed. Out of them, 240 ones were usable, 60 ones were not usable and 40 ones were not returned.

**Measures**

**The questionnaire of demographic features**

This questionnaire was provided by the researcher for demographic purposes including gender, age, education, occupation, marriage life time, marriage background and the number of children.

**The Rahim scale of styles of solving conflicts (ROC-II)**

This scale was provided by Rahim (1983) for measuring of styles of solving conflicts. This scale is a mechanism for measuring five methods by which people respond to conflicts. This scale has 28 items and its goal is evaluating styles of solving conflicts in people in their relationships with their husbands. Also this scale has five sub-scales of integrate, dominating, obligated, avoiding and compromising styles. The reliability of this scale is reported based on the study of Corcoran and Mallincroodt (2000), for sub-scales from 0.72 to 0.81. This is also proved to be validated. The validity of this construct is calculated using the factor analysis method and its acceptability is proved. In previous researches, this scale had the acceptable validity of (from 0.50 to 0.95) and reliability (of retesting type 0.60 to 0.83). (Citing Sepehr & Pakdaman, 2010). Also, in a study, Haghighi, Zarei and Ghaderi (2011), the reliability coefficient was reported for subscales using Cronbach’s alpha as follows: integrate (0.71), dominating (0.70), obligated (0.70), avoiding (0.72) and compromising (0.75). In this study, the coefficient of Cronbach’s alpha of items of each of the subscales of this scale for all participants (N=240), is as follows integrity style (0.84), avoiding style (0.76), dominating style (0.77), compromising style (0.53) and obligated style (0.77).

**The Questionnaire of Adults’ Attachment Styles (AAS)**

This questionnaire has 15 items which is constructed by Hazen and Shiver (1987). This questionnaire has 3 subscales whose 5 items are related to the safe attachment style, five ones related to the avoiding/unsafe attachment style and five others related to the unsafe/ambivalent attachment style. The subscale in which participants get a better mark is considered the attachment style of that person. Hazen and Shiver (1987), calculated the retesting reliability of this questionnaire 0.81 and the one with Cronbach’s alpha 0.87(citing Safavi & Marufi, 2012). Rahimian, Nouri, Arizi Samani, Molavi and Forugh Mobarakeh (2006), reported the simultaneous validity of this questionnaire with the schedule of interview of adults’ attachment as follows : safe attachment(0.79), avoiding /unsafe (0.84) and unsafe/ambivalent (0.87). In the current study, giving the test of Cronbach’s alpha for 5 items of the parameter of safe attachment style resulted in the coefficient equal to 0.41. Analysis of items showed that the 8th item has the coefficient of correlation equal to about zero with the total mark of the parameter. Therefore this item was not considered appropriate and was omitted. The alpha
coefficient was again calculated for 4 items and the resulting number was 0.52. The Cronbach’s alpha coefficient for 5 items of the parameter of style of unsafe/avoiding attachment was calculated as 0.63.

**The Scale of Forgiveness**

This scale was provided in 15 items by Rye et al. (2001). The original scale had 16 items and after factor analysis, one item was omitted and 15 ones remained. The higher marks in this criteria show more forgiveness to annoyers. Rey et al. (2001) compared this scale with the measurement criterion of Enrigh. The resulted correlation in the method of homogenization was relatively high. (from r=0.50 to r=0.75). The reliability of this research was calculated via the Cronbach's alpha and the split-half method in the study of Zandipoor, Azadi & Nahidpoor(2012). The reliability coefficient calculated via the Cronbach’s alpha method was 0.79 and the one calculated via split half method was 0.81. In this study the result of Cronbach’s alpha for 15 items of this scale resulted in a coefficient equal to 0.80.

**Procedure**

The execution method was a group one. After getting questionnaires and visiting quarters of neighborhoods and cultural centers of the 1st district of Tehran and cooperating with their health houses and explaining questionnaires and scales, they were distributed in classes held in quarters of neighborhood and culture centers. Before distributing them, some explanations were given about how to answer questions, what the aim of the research is and why the necessity of honest of cooperation is necessary. In addition to it, participants were reassured that their answers would remain confidential. About 25 minutes were given to participants to answer questions. After gathering of questionnaires and scales, marks were given. The gathered information was analyzed using SPSS version 21 and LISREL version 8.5 soft wares. The results were presented in a descriptive way using frequency, mean and standard deviation(SD) and analyzed in the inferential method using correlation methods and path analysis.

**Findings**

In this study the age range of participants was between 19 and 65 with the mean of 38.79 and standard deviation (SD) of 10.66. Their marriage life time was from 1 to 47 years with the mean of 14.33 and SD of 11.83 and the number of their children was from 0 to 5 years with the mean of 1.26 and SD of 1.09. In this study, 7 people of participants were educated up to primary schools (2.9%), 3 was them studied until high school (1.3%), 63 of them had diploma (26.3%) 35 of them were holders of associate's degrees, 96 were holders of B.A. (40 %), and 36 of them (15 %)were holders of MA or higher. Also in the variable of occupation, 122 of them were househusbands (50.8 %) and 118 of them were employed (49.2 %) In the variable of marriage background, for 229 of them (95.4 %) it was their first marriage and for 8 of them (3.3 %) their second and for 3 of them (1.3 %) their third.

**Table 1. Mean, and SD of styles of solving conflicts, attachment and forgiveness.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Integrate</td>
<td>29.04</td>
<td>3.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoiding</td>
<td>19.22</td>
<td>4.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominating</td>
<td>14.69</td>
<td>4.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compromising</td>
<td>14.90</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obligated</td>
<td>20.54</td>
<td>4.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoiding-att</td>
<td>8.02</td>
<td>3.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe-att</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>6.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambi-att</td>
<td>6.30</td>
<td>3.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forgiveness</td>
<td>46.43</td>
<td>8.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The mean of the integrate solving conflicts was (29.04±3.83) the one of avoiding solving of conflicts (19.22±4.48) the one of dominating solving of conflicts (14.69±4.14), the one of compromising solving of conflicts (14.9±2.25) and the one of obligated solving of conflicts (20.54±4.06), the one of avoiding attachment (8.02±3.41), the one of safe attachment (10±2.72), the one of ambivalent attachment (6.30±3.11). Also, the mean of forgiveness was (46.43±8.18). In order to analyze the relationships of forgiving, attachment styles and the ones of solving conflicts of participants, the correlation coefficients were used whose results are mentioned in the table 2.

**Table 2. The results of correlation between attachment styles, forgiving, and styles of solving conflicts.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>integrated</th>
<th>avoiding</th>
<th>dominated</th>
<th>compromising</th>
<th>obligatory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Avoiding-att</td>
<td>-.15*</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>- .01</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe-att</td>
<td>.13*</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambival-att</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forgiving</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.18**</td>
<td>- .13*</td>
<td>- .10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05, **p<.01
In the table 2, there is negative and significant correlation between the styles of avoiding attachment and the style of integrate solving conflicts (r=-0.155, p<0.05); there is positive and significant correlation between the styles of avoiding attachment and the style of avoiding solving conflicts (r=0.311, p<0.001); there is positive and significant correlation between the styles of avoiding attachment and the style of dominating solving conflicts (r=0.309, p<0.001); there is positive and significant correlation between the style of safe attachment and the style of integrate solving conflicts (r=0.311, p<0.001); there is positive and significant correlation between the style of avoiding attachment and the style of avoiding solving conflicts (r=0.309, p<0.001); there is positive and significant correlation between the style of dominating solving conflicts (r=0.309, p<0.001); there is positive and significant correlation between the style of safe attachment and the style of integrate solving conflicts (r=0.311, p<0.001); there is positive and significant correlation between the style of safe attachment and the style of dominating solving conflicts (r=0.309, p<0.001); there was no significant correlation found among the safe attachment style and the other parameters of styles of solving conflicts. Also there is positive and significant correlation between the style of ambivalent attachment and the style of avoiding solving conflicts (r=0.237, p<0.001); Among the ambivalent attachment and other parameters of solving conflicts, no relationships could be found.

As you can see in the table 2, there is negative and significant correlation between forgiveness and the style of dominating solving conflicts (r=-0.189, p<0.01); there is positive and significant correlation between forgiveness and the style of compromising solving conflicts (r=0.131, p<0.05). No relationship was seen among forgiveness and other parameters of solving conflicts.

For determining which of the attachment and forgiveness styles is a significant predictor of integrate, avoiding, dominating or compromising solving conflict styles, the following analysis is rendered:

Table 3. The summary of step by step regression analysis for predicting the solving conflict styles.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent</th>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Integrity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Avoid-att</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.024</td>
<td>5.82*</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>-2.41*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoiding</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Avoid-att</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.097</td>
<td>25.51**</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>4.38**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ambiv-att</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.124</td>
<td>7.44**</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>2.72**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominated</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Avoid-att</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.095</td>
<td>25.05**</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>5.00**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compromise</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>forgive</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td>4.18*</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>2.04*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05, **p<.01

In the table 3, in the step by step regression analysis for predicting the integrity, only the avoiding attachment style entered the equation. It means that only this style predicts the style of integrate solving conflicts. Regarding the style of avoiding solving conflict style, in the first step, the avoiding attachment has entered the equation and in the second one the ambivalent attachment. This means that these two styles predict the avoiding solving conflict style. Regarding the dominated style of solving conflicts, only avoiding attachment style has entered the equation, meaning that this attachment predicts the dominating solving conflicts and regarding the compromising solving conflict, only forgiveness is the significant predictor and none of the variables could predict the compromising style. In order to analyze the mediatory role of forgiveness in the relationship between the attachment styles the integrate style of solving conflicts, the following figure is rendered.
Figure 1. The model of mediatory role of forgiveness in the relationship among attachment styles and the style of integrate solving of conflicts.

For this model the goodness of fit indexes including $\chi^2$, $\chi^2 / df$, the comparative goodness (CFI), goodness of fit (GFI), adjusting goodness of fit (AGFI), and the root mean square of approximation (RMSEA), were 6.40, 2.13, 0.95, 0.99, 0.95 and 0.069 respectively. The numbers of these indexes of this model show its goodness of fit with the presupposed model of data. Of course RMSEA which must be fewer than 0.05 for good models, but here it is a few more than that. With general attention to the model, we can accept the mediatory role of forgiveness in the relationship among attachment styles and the integrate style of solving conflicts. In order to analyze the mediatory role of forgiveness in the relationship between the attachment styles the compromising style of solving conflicts, the following figure is rendered.

Figure 2. the model of mediatory role of forgiveness in the relationship among attachment styles and the style of compromising solving of conflicts.

For this model the goodness of fit indexes including $\chi^2$, $\chi^2 / df$, the comparative goodness (CFI), goodness of fit (GFI), adjusting goodness of fit (AGFI), and the root mean square of approximation (RMSEA), were 3.98, 1.32, 0.98, 0.99, 0.97 and 0.037 respectively. The numbers of these indexes of this model show its goodness of fit with the presupposed model of data. With general attention to the model, we can accept the mediatory role of forgiveness in the relationship among attachment styles and the compromising style of solving conflicts. In order to analyze the mediatory role of forgiveness in the relationship between the attachment styles the obligatory style of solving conflicts, the following figure is rendered.
Figure 3. the model of mediatory role of forgiveness in the relationship among attachment styles and the style of obligatory solving of conflicts.

For this model the goodness of fit indexes including $\chi^2$, $\chi^2$ / df, the comparative goodness (CFI), goodness of fit (GFI), adjusting goodness of fit (AGFI), and the root mean square of approximation (RMSEA), were 1.52, 0.50, 1.00, 1.00, 0.99 and 0.0001 respectively. The numbers of these indexes of this model show its goodness of fit with the presupposed model of data. With general attention to the model, we can accept the mediatory role of forgiveness in the relationship among attachment styles and the obligatory style of solving conflicts. At the end, regarding the use of 5 models, the mediatory role of forgiveness is confirmed in three styles of integrative, compromising and obligated styles of solving conflicts and in the 2 dominating and avoiding ones is not.

Conclusion and Discussion

The avoiding attachment style expects the integrate style of solving conflicts. In fact, avoiding adults do not trust others and have always an emotional distance from others and often are they alone and aggressive. They avoid making intimate relationships with others. (Mayer, Caruso & Salovey, 2000). All these features result in that people with avoiding attachments can be opposite to the style of integrate solving of conflicts which is constructive for styles of solving couples’ conflicts. It is for this reason that the integrate style of solving conflicts needs mutual cooperation and has high significance for oneself and others. These features are clearly opposite to the avoiding attachment. Also the avoiding and ambivalent attachments expect the avoiding style of solving conflicts. We can state that in fact, couples with the unsafe (ambivalent or avoiding) attachment are always afraid of being left alone or rejected, not being accepted or lovely, because of their mental models which are aroused by unsafe attachment in their primary childhood relationships. Therefore in their relationship grounds, they consistently wait for signs which confirm their cognitive mental constructs. As a result, when facing with a negative dialogue or activating behavior, unsafe couples start the process of giving negative evidence based on their presuppositions and they consider the reasons of their husbands’ negative behavior consistent and generalize them to all of their characteristics and dominions of their relationships. As a result, this process of compiling pessimistic information in the minds of unsafe couples can appear as negative behavior, anger and disappointment from relationshipships and severe conflicts which results in decrease of conjugal quality and satisfaction of couples. (Ben-Ari & Hirshberg, 2009) These definitions show the direct and positive and meaningful capability of expectation of unsafe attachment and the avoiding style of solving conflicts. These state the features of the avoiding attachment implicitly. The avoiding style of solving conflicts anticipates the dominating one. People with avoiding attachments are uncomfortable with getting close to others. It is difficult for them to depend on others. Whenever someone wants to becomes very intimate with them they become angry and they think that others often are intimate with them more than they feel comfortable. (Khojastehmehr et al., 2012) These features state a kind of solving conflict style which can be explained disregarding ideas of the other partner. It was shown that forgiveness anticipates the compromising solving conflict style. The ability to forgive spouses can result in stability of relationships and increase of conjugal satisfaction. Therefore, forgiveness, stopping the implicit or explicit aggressive responses, results in controlling aggressive momentum, decrease of conjugal conflicts and boredom in conjugal relationships. In fact, it is a mechanism which acts preventively and both in appearance of conflicts and after them decrease the increasing process of severe conjugal conflicts, via increasing of positive emotions and also establishing trust in relationships. These features describe the compromising style of solving conflicts in which couples forgive each other and consider positive features of their spouses and solve conflicts constructively and positively.

In the findings section, it was observed that there was negative correlation between avoiding attachment and integrate style of solving conflicts. Also, there was positive correlation among avoiding attachment and avoiding style of solving conflicts and the dominating one. In addition, there was positive correlation between safe attachment and integrate style of solving conflicts and there was positive correlation between ambivalent attachment and avoiding style of solving conflicts. In explaining the positive correlation between avoiding attachment and avoiding style of solving conflicts and the dominating one, it can be stated that people with avoiding attachment are more comfortable without intimate relationships and it is very important for them to feel independence. They prefer not to be dependent on others and others not be dependent on them either. As a result they avoid solving conflicts. Bartholomew & Horowitz (2001) found out that these people thwart their attachment defensively and decrease their desires because of anxiety following unsatisfied attachment needs. Therefore it is not unlikely that people who have avoiding attachment use the avoiding style of solving conflicts and the dominating one in solving their problems. Also regarding the negative correlation between integrate style of solving conflicts and avoiding attachment and its positive correlation with safe attachment style, it can be stated that this style needs mutual cooperation and has much significance for oneself and others. Also this style has positive correlation with safe attachment style based on Bowlby theory that states that these people have high self-confidence. Safe people believe that others are available when they need answers. Therefore, when solving conflicts they try to use styles which include mutual cooperation and they attempt to solve conjugal conflicts constructively. (Feeney, 2002) But this process does not occur in avoiding attachment case and they try to solve conflicts in one-way style and without paying attention to their partners because they can not start any relationships. Regarding the positive correlation between ambivalent attachment and avoiding style of solving conflicts, we can state that ambivalent people show much anxiety and stress in conflicts and show more anger and violence when confronted by their spouses. These people understand their spouses and their relationship with them less in terms of love, commitment, mutual relationship and supporting. They liked to more dominate conflicts and press their
spouses more. They liked to dictate their opinions ignoring other opinions. (Simpson, Rhodes & Phillips, 1996). These definitions state avoiding style of solving conflicts in which people do not engage positively with their partners and solve conflicts unconstructively disregarding their partners' opinions. Decrease of conflicts and increase of quality of life and satisfaction of it, are often achieved via successful solving of conjugal conflicts so that both parties are satisfied and forgive each other. Therefore, since forgiveness is an important element in the relationship between man and wife, knowledge of effects of the main family and the methods of facing blocks could prepare grounds for improvement of forgiveness in couples. Limitation of the sample of the study to married women of the first district of Tehran has negative effects on the generalizability of its results. It is recommended that this study be done in other districts of Tehran and other provinces of country and their results be compared and also it is recommended that in the future studies, couples are analyzed simultaneously to compare the psychological constructs in both genders.
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