

## Original Research

# A Comparative Study Of Moral Foundations, Psychological Hardiness, Resiliency And Differentiation In Women Of Functional And Dysfunctional Families

Azam Akrami <sup>1</sup>, Hamid Kazemi-Zahrani <sup>2\*</sup>.

1-Master of arts, Payame Noor University, Najaf Abad Branch, Department of Public Psychology

2- Department of Psychology, Payame Noor University, Tehran, Iran.

**Corresponding author:** Hamid Kazemi-Zahrani, Department of Psychology, Payame Noor University, Tehran, Iran.

Email: [kazemi@nj.isfpnu.ac.ir](mailto:kazemi@nj.isfpnu.ac.ir)

## Abstract

**Background:** This is a comparative study of moral foundations, psychological hardiness, resiliency and differentiation in women of functional and dysfunctional families.

**Method:** The research method is comparative and cross-sectional in terms of time and this is a basic research in terms of purpose. The statistical population of the study is all women referring to health centers in Lenjan city. Sampling method is random and convenience. Therefore, 120 available people were randomly selected, 60 of them were selected from functional families and 60 people were from dysfunctional families. The research tools used in the present study are of Haidt & Graham moral foundations standard questionnaire (2007), Kobasa Hardiness questionnaire by Kobasa (1976), resilience questionnaire by Connor-Davidson (2003), and *Differentiation* questionnaire (1998). SPSS21 software was used to analyze the data. To test the research hypothesis, one-way analysis of variance was used for variables without subscale and multivariate analysis of variance was used for variables with subscale.

**Result:** Findings of the research showed that in multivariate analysis of variance, there is a significant difference between moral foundations in women of dysfunctional and functional families. Furthermore, there is a significant difference between the psychological hardiness of women in dysfunctional and functional families.

**Conclusion:** significant difference between the resilience of women in dysfunctional and functional families. There is also a significant difference between Differentiation in women of dysfunctional and functional families. This means that scores of moral foundations, psychological hardiness, resilience and differentiation in women of functional families is higher than women of dysfunctional families.

**Keywords:** Moral Foundations, Psychological Hardiness, Resilience and Differentiation, Women, Functional Families, Dysfunctional Families

Submitted: 11 February 2020, Revised: 21 June 2020, Accepted: 29 June 2020

## Introduction

Family is the smallest unit of the society, this social unit is the source of human emotions and center of the most intimate relationships and

interpersonal interactions. It is so important that the health and growth of any society depends on the health and growth of the family in that society. One of the most important

factors in the family is family function, which includes a set of important behaviors and skills, including problem solving, roles, and emotions, and describes part of a family's health or unhealthiness. It is stated in definition that family function is a common effort to create and maintain balance in the family. All families that have weak function on emotional issues have problems and often fail in the problem-solving process [2].

Family has a very important role among the factors affecting human resilience. Many psychological and behavioral abnormalities of human beings are rooted in the family, and at the same time many human advances originate from the family. The family as an emotional-social unit is the center of growth, development, healing, change, revolution and damage that creates conditions for both flourishing and declining of relationships between its members. On the other hand, family is the basic foundation in social structure of the societies that its health or unhealthiness of it leads to the consolidation and destruction of society [3].

Researching and studying the family as the main social entity and influencing the growth and development of its members has been studied by many researchers. Families can hurt people by creating tension and reducing their levels of mental health. Turbulent families can be dangerous for both individuals and society. The presence of positive components in functional families is one of the factors

affecting the interpersonal relationships of family members. Various psychological variables in the family members create a disturbed atmosphere for the family. In the present research, variables such as moral foundations, psychological hardiness, resilience and differentiation in functional and dysfunctional families are studied [4].

Another important variable in dysfunctional families is the low resilience of family members. Resilience means the ability to cope with changes in crisis situations, the ability to recover and balance after a crisis, and it includes components of family communication and problem solving, benefiting from economic and social resources, maintaining a positive perspective, family connection, morality and the ability to create meaning for hardiness [5].

In fact, low resilience can lead to abnormal reactions of members to events and failure to solve problems in the family environment, which can cause disturbance in the family and disrupt its order. Meanwhile, functional families with high resilience can deal properly with the problems and provide reasonable responses to the stresses that arise. Another domain that can vary between members of functional and dysfunctional families is the differentiation variable. One of the most influential views in this field is [6] theory of differentiation, which emphasizes the primary relationships in the family and considers it to be effective in subsequent relationships. The

degree of differentiation in each individual reflects the individual's ability to cognitive separation from the emotional process that the individual is experiencing [6].

Differentiation examines foundations of intimacy and reciprocal acceptance between couples and families. Families with low differentiation are expected to have less emotional maturity and limited capacity for intimacy and unity of members. In contrast, highly differentiated families have a more flexible role and a more intimate relationship, and usually tolerate differences of opinions and experience less emotional responses. Therefore, according to the above, in the present study, it is assumed that members of dysfunctional families have lower levels of resilience than members of functional families, especially in the variables of moral foundations, psychological hardiness, resilience and differentiation. In the present study, these variables are examined on women of these two types of families and the question will be answered whether there is a difference between women of functional and dysfunctional families in the variables of moral foundations, psychological hardiness, resilience and differentiation?

### Significance of the study

Regarding that the family is one of the most basic institutions of society and family health has a direct impact on community health, researching about the family is important in

every aspect and researchers should study this social institution from different perspectives. Therefore, existence of a healthy psychological family can create a safe environment for couples and a suitable environment for the growth and upbringing of children. Since there may be stresses in families and family members may be involved with it, the presence of positive psychological components can be very important in the reaction of members and how they deal with that stresses in a good or bad way. Since there are not many researches in this area and it has been shown that there is no research in this regard, such study can be very important and can help to clarify the role of the mentioned variables in the study on the functional and dysfunctional families. Since women play the role of both mother and wife in the family, studying the different psychological aspects of women in these two types of families can help a lot in preventing formation of dysfunctional families, and additionally eliminating these factors can help the health of the family and children. Therefore, according to the above and the necessity of investigating this issue in order to help improving the health of dysfunctional families, the present study has been conducted. Kiaei and Mohammadi (2019) studied positive psychology interventions on the resilience of mothers with exceptional children in Bastak city. According to the results of this study, the resilience of mothers of exceptional children can be improved by using positive psychological interventions. Therefore, using

of this skill as an effective training program is recommended to increase resilience of mothers with exceptional children [6]. Kiani et al, conducted a study entitled “comparison of hardiness, differentiation and mindfulness emotional regulation problems of dysfunctional and functional couples”. Multivariate analysis of variance showed that the Wilkes Lambda index at the  $P < 0.01$  level was significant, indicating that the weight composition of the variables varied between groups. Furthermore, the test results of intergroup effects showed that the component of not accepting the emotional regulation of the mindfulness variable is at a significant level. The results of post hoc test showed that in the variable of non-acceptance there is a significant difference between dysfunctional men and functional women, as well as functional men and dysfunctional women. Also in mindfulness, dysfunctional men and functional women, dysfunctional women with functional women as well as functional men and dysfunctional women are significantly different in level. Conclusion: dysfunctional couples are less able to accept negative emotions. Additionally, problems in men's relationships do not affect mindfulness, but problems reduce mindfulness in women [7].

Samanloo and Tayebi (2017) investigated the relationship between moral foundations and life quality in a descriptive manner in a study. Data analysis shows that there is a significant correlation between moral foundations and life

quality. Overall results showed that there is a positive and significant correlation between moral foundation and life quality. The results of regression analysis also showed that moral foundations are significant prediction for life quality [8]. Samanlou et al, conducted a study entitled “Ethics, Deception, Self-Resistance, and Ethics Code”. The article has two purposes. This article argues that the ethics committee finally established the "self-resistance" model in the 1973 APA ethics code. At the broadest level, the article surveys how dominant perceptions of human nature are written into seemingly universal and timeless ethics codes [9]. Bowen et al, studied marital conflict in relation to relationships, structure and context in his research after three decades of research on the harmful effects of marital conflict on mental and physical health of family members, and states that after marital conflict and breakdown, controlling the initial level of depression and other variables, subsequent depression appears and the effect of marital conflict on depression is greater among poor women than women who have better financial status and these findings indicate the importance of family economic status and its impact on the relationship between marital processes and women's mental health [10]. Kiai et al, studied the relationship between family conflict management and adaptability of children. Evidence showed that the conflicting relationship between husband and wife leads to the withdrawal of fathers from the parent-child relationship and the presence of mothers in this

relationship becomes more dominant. In communication patterns in which women show negative behaviors, the level of conflict increases and husbands show negative behaviors to avoid confronting conflicts. Therefore, studying the degree of confusion in spouse interactions is largely due to the fact that women do not accept their husbands' efforts to end the conflicts. Samanloo's study have shown according to previous researches that spouses who listen carefully to each other will be more capable to support each other. Listening is the most important communication skill. Success in marriage is related to how spouses get along with each other and how they make decisions and how they deal with conflicts. Problem-solving training is considered as the foundation of controlling conflicts in marital relationships. Problem-solving training includes the teaching of logical decision-making to couples that will lead to adaptation. In recent researches, in addition to physiological and hormonal factors in the incidence of depression in women, the existence of an important cause of communication problems and hidden communication patterns that lead to this disorder has been confirmed [12]. Machado et al, conducted a study entitled "The Relationship between Resilience and Self-Regulation in the Study of Spanish Youth at Risk of Social Exclusion". Behavioral self-regulation is one of the most important protective factors against resilience and should be enhanced especially in young people which

are at risk. Linear relationship analysis (correlation and structural) and nonlinear dependence analysis (MANOVA) were performed between the two structures. The relationship between them was significant and positive. Learning from mistakes (self-regulation) was an important predictor of coping, self-confidence, hardiness, adaptation and tolerance to negative situations (resilience). Similarly, low-median self-regulation is related to scores on resilience factors. The implications of these outcomes have been discussed for future trainings and researches [13]. Kamamoto et al. (2019) studied the relationship between moral foundations and cognitive abilities in a research. The sample of this study included 4863 Japanese adults, of which 2922 were female and the rest were male. Their average age was 48.78. In this study, the basic moral foundations that exist inherently within human beings such as attention / injury, fair behavior / deceptive behavior, loyalty / betrayal, ability / inability with cognitive ability were discussed. Correlation and regression showed that cognitive abilities were associated with fair behavior / deceptive behavior. There is a significant relationship between cognitive ability and loyalty / betrayal, ability / inability under the age of 50. The results showed that moral foundations based on greater emotion and insight have a significant relationship with cognitive abilities [14].

## Research Goals and Objectives

- Determining significance difference of moral foundations, psychological hardiness, resiliency and differentiation in women of dysfunctional and functional families.
- Determining significance difference of moral foundations in women of dysfunctional and functional families
- Determining significance difference of psychological hardiness in women of dysfunctional and functional families.
- Determining significance difference of resiliency in women of dysfunctional and functional families.
- Determining significance difference of differentiation in women of dysfunctional and functional families.

### Research Hypotheses

- There is a significant difference between the moral foundations, psychological hardiness, resiliency and differentiation in the women of dysfunctional and functional families.
- There is a significant difference between the moral foundations in the women of dysfunctional and functional families.
- There is a significant difference between psychological hardiness in the women of dysfunctional and functional families.

- There is a significant difference between resiliency in the women of dysfunctional and functional families.
- There is a significant difference between differentiation in the women of dysfunctional and functional families.

### Theoretical Foundations of Research Moral Foundations

Indicates the process of achieving a sense of justice in relation to others, the trueness or falseness of this or that matter, and how one behaves in each of these matters. In fact, the development of moral foundations theory (MFT) has played an important role in showing the scope of ethics.

### Psychological Hardiness

Hardiness is defined as a combination of attitudes and beliefs that motivates a person to do hard and strategic work in facing stressful and difficult situations and work hard to adapt to those situations in order to cope with events and open a way to growth and improvement. Kobasa proposed the concept of hardiness as an explanation for the relation between psychological pressure and illness in some people.

### Resilience

McCubbin & McCubbin (1998, quotes from Buchanann, 2008) define family resilience as a family trait that increases their resilience and compatibility in dealing with changes and crisis.



## Differentiation

Differentiation is a family therapy concept of Bowen theory (1978). This structure is used by Kerr and Bowen (1988) as a process in which individuality and being together are managed within a communication system. This concept refers to an individual approach to the relationship and an individual sense of ideal self-differentiation, including the individual's capacity to his/her contribution in the relationship and his/her personal individuality. In addition, there is a strong self-sense that is not solely and completely controlled by emotion. Self-differentiation has two dimensions: intrapersonal and interpersonal. Self-differentiation is an intrapersonal ability to differentiate systems of thought and emotion, and interpersonal ability to maintain intrinsic autonomy is a deep intimacy with other important people.

## Dysfunctional Family

In a troubled family, the rules are very strict, soulless and irrational, and members are forced to follow these rules, and this compulsion is due to the fear that has taken root in them. Unfortunately, this fear also spreads to family members' relationships with outside the family, that is, social relationships. In dysfunctional families, character assassinations happen easily and very often. In this group of families, parents are often in a state of wrath and reconciliation, which has a negative effect on their children's soul.

## Research Method

This is a comparative research which is cross-sectional in terms of time and basic in terms of purpose. The study population in this study are women referring to health centers in Lenjan. Based on the research texts, the sample size for a causal comparative study is equal to  $n=60$  people (Delavar, 2011). Sampling is randomly available. Therefore 120 people were randomly selected. For sampling, we needed 120 members of dysfunctional and functional families, of which 60 were in the first group related to dysfunctional families and 60 in the second group were related to functional families. Thus, by referring to the medical center and getting permission of the superior of the center, the present people in the center on the testing days were selected for the sample group, on condition that they have entry criteria and be interested to participate in the research. The research tools of the present study were the Graham Hyatt Moral Foundations standard questionnaire (2007), Kobasa Hardiness questionnaire by Kobasa (1976), Conner & Davidson Resilience Questionnaire (2003) and the Differentiation Questionnaire (1998) (Table 1).

In the present study, SPSS software was used to analyze the data. Finally, data was first examined for normality, and then inferential statistics (One-way analysis of variance for non-subscale variables and multivariate analysis of variance for subscale variables) were used.

## Inferential Test of Study

### First Hypothesis Test

There is a significant difference between the moral foundations in the women of dysfunctional and functional families.

**H0:** There is not a significant difference between the moral foundations in the women of dysfunctional and functional families.

**H1:** There is a significant difference between the moral foundations in the women of dysfunctional and functional families.

According to the results of Table (2) show, as the value is more than 0.05 (0.00), it can be said that there is no significant difference between the moral foundations in the women of dysfunctional and functional families.

As the findings in Tables (2) and (3) show, F values of Analysis of variance are significant with  $P=0.0001$  and  $P=0.001$  and this means that the scores of moral foundations (care / injury, fairness (justice), group loyalty, respect to authority, and sincerity and purity) are significant in both groups of (dysfunctional and functional families) and confirms this hypothesis. Therefore, by referring to the tables, it is clear that the average scores of affection styles variables (care / injury, fairness (justice), loyalty to group, respect for authority and purity and sincerity in functional families is higher than dysfunctional families.

### Second Hypothesis Test

There is a significant difference between psychological hardiness of the women in dysfunctional and functional families.

**H0:** There is a not significant difference between psychological hardiness of the women in dysfunctional and functional families.

**H1:** There is a significant difference between psychological hardiness of the women in dysfunctional and functional families.

As the findings in Tables (4) and (5) show, F values of analysis of variance are significant with  $P=0.0001$  and  $P=0.001$  and this means that the scores of Psychological Hardiness (challenge, control, commitment and hardiness totally) are significant in both groups of (dysfunctional and functional families) and confirms this hypothesis. Therefore, by referring to the tables, it is clear that the average scores of Psychological Hardiness (challenge, control, commitment and hardiness totally) in functional families are higher than dysfunctional families.

### Third Hypothesis Test

There is a significant difference between resilience in the women of dysfunctional and functional families.

**H0:** There is not a significant difference between resilience in the women of dysfunctional and functional families.

**H1:** There is a significant difference between resilience in the women of dysfunctional and functional families.

and  $P=0.001$  and this means that the Resilience score is significant in both groups of (dysfunctional and functional families) and confirms this



hypothesis. Therefore, by referring to the tables, it is clear that the average scores of Resilience variables in functional families are higher than dysfunctional families.

### Fourth Hypothesis Test

There is a significant difference between Differentiation in women of dysfunctional and functional families.

**H0:** There is not a significant difference between Differentiation in women of dysfunctional and functional families.

**H1:** There is a significant difference between Differentiation in women of dysfunctional and functional families.

As the findings in Tables (8) and (9) show, F values of Analysis of variance are significant with  $P=0.0001$  and  $P=0.001$  and this means that the Differentiation scores (Emotional Reactivity, I position, Emotional cutoff, Integration with others) is significant in both groups of (dysfunctional and functional families) and confirms this hypothesis. Therefore, by referring to the tables, it is clear that the average scores of Differentiation variables (Emotional Reactivity, I position, Emotional cutoff, Integration with others) in functional families are higher than dysfunctional families.

### Discussion and Conclusion

Given the extent of the present research in a limited scope, concluding is not easy. Also, despite of observing all research principles to review reliable findings, a reliable conclusion

on such a subject requires extensive national or regional researches. However, the results of this study can be used as a guide for further researches. Analysis and comparing of moral foundations, psychological hardiness, resiliency and differentiation in women of functional and dysfunctional families are studied in this research. Sample of 120 available people which was included 60 women of functional families and 60 women of dysfunctional families was chosen. The research tools used in the present study are of Haidt & Graham moral foundations standard questionnaire (2007), Kobasa Hardiness questionnaire by Kobasa (1976), Resilience questionnaire by Connor-Davidson (2003), and Differentiation questionnaire of Skowron & Friedlander (1998). Data analysis was performed by descriptive method (frequency, percentage, mean and standard deviation) and inferential method (one-way and multi-way analysis of variance) after collecting data. In the following of the present chapter, each of the hypotheses is presented separately and the results are analyzed.

According to the first hypothesis there is a significant difference between the moral foundations in the women of dysfunctional and functional families. As the findings in Tables 4-4 and 4-5 show, F values of Analysis of variance are significant with  $P=0.0001$  and  $P=0.001$  and this means that the scores of moral foundations (care / injury, fairness (justice), Group loyalty, respect to authority, and sincerity and purity) are significant in both

groups of (dysfunctional and functional families) and confirms this hypothesis. Therefore, by referring to the tables, it is clear that the average scores of affection styles variables (care / injury, fairness (justice), loyalty to group, respect for authority and purity and sincerity in functional families is higher than dysfunctional families. These findings are consistent with the researches of Kamamoto et al. (2019), Conner et al and Derakhshan et al. Kamamoto et al. (2016) studied the relationship between moral foundations and cognitive abilities. The results showed that moral foundations based on greater emotion and insight have a significant relationship with cognitive abilities. Shaker studied Comparison of Self-Inhibition, Moral Foundations, and Life Orientation among Compatible and Incompatible Parents of Educable Intellectually Disabled Children. The results showed that there is a significant difference between moral foundations in the subscales of moral based on learning and moral based on the approval of others and in orientation of life between compatible and incompatible parents and mean of the orientation of life of compatible parents is significantly higher than incompatible parents. In explaining of these findings, the following can be stated.

In a family, a woman has an important responsibility and responsibility as a person who has to raise children. If the mother of a family can understand the rightness or wrongness of affairs and behave fairly with the

family members and be aware of how to behave her husband and children, as well as the manner the mother of the family talks to her husband and her children and politeness and curtesy can be an example for the family and prevent them from going in the wrong direction.

But the mothers who are not able to manage family properly and unable to solve problems and their behavior is itself a problem, move their family towards chaos day by day.

According to the first hypothesis there is a significant difference between psychological hardiness of the women in dysfunctional and functional families. As the findings of the study showed, F values of analysis of variance are significant with  $P=0.0001$  and  $P=0.001$  and this means that the scores of Psychological Hardiness (challenge, control, commitment and hardiness totally) are significant in both groups of (dysfunctional and functional families) and confirms this hypothesis. Therefore, by referring to the tables, it is clear that the average scores of Psychological Hardiness (challenge, control, commitment and hardiness totally) in functional families are higher than dysfunctional families. These findings are consistent with the researches of Palaïou (2016), Kiani et al. (2012), Jalal Gharibi et al. (2016). Palaïou (2016) investigated the relationship of psychological Hardiness, Academic Resiliency and Self-evaluation with Academic Performance in a study. The results showed a direct a significant correlation between psychological Hardiness and

Academic Performance and also between Academic Resiliency and Academic Performance of students. Furthermore, Jalal Gharibi et al. (2016) studied the comparison of happiness, meaning of life and psychological hardiness in fertile and infertile women of Sanadaj city. The results showed that F values in four variables of happiness, meaning of life, searching for meaning in life and psychological hardiness is significant statistically. The results also showed that there is difference in fertile and infertile women in terms of all variables and the highest level of mean difference among them was related to psychological hardiness. In explaining this hypothesis it can be stated that hardiness is the characteristic of people who find a solution for every problem and never let difficult situation and problems defeat them and deviate them from the main route. In functional families, there are women who try to solve problems and teach their children to deal with problems and overcome difficulties and help their families to achieve their highest goal. But in dysfunctional families, the women who do not have hardiness make themselves and their families disturbed and they are unable to solve their problems. According to the third hypothesis of the study there is a significant difference between resilience in the women of dysfunctional and functional families. As the findings of the study showed, F values of Analysis of variance are significant with  $P=0.0001$  and  $P=0.001$  and this means that the Resilience score is significant in both groups of (dysfunctional and functional families) and

confirms this hypothesis. Therefore, by referring to the tables, it is clear that the average scores of Resilience variables in functional families are higher than dysfunctional families. The results of the present study are consistent with Machado et al. (2004), Kaboudi et al. (2018), and Khandandel & Kavianfar (2015).

Kaboudi et al. (2018) studied the effectiveness of resilience on stress of parents whose children suffer from cancer. The results showed that mothers who increase their resilience skills and practice to do this, were able to decrease stress and improve their lifestyle significantly in comparison to mothers in control group. Khandandel & Kavianfar (2015) studied the role of trust in interpersonal relationships and family hardiness in marital satisfaction in working couples. The results showed that trust in interpersonal relationships and family hardiness with marital satisfaction have positive and meaningful correlation. In explaining this hypothesis, it can be stated that people with high hardiness have high resilience too. Women with low resilience in families can cause disturbance in two form:

They are not able to solve problems and leave their family to exit the situation.

They feel weakness in front of family members and they do not know how to manage the situation and if they do not leave, they will become depressed and make problems to their interpersonal relations in family.

According to the forth hypothesis, there is a significant difference between Differentiation in women of dysfunctional and functional families. As the findings showed, F values of Analysis of variance are significant with  $P=0.0001$  and  $P=0.001$  and this means that the Differentiation scores (Emotional Reactivity, I position, Emotional cutoff, Integration with others) is significant in both groups of (dysfunctional and functional families) and confirms this hypothesis. Therefore, by referring to the tables, it is clear that the average scores of Differentiation variables (Emotional Reactivity, I position, Emotional cutoff, Integration with others) in functional families are higher than dysfunctional families. Results of this study is not consistent with study of Rezaeian et al. (2017) and is consistent with studies of, Ghaffari et al. (2016) and Arefi et al. (2016). Rezaeian et al (2017) studied and compared self-differentiation, communication patterns, and sexual satisfaction in divorce-applicant and normal couples of Qom city. The results showed that in communication patterns and sexual satisfaction there are significantly difference between divorce-applicant and non-divorce-applicant couples, and not in self-differentiation. Arefi et al. (2016) studied marital adjustment prediction among young teaching couples on the based on differentiation and parents' marital satisfaction. The results showed that there is positive and significant correlation between differentiation and parents' marital satisfaction and marital adjustment prediction among

young couples. Furthermore, differentiation and parents' marital satisfaction predict positively the marital adjustment of couples in this research. It can conclude that couples whose parents have high marital satisfaction and have high differentiation level, will reach to high adjustment level in their marital life.

In explaining of these findings, the following can be stated.

Differentiation as described in chapter 2, is two types: Interpersonal and Intrapersonal differentiation.

Interpersonal differentiation means that a person is brought up in such a way that his differentiation from family and other people is balanced and he does not have excessive and unconventional dependence on others, so that this dependence disrupts his life and the others lives. According to John Bowlby's attachment theory, this type of education is related to the mother-child relationship in childhood).

In intrapersonal differentiation, a person can balance his intellect and senses in the face of any issue, and this is an important issue in dealing with life problems and in social and marital relationships. Therefore, in explaining this hypothesis, it can be stated that undifferentiated women play an important role in creating a dysfunctional life. Because in general, women are more emotionally and sensitive, and when they react emotionally, they can get into trouble with their husbands over time (given that thinking is more dominant than emotions in men), and

according to Jung theory, it is necessary that every man has some femininity (Anima) and every women have some masculinity (Animus).

## Acknowledgments

None

## Conflict of interest

There is no conflict of interest for the authors of this article.

## References

1. Conner, K. M., & Davidson, J. R. T: Development of a new resilience scale: The Conner-Davidson Resilience Scale(CD RISC). *Depression and Anxiety*, 2003; 18(2), 76-82.
2. Shaker Dioulagh A, Abedi Z: A Comparison of Self-Inhibition, Moral Foundations and Life Orientation among Compatible and Incompatible Parents of Educable Intellectually Disabled Children. *JOEC*.2017; 17 (1).89-101.
3. Kiani S, Montazeri Ali, Holakouee Naeini K, and Majdzadeh S : Standardization of the World Health Organization Hardiness Questionnaire: Translation and Psychometrics of the Iranian Species. *Journal of Health Faculty and the Research Institute of Health*.2011; 5 (1). 26-40.
4. Derakhshan R : Comparison of hardiness, differentiation and mindfulness of emotional regulation problems of dysfunctional and functional couples, *Family Study*,1397; 7(1), 23.
5. Samanlou H, Tayyab A : The Relationship between Moral Foundations and Public Welfare, *National Conference on New Research in Management, Economics and Humanities, Kazerun, Islamic Azad University, Kazerun Branch*.2017; 12(2), 145-158.
6. Bowen, M: family therapy in clinical practice. NY. London: Jason Anderson. 1978; 12(2), 145-158.
7. Kiai, Maryam; And beautiful, Mohammadi: The Effectiveness of Positive Psychology on the Resilience of Mothers of Exceptional Children, *5th National Conference on New Positive Psychology, Bandar Abbas, Farhangian University*.2019; 13-38.
8. Samanloo, Haniyeh; Tayyab, Afshin: The Relationship between Ethical Foundations and Public Welfare, *National Conference on New Research in Management, Economics and Humanities, Kazerun, Islamic Azad University, Kazerun Branch*.1396; 26(1) , 124-132.
9. Machado, J. : Evaluation of Quality of life among women with HIV AIDS using HAT-Sol. *Cad suedpublic*, 2004; 20(2), 430-437.
10. Kerr, M. E., & Bowen, M. : Family evaluation. New York, NY: W. W. Norton.1988; 24(4): 225–227.
11. Gharibi, Jalal, Gharibi, Mohammadian, & Kuistan. Comparison of happiness, meaning of life and psychological hardiness in fertile and infertile women in Sanandaj. *Women and Family Studies*,1395; 9 (3), 103-116.
12. Kaboudi M, Abbasi P, Heidarisharaf P, Dehghan F, Ziapour A. : The Effect of Resilience Training on the Condition of Style of Coping and Parental Stress in Mothers of Children with Leukemia.

- Journal of pediatrics 2018; 6(2):7299-7310.
13. Khandan Del, Kavianfar, & Hossein : The role of trust in interpersonal relationships and family resilience in marital satisfaction of working couples. Journal of Pathology, Counseling and Family Enrichment, 2015; 1 (1), 14-31.
14. Ghaffari, Algar; Lunar, kiwi; Sharifi, Hussein; And Rezaei Sharif, Ali : The relationship between differentiation and emotional intelligence with cognitive definitions and quality of life of couples. Faculty of Educational Sciences and Psychology, Department of Educational Sciences. 2015; 8(2) :1-5.

## Tables and Charts:

**Table (1).** Reliability of questionnaire dimensions

| Cronbach Alpha | Components        |
|----------------|-------------------|
| 0.869          | Moral Foundations |
| 0.864          | Hardiness         |
| 0.859          | Resiliency        |
| 0.860          | Differentiation   |
| 0.863          | Total             |

**Table (2).** Results of mean deviation test of first hypothesis in Functional and Dysfunctional Families

| Life style    | Mean   | Mean Deviation | Std. Error of Deviation | Subscale             |
|---------------|--------|----------------|-------------------------|----------------------|
| Dysfunctional | 2.8595 | 0.31156        | 0.02832                 | Care /Injure         |
| Functional    | 2.7160 | 0.31961        | 0.10656                 |                      |
| Dysfunctional | 2.8579 | 0.49426        | 0.04493                 | Fairness (Justice)   |
| Functional    | 2.9556 | 0.47726        | 0.15909                 |                      |
| Dysfunctional | 2.5838 | 0.29813        | 0.02710                 | Loyalty to group     |
| Functional    | 2.5139 | 0.32140        | 0.10713                 |                      |
| Dysfunctional | 2.2342 | 0.46277        | 0.04207                 | Respect to Authority |
| Functional    | 2.2037 | 0.23241        | 0.07747                 |                      |
| Dysfunctional | 2.9545 | 0.27076        | 0.02461                 |                      |



|            |        |         |         |                      |
|------------|--------|---------|---------|----------------------|
| Functional | 3.0131 | 0.18315 | 0.06105 | Sincerity and Purity |
|------------|--------|---------|---------|----------------------|

Reference: Findings of the study

**Table (3).** Multivariable Variance (MANOVA) to study moral foundations in women of Functional and Dysfunctional Families

| Reference          | Subscale               | Df  | Square Sum | Square Mean | Value F | Significance Level | Statistical Power |
|--------------------|------------------------|-----|------------|-------------|---------|--------------------|-------------------|
| Moral Foundations  | Dysfunctional Families | 1   | 1835/65    | 1835/65     | 1356/2  | 0.0001             | 1                 |
|                    | Functional Families    | 1   | 1294/85    | 1294/85     | 1147/9  | 0.0001             | 1                 |
| Group              | Dysfunctional Families | 1   | 37/64      | 37/64       | 27/8    | 0.0001             | 1                 |
|                    | Functional Families    | 1   | 5/89       | 5/89        | 5/23    | 0.0001             | 1                 |
| Intergroup (error) | Dysfunctional Families | 118 | 213/85     | 1/35        |         |                    |                   |
|                    | Functional Families    | 118 | 178/22     | 1/13        |         |                    |                   |
| Total              | Dysfunctional Families | 120 | 2087/15    |             |         |                    |                   |
|                    | Functional Families    | 120 | 1478/97    |             |         |                    |                   |

Reference: Findings of the study

**Table (4).** Results of Mean Deviation test of second hypothesis in Dysfunctional and Functional Families

| Life style    | Mean   | Mean Deviation | Std. Error of Deviation | Subscale           |
|---------------|--------|----------------|-------------------------|--------------------|
| Dysfunctional | 3.1455 | 0.65826        | 0.07502                 | Challenge          |
| Functional    | 3.3282 | 0.44836        | 0.07179                 |                    |
| Dysfunctional | 3.4531 | 0.54696        | 0.06233                 | Control            |
| Functional    | 3.5556 | 0.44517        | 0.07129                 |                    |
| Dysfunctional | 3.3952 | 0.59936        | 0.06830                 | Commitment         |
| Functional    | 3.3846 | 0.47398        | 0.07590                 |                    |
| Dysfunctional | 3.0086 | 0.74721        | 0.08515                 | Hardiness in Total |
| Functional    | 3.0373 | 0.56532        | 0.08592                 |                    |

Reference: Findings of the study

**Table (5).** multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) to study Psychological Hardiness in women of Functional and Dysfunctional Families

| Reference | Subscale | Df | Square Sum | Square Mean | F value | Significance Level | Statistical Power |
|-----------|----------|----|------------|-------------|---------|--------------------|-------------------|
|-----------|----------|----|------------|-------------|---------|--------------------|-------------------|

|                         |                        |     |         |         |        |        |   |
|-------------------------|------------------------|-----|---------|---------|--------|--------|---|
| Psychological Hardiness | Dysfunctional Families | 1   | 1758.33 | 1653.30 | 1452.2 | 0.0001 | 1 |
|                         | Functional Families    | 1   | 1256.75 | 1235.85 | 1154.9 | 0.0001 | 1 |
| Group                   | Dysfunctional Families | 1   | 45.77   | 35.63   | 36.7   | 0.0001 | 1 |
|                         | Functional Families    | 1   | 5.63    | 5.63    | 5.54   | 0.0001 | 1 |
| Intergroup (error)      | Dysfunctional Families | 118 | 254.80  | 1.27    |        |        |   |
|                         | Functional Families    | 118 | 181.23  | 1.10    |        |        |   |
| Total                   | Dysfunctional Families | 120 | 2156.16 |         |        |        |   |
|                         | Functional Families    | 120 | 1542.90 |         |        |        |   |

Reference: Findings of the study

**Table (6).** Results of Mean Deviation Test of second hypothesis in Dysfunctional and Functional Families

| Family Type   | Frequency | Mean   | Mean Deviation | Std. Error Deviation | Scale      |
|---------------|-----------|--------|----------------|----------------------|------------|
| Dysfunctional | 60        | 2.4537 | 0.6396         | 0.08393              | Resilience |
| Functional    | 60        | 3.5000 | 0.68158        | 0.21550              |            |

Reference: Findings of the study

**Table (7).** Univariate Analysis of Variance to study Resilience in women of Functional and Dysfunctional Families

| Reference            | F Value | Square Mean | Df  | Square Sum |
|----------------------|---------|-------------|-----|------------|
| Resilience           | 50.14   | 215.96      | 1   | 439.89     |
| Modified Intergroup  |         | 3.24        | 1   | 46.44      |
| concomitant variable | 44.3    | 124.35      | 118 | 152.37     |
| Total Modified       |         |             | 120 | 358.34     |

Reference: Findings of the study

**Table (8).** Results of Mean Deviation test of fourth hypothesis in Dysfunctional and Functional families

| Subscale             | Std. Error Deviation | Mean Deviation | Mean   | Frequency | Family style  |
|----------------------|----------------------|----------------|--------|-----------|---------------|
| Emotional Reactivity | 0.09014              | 0.79102        | 3.8929 | 77        | Dysfunctional |
|                      | 0.09342              | 0.58338        | 4.0577 | 39        | Functional    |
| I position           | 0.08156              | 0.71572        | 3.5455 | 77        | Dysfunctional |
|                      | 0.09290              | 0.58015        | 3.6974 | 39        | Functional    |
|                      | 0.08441              | 0.74072        | 3.2446 | 77        | Dysfunctional |

|                         |         |         |        |    |               |
|-------------------------|---------|---------|--------|----|---------------|
| Emotional cutoff        | 0.09034 | 0.54418 | 3.2650 | 39 | Functional    |
| Integration with others | 0.08474 | 0.74418 | 3.0974 | 77 | Dysfunctional |
|                         | 0.09461 | 0.59086 | 3.1838 | 39 | Functional    |

Reference: Findings of the study

**Table (9).** Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) to study Differentiation in women of Functional and Dysfunctional Families

| Reference          | Subscale               | Df  | Square Sum | Square Mean | F value | Significance Level | Statistical Power |
|--------------------|------------------------|-----|------------|-------------|---------|--------------------|-------------------|
| Differentiation    | Dysfunctional Families | 1   | 1653.30    | 1756.12     | 1253.3  | 0.0001             | 1                 |
|                    | Functional Families    | 1   | 1325.70    | 1256.71     | 1254.9  | 0.0001             | 1                 |
| Group              | Dysfunctional Families | 1   | 46.71      | 36.63       | 37.2    | 0.0001             | 1                 |
|                    | Functional Families    | 1   | 5.65       | 5.74        | 5.23    | 0.0001             | 1                 |
| Intergroup (error) | Dysfunctional Families | 118 | 265.75     | 1.30        |         |                    |                   |
|                    | Functional Families    | 118 | 165.21     | 1.10        |         |                    |                   |
| Total              | Dysfunctional Families | 120 | 2235.23    |             |         |                    |                   |
|                    | Functional Families    | 120 | 165.90     |             |         |                    |                   |

Reference: Findings of the stud

**Table (10).** Results summary of the study hypothesis

| Results   | Hypothesis   | Row |
|-----------|--|-----|
| Confirmed | There is a significant difference between the moral foundations in the women of dysfunctional and functional families.   | 1   |
| Confirmed | There is a significant difference between psychological hardiness in the women of dysfunctional and functional families. | 2   |
| Confirmed | There is a significant difference between resiliency in the women of dysfunctional and functional families               | 3   |

|           |  |   |
|-----------|--|---|
| Confirmed | There is a significant difference between differentiation in the women of dysfunctional and functional families. | 4 |
|-----------|--|---|

Reference: Findings of the study