

## Original Research

### Explaining and Evaluating Couples' Coping Styles, Differentiation of Self-Inventory and Maladaptive Schemas in Predicting Emotional Divorce in Couples

Mahdieh Ramezani<sup>1\*</sup>, Mehdi Tabrizi<sup>2</sup>

1. Master of Rehabilitation Counseling, Department Of Humanities Faculty, Islamic Azad University, University Of Khomeini Shahr, Isfahan, Iran

2. Ph.D, Counselling, Department Of Counseling, Khomeinishahr Branch, Islamic Azad University, Isfahan, Iran

**\*Corresponding Author: Mahdieh Ramezani**, Master of Rehabilitation Counseling, Department Of Humanities Faculty, Islamic Azad University, University Of Khomeini Shahr, Isfahan, Iran. E-mail: Rmahdieh1360@Yahoo.Com. ORCID:0000-0002-7508-4507

#### Abstract:

#### Background:

The aim of this study was to explain and evaluate couples' coping styles, differentiation of self-inventory (DSI) and maladaptive schemas in predicting emotional divorce in couples.

#### Method:

This descriptive cross-sectional study is a correlational study and the statistical population consists of all couples referring to counseling and psychotherapy centers in Isfahan in 2017-2018. A total of 300 individuals were selected by multi-stage cluster random sampling method. Data collection tools include differentiation of self-inventory questionnaire, initial maladaptive schematic questionnaire-short form, stress coping questionnaire and emotional divorce questionnaire. In order to analyze the research data, descriptive statistics, correlation coefficient and regression methods have been used.

#### Results:

The results show that there is a negative and significant relationship between emotional divorce and its differentiation and each of its dimensions including emotional reaction, my position, emotional cutting and fusion of questions. Also, between the five areas of early maladaptive schemas (cut/rejection, self-management and impaired performance, impaired constraints, other orientation, and excessive doubt and inhibition) and the total score of divorce incompatible schemas, there is a significant emotional connection. The relationship between problems solving coping style with emotional divorce is negative and significant, and the relationship between avoidant and emotional coping style is also positive and significant.

#### Conclusion:

Lack of differentiation of self-inventory characteristics, active coping style and consistent schemas, is a factor leading to the aggravation of marital and family problems and leads to the continuation of incompatibility and divorce. Therefore, it is necessary to pay attention to these issues and explain and teach them to couples.

**Keywords:** Emotional divorce, Early maladaptive schema, Differentiation of self-inventory, Coping style, Couples

Submitted: 20 August 2022, Revised: 25 September 2022 , Accepted: 19 October 2022

## Introduction

The family is a complex emotional system that spans several generations and its distinguishing feature from other social systems is its loyalty, affection, and permanent membership (1).

Desirability, satisfaction, contentment, quality and optimal functioning of the family are very influential factors in the prosperity, growth and development of family members (2). Having close social relationships such as marriage is associated with both the well-being of individuals and the consequences of mental and physical health (3). In recent years, due to fluctuations in values and changes in social norms that have caused changes in attitudes and expectations, and due to changes in the structure and relationships between couples, we face a new division; Divorce is divided into two types, formal and emotional (4). Among the factors affecting the life of couples, the role of emotional divorce is important. Available statistics show only formal divorce; According to these statistics, in 1394, the ratio of marriage to divorce was 5/5 % (5). But because emotional divorce is not recorded anywhere, it is not possible to provide accurate statistics about it, which makes it difficult to research it. In emotional divorce, the parties have no love, affection and intimacy with each other and do not enjoy any closeness with each other (6). Despite this lack of love and interest in life, they have accepted each other and are not separated, and the first stage in the divorce process is a declining marital relationship that is replaced by a feeling of alienation. One of the variables that seems to be related to the couples' life and divorce is differentiation of self-inventory. The differentiation of self-inventory is the balance that each person establishes between the two forces of being together and individuality, and the result is a balance between maintaining independence and continuing to communicate with important people in life (7). Low differentiation of self-

inventory within family members due to anxiety disrupts their individual and social functioning and leads to feelings of inadequacy, resulting in poor self-confidence and low self-esteem (8). Other variables that are assumed to affect couples' relationships are initial maladaptive schemas and coping styles. Early maladaptive schemas are deep and pervasive patterns or themes of memories, emotions, cognitions, and bodily feelings that formed during childhood or adolescence, they continue in the course of life, they are about themselves and in relation to others, and are highly inefficient (9). Although not all schemas are rooted in the evolution of traumatic experiences, they all interfere with healthy living. Coping, as a psychological process, refers to individuals' cognitive and behavioral efforts to resolve stressful situations. (10). Coping involves efforts, both action-oriented and intra-psychological, to manage and regulate environmental, internal demands, and conflicts in between, and it has two important functions: to regulate the unpleasant emotions and to take action to change and improve the problem that has caused the upset. There are two types of coping styles: problem solving coping style and emotional coping style (11). In a problem solving coping style, the individual focuses on the stressor and tries to take constructive action to change or eliminate the stressful situation. But in the emotional coping style, the person tries to control the emotional consequences of the stressful event (12). On the other hand, the avoidant coping style may also appear in the form of turning to and engaging in a new activity or in the form of turning to the community and other people. Our maladaptive personality and schemas influence the assessment of the situation and thus the choice of coping style. Thus, the lack of consistent coping styles is a driving factor towards marital problems and helps to perpetuate it (13). Based on what has been

stated, this study aims to explain and evaluate couples' coping styles, differentiation of self-inventory and maladaptive schemas in predicting emotional divorce in couples in Isfahan and the following hypotheses are proposed:

- Hypothesis 1: The differentiation of self-inventory (emotional reaction, my situation, emotional cut and fusion of questions) predicts emotional divorce in couples in Isfahan.
- Hypothesis 2: Five areas of maladaptive schemas (cut / rejection, impaired autonomy and function, impaired constraints, other-orientation, and excessive doubt and inhibition) predict emotional divorce in Isfahan couples.
- Hypothesis 3: Coping styles (problem solving, emotional and avoidance) predict emotional divorce in couples in Isfahan.

### Research Method

The present study is a descriptive cross-sectional correlational study and is applied in terms of purpose. The statistical population of the study includes all couples in Isfahan in 2017-2018 who have referred to counseling and psychotherapy centers. Using multi-stage cluster random sampling method and based on Morgan (1997) table, a sample of 300 people was selected. The research tools are as follows:

- The differentiation of self-inventory questionnaire: This tool was developed by Skowron & Dendy in 1998 (12), revised by Skowron and Schmitt (13) in 2003, and the final 46-item questionnaire was based on Bowen's theory. The focus of this tool is on the important life relationships and current relationships of individuals with the main family. The subscales of this questionnaire include emotional response, my position, emotional cutting, and fusion of questions. The questions in this questionnaire are scored on a Likert scale from (strongly

disagree with score 1) to (strongly agree with score 6).

- Young Schema Questionnaire-Short Form (YSQ-SF( : To measure the initial maladaptive schemas from the questionnaire that Young (2005) (5) with 75 questions, with a 6-point response Likert scale (completely false = 1 to completely true = 6) and 15 subscales included; Emotional deprivation, rejection / instability, distrust / misconduct, social isolation / alienation, disability / shame, failure, dependence / inadequacy, vulnerability to disease, immature / trapped, obedience, self-sacrifice, emotional inhibition, Stubborn criterion / over-critical, entitlement / hauteur and inadequate self-control were prepared and executed.
- Coping Inventory for Stressful Situation (CISS) Questionnaire: This questionnaire, developed by Endler & Parker (1994) (4), contains 48 questions that measure three coping styles; problem solving coping, emotional coping, and avoidant coping. Each question is graded by 5 Likert options (from never to too much) and each category contains 16 questions.
- Emotional Divorce Scale (EDS) Questionnaire: Gottman (2000) (8) has formulated this self-report questionnaire in 24 questions in the form of two options of yes (1) and no (0) and it has been translated in Iran by Jazayeri (2009) (2). After adding positive answers, if the number is equal to 8 and higher, it means that the person's married life is subject to separation and there are signs of emotional divorce in him. The total reliability of the questionnaire using Cronbach's alpha was reported to be 0.93 and its face validity was confirmed by experts.

In order to analyze the data, descriptive statistical methods (mean and standard

deviation), correlation coefficient and multivariate regression, with simultaneous login method and observing statistical presuppositions in regression theories have been used. All analyzes were performed with the help of SPSS<sup>1</sup> software version 22 and the significance level was considered "0.95".

### Research results

The descriptive data of the research are presented as follows:

Table 1 shows the descriptive indicators (mean and standard deviation) related to the differentiation of self-inventory among couples in Isfahan.

As can be seen in Table 1, in the differentiation of self-inventory variable subscales, the highest and lowest mean ( $\pm$ standard deviation) are related to my position component (21.38 ( $\pm$ 4.12)) and the emotional reaction is (16.23 ( $\pm$  2.08)), respectively and the total differentiation of self-inventory score is also (132.69 (11.55.)). Descriptive indices (mean and standard deviation) of the variable of initial incompatible schemas in five areas among couples in Isfahan are presented in Tables 2 to 6.

The results show that in the first area, cut / rejection, the highest mean scores were related to the instability component (9.30) and the lowest scores were related to the emotional deprivation component (8.05), respectively.

As the results show, among the components of the second area, namely self-management / impaired performance, the highest mean scores are related to the failure component (9.16) and the lowest mean scores are related to the vulnerability component (8.19), respectively.

As can be seen, in the third area, i.e. impaired constraints, the highest mean scores are related to the entitlement / hauteur component (9.54) and the lowest mean scores are related

to Continenence and Inadequate self-control (8.13).

According to the obtained results, in the fourth area, i.e. orientation, the highest mean scores were related to the obedience component (8.90) and the lowest mean scores were related to the self-sacrifice component (7.14).

As can be seen, in the fifth domain, i.e. excessive doubt and inhibition, the mean scores related to the emotional inhibition component was (8.56) and the mean score related to the component of stubborn criterion / over-critical was (8.69). Descriptive indices (mean and standard deviation) of the coping style variable among couples in Isfahan are presented in Table 7.

The results show that in the subscales of the coping style variables, the highest and lowest mean ( $\pm$ standard deviation) are related to avoidance coping style (22.66 (4.82))) and problem-solving (16.75 (15/2)), respectively. In this section, the inferential data obtained in the research are presented:

The results of the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test are reported in Table 8 to evaluate the normality of the distribution of scores.

As can be seen, the distribution of scores of research variables is normal with 95% confidence. After calculating the skewness and elongation, the results are shown in Table 9.

Based on the obtained results, skewness is a measure of symmetry or asymmetry of the distribution function. Elongation is a measure of the height of the curve at the maximum point and the amount of elongation for a normal distribution is 3. Positive elongation means that the desired distribution peak is higher than the normal distribution and negative elongation indicates that the peak is lower than the normal distribution. According to the results in the table above, since skewness and elongation are in the range (2, 2-), so the data have a normal

<sup>1</sup> Statistical Package for Social Science Version-22 (SPSS)

distribution. One of the basic assumptions of multiple regression analysis is the independence of independent variables, or in other words, the lack of correlation between the error scores of the independent variables. This assumption is tested by Durbin-Watson test. If the correlation of independent variables with each other is high, the use of multiple regression is questionable. The results of this test are presented in Table 10.

According to Table 10, it can be said that since the statistical value of this test is between 1.5 to 2.5, the independence of observations can be accepted and the analysis can be followed. Since Durbin-Watson statistics are between 1.5 and 2.5, they indicate the independence of the errors of the research variables. In the following, the results of the goodness-of-fit test are presented in Table 11.

Based on the results, the F-statistic of the goodness-of-fit test is higher than the value of the F-statistic of the table and the significance level of the model is less than the error level (0.05); therefore, in this model, dependent variable changes can be significantly justified and multivariate regression can be used. In order to investigate the hypothesis of alignment of variance inflation factor (VIF) and tolerance coefficient, the tolerance coefficient and variance inflation factor (VIF) of the research variables are shown in Table 12.

The results of the table show that the problem of alignment has not occurred in the variables of the present study. If the value of the variance inflation factor (VIF) is higher than 10 and the value of the tolerance coefficient is less than 0.1, it indicates alignment.

In the following, the research hypotheses are examined:

- The first hypothesis of the research: Differentiation of self-inventory (emotional reaction, my situation, emotional cutting and fusion of questions) predicts emotional divorce in couples in Isfahan.

Findings from the studies show that there is a negative and significant relationship between differentiation of self-inventory and each of its dimensions with emotional divorce in couples in Isfahan ( $P < 0.05$ ).

As can be seen, the value of determination coefficient and adjusted determination coefficient and estimated criterion error are equal to 0.292, 0.330, and 5.411, respectively. Multivariate regression has been used to predict the role of differentiation of self-inventory in emotional divorce between couples. Differentiation of self-inventory as a predictor variable and emotional divorce as a criterion variable in the regression equation were analyzed by the input method. Table 15 shows the results of standard and non-standard coefficients of emotional divorce based on their differentiation of self-inventory between couples in Isfahan.

As can be seen, among the predictor variables included in the analysis, only the component of my position in the analysis was significant and the other components were not significant in this model. This variable, i.e. the component of my position in predicting emotional divorce among couples, is important and its share in explaining the variance of predicting emotional divorce based on R is 0.33%.

- The second hypothesis of the study: Five areas of maladaptive schemas (cut / rejection, self-management and impaired performance, impaired constraints, other-orientation, and excessive doubt and inhibition) predict emotional divorce in couples in Isfahan.

The results show that there is a significant relationship between the initial maladaptive schema and emotional divorce among couples in Isfahan ( $P < 0.05$ ).

As can be seen, the value of the determination coefficient and the adjusted determination coefficient and estimated criterion error are equal to 0.198, 0.176, and 3.900, respectively. Multivariate regression has been used to

predict the role of initial maladaptive schema on emotional divorce in couples. The initial maladaptive schema was analyzed as a predictor variable and emotional divorce as a criterion variable in the regression equation was analyzed by the input method. Table 18 shows the results of standard and non-standard coefficients of emotional divorce based on five areas of initial maladaptive schemas in couples in Isfahan.

As can be seen, among the predictor variables included in the analysis, only the area of self-management and impaired performance in the analysis were significant and other areas were not significant in this model. This variable, i.e. the area of self-management and impaired performance in predicting emotional divorce among couples is important and its share in explaining the variance of predicting emotional divorce based on adjusted R is 0.17%.

- The third hypothesis of the research: Coping styles (problem solving, emotional oriented and avoidance) predict emotional divorce in couples in Isfahan.

The findings of the table show that there is a positive and significant relationship between emotional coping styles and avoidance with emotional divorce among couples in Isfahan and a negative and significant relationship with problem solving coping style ( $P < 0.05$ ).

As shown in Table 20, the determination coefficient and adjusted determination coefficient and estimated criterion error are equal to 0.216, 0.193, and 2.725, respectively. Multivariate regression has been used to predict the role of coping style on emotional divorce between couples. Coping style as a predictor variable and emotional divorce as a criterion variable in the regression equation were analyzed by the input method. Table 21 shows the results of standard and non-standard coefficients of emotional divorce based on coping style among couples in Isfahan.

As can be seen in Table 21, a significant model was obtained ( $P \leq 0.05$ ;  $F = 90/531$ ). This means that the regression effect of avoidant coping style variable on emotional divorce between couples is significant; and its share in explaining the variance of predicting emotional divorce based on R adjusted is 19.3%. Analysis of research data by multivariate simultaneous entry regression method, the results of which are presented in Table 22.

The results show that predictor variables (coping style, differentiation of self-inventory and initial maladaptive schemas) have the ability to predict and explain emotional divorce among couples in Isfahan. The beta value for its differentiation of self-inventory is 0.36, for the initial maladaptive schema, 0.44, for the problem solving coping style, 0.25, for the emotional style, 0.36, and for the avoidant coping style, 0.38, at the level ( $P = 0.001$ ) is significant. Also, the results show that the predictor variables together could explain 0.41% of the variance of emotional divorce. Therefore, the hypotheses of the present study are confirmed ( $P < 0.001$ ).

## Discussion

The aim of this study was to explain and evaluate couples' coping styles, self-differentiation and maladaptive schemas in predicting emotional divorce in couples. Based on this, some hypotheses are proposed and examined and the results of these studies are presented below.

- The first hypothesis of the research: differentiation of self-inventory (emotional reaction, my situation, emotional cutting and fusion of questions) predicts emotional divorce in couples in Isfahan.

The results of the study using correlation coefficient and regression show that there is a negative and significant relationship between differentiation of self-inventory and each of its dimensions with emotional divorce in couples

in Isfahan ( $P < 0.05$ ). Therefore, the first hypothesis of the research is confirmed. The findings of the study are consistent with the results of other studies including Suri, Kariminejad, Ghanbari and Karimian (2016) (14), Turner (2016) (15), Ditzen et al. (2013) (16) and Hyland, Shevlin, Adamson, Boduszek (2014) (17). In explaining the result, it can be said that according to Bowen's theory, differentiation of self-inventory includes psychological separation of reason and excitement and independence from others. Individuals gain an understanding of their identity during differentiation of self-inventory. This distinction enables them to take responsibility for their thoughts, feelings, perceptions and actions. A self-differentiated person has the ability to deal with life's problems and issues logically and rationally and can avoid dealing with problems emotionally. So these people have the ability to solve problems peacefully. There are many problems in married life that can cause family members, especially couples, to have emotions and consequently negative emotions. Therefore, the correct treatment of couples with these emotions and their control can be effective in improving marital relationships. On the other hand, people with low levels of differentiation of self-inventory have higher anxiety and more fusion between their intellect and their emotions, and experience emotional tensions in their relationships with their spouse (and others). According to Bowen's theory, it can be said that couples with a low level of differentiation have less rational decision-making ability in dealing with life issues and problems, and on the other hand, these couples have problems due to dependence on their main family system and system interference. This in turn increases conflicts and problems and ultimately increases marital conflicts, lack of intimacy and eventually leads to emotional divorce.

- The second hypothesis of the study: Five areas of maladaptive schemas (cut / rejection, self-management and impaired performance, impaired constraints, other-orientation, and excessive doubt and inhibition) predict emotional divorce in couples in Isfahan. The results of the study using correlation coefficient and regression show that there is a significant relationship between the initial maladaptive schema and emotional divorce among couples in Isfahan ( $P < 0.05$ ). Therefore, the second hypothesis of the research is confirmed. The findings of the study are consistent with the results of other studies including Akbari et al. (2016) (18), La'lzadeh et al. (2015) (19) and Razavi Nematollahi and Mehrabi Gohari (2014) (20). In explaining the result, it can be said that according to Young theory, early maladaptive schemas can have a negative role on mood disorders as well as personality. Therefore, if couples have active maladaptive schemas, due to the experience of negative mood, negative thoughts and also instability in emotions in the home environment, tension will be created and this situation will disrupt their relationship. Young, on the other hand, believes that people with active maladaptive schemas are more likely to use inappropriate coping strategies; And since a couple's perception and feedback to each other is influenced by each other's cognitive distortions, it leads to bias in life, and this affects their interpretation of life events, the behaviors of the other party, and in general, life-related issues negatively affect and damage marital relationships. Lack of intimate relationship will also be one of the factors affecting emotional divorce.

- The third hypothesis of the research: Coping styles (problem solving, emotional and avoidance) predict emotional divorce in couples in Isfahan. The results of the study using correlation coefficient and regression showed that there is a positive and significant

relationship between emotional coping styles and avoidance with emotional divorce among couples in Isfahan and a negative and significant relationship with problem solving coping style ( $0.05 > P$ ). Therefore, the third hypothesis of the research is confirmed. The findings of the study are consistent with the results of other studies such as Kim (2015) (21) and Scourfield and Evans (2015) (22) and Mozas et al. (2022) (23). Explaining the result, it can be said that married life is full of problems that will require the use of problem solving methods. In the meantime, people who use problem solving methods consult their spouse and try to solve family problems in the right way with the help of each other.

### Conclusion

This coordination with the spouse in solving problems, in addition to solving life problems, will also improve marital intimacy. On the other hand, when problems are not solvable, couples use positive emotional methods such as empathy with each other, trust in God, refuge in spirituality, etc., and do not quarrel with each other, So their relationship improves and does not get into trouble. On the other hand, couples who use negative emotional methods, due to not solving the problem and experiencing negative emotions, have resorted to behaviors such as aggression, drug and alcohol use, etc., and this issue will also increase marital conflicts and increase emotional divorce as a result. For future research, it is suggested that a wider community including couples on the verge of divorce and couples with emotional divorce be selected and examined.

### References

1. Heron, K. E., Miadich, S. A., Everhart, R. S., & Smyth, J. M. (2019). Ecological momentary assessment and related intensive longitudinal designs in family and couples research.
2. Perelli-Harris, B., & Blom, N. (2021). So happy together... Examining the association between relationship happiness, socio-economic status, and family transitions in the UK. *Population Studies*, 1-18.
3. Chen, C., Huang, F., Wang, K., Jing, X., Zhou, M., & Zhang, J. (2021). Income and life satisfaction of dual-earner couples: A dyadic study. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology*, 24(4), 553-564.
4. Rezvani, H. A. E., & Saemi, H. (2019). Correlation between the differentiation of self-inventory and Neuroticism with Emotional Divorce in married Students of Azad Shahr Azad University. *Journal of Health Promotion Management*, 8(2), 23-30.
5. Scafi, M., and Turkaman, F.; (2015). Assessment and typology of emotional divorce in Mashhad. *Women's Research Letter*. 6 (4): 19-36.
6. Van Gasse, D., & Mortelmans, D. (2020). Reorganizing the single-parent family system: Exploring the process perspective on divorce. *Family Relations*, 69(5), 1100-1112.
7. Goldenberg, A., and Goldenberg, H. (2016). *Family Therapy*. Hamidreza Hossein Shahi Barvati and Siamak Naqshbandi. Tehran: Ravan Publishing. (Year of publication of the work in the original language, 2009).
8. Thomas, R., Shelley-Tremblay, J., & Joanning, H. (2021). Anxiety Explains the differentiation of self-inventory: Implications for Bowenian Approaches to Marriage and Family Therapy. *The American Journal of Family Therapy*, 49(5), 534-549.
9. Young, J. E. (2005). *Young Schema Questionnaire-Short Form*. New York: Schema Therapy Institute.
10. Molgora, S., Fenaroli, V., Acquati, C., De Donno, A., Baldini, M. P., & Saita, E. (2019). Examining the role of dyadic coping on the marital adjustment of couples undergoing assisted reproductive technology (ART). *Frontiers in psychology*, 10, 415.

11. Sbarra, D. A., & Borelli, J. L. (2019). Attachment reorganization following divorce: Normative processes and individual differences. *Current opinion in psychology*, 25, 71-75.
12. Bahadori Khosroshahi, J., Khanjani, Z. (2013). The relationship between coping strategies and self-efficacy with students' tendency to drug abuse. *Journal of Knowledge and Research in Applied Psychology*. 14 (3): 80- 90.
13. Zurlo, M. C., Cattaneo Della Volta, M. F., & Vallone, F. (2019). The association between stressful life events and perceived quality of life among women attending infertility treatments: the moderating role of coping strategies and perceived couple's dyadic adjustment. *BMC Public Health*, 19(1), 1-8.
14. Suri, G., Kariminejad, K., Ghanbari, V., and Karimian, S. (2016). The role of the differentiation of self-inventory and spiritual intelligence in predicting emotional divorce. The first international conference on modern research in the field of educational sciences and psychology. Tehran.
15. Turner MJ. (2016). Rational Emotive Behavior Therapy (REBT), Irrational and Rational Beliefs, and the Mental Health of Athletes. *Front Psychol*. 20;7:1423.
16. Ditzen, B., Hahlweg, K., Fehm-Wolfsdorf, G., & Baucom, D. (2013). Assisting couples to develop healthy relationships: effects of couples' relationship education on cortisol. *Psychoneuroendocrinology*. 10(36): 597-607.
17. Hyland P, Shevlin M, Adamson G, Boduszek D. (2014). The organization of irrational beliefs in posttraumatic stress symptomology: testing the predictions of REBT theory using structural equation modelling. *J Clin Psychol*. 70(1):48-59.
18. Akbari, A., Azimi, Z., Talebi, S., and Fahimi, S. (2016). Predicting a couple's emotional divorce based on initial maladaptive schemas, emotion regulation, and its components. *Journal of Personality and Behavioral Knowledge*. 11 (4): 1/15.
19. La'lzadeh, A., Asghari Ebrahimabad, M. J., and Hesar Sorkhi, R. (2015). Investigating the role of early maladaptive schemas in predicting emotional divorce. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*. 7 (2): 9-19.
20. Razavi Nematollahi, V., and Mehrabi Gohari, M. (2014). Predicting emotional divorce in women based on emotion regulation and early maladaptive schemas. First International Conference on Psychology and Educational Sciences. Tehran.
21. Kim MA. (2015). Effects of rational emotive behavior therapy for senior nursing students on coping strategies and self-efficacy. *Nurse Educ Today*. (3):456-60.
22. Scourfield J, Evans R. (2015). Why Might Men Be More at Risk of Suicide After a Relationship Breakdown? *Sociological Insights. Am J Mens Health*. 9(5):380-4.
23. Mozas-Alonso, M., Oliver, J., & Berástegui, A. (2022). The differentiation of self-inventory and its relationship with marital satisfaction and parenting styles in a Spanish sample of adolescents' parents. *Plos one*, 17(3), e0265436.

## Tables

**Table 1: Mean and standard deviation of differentiation of self-inventory scores among couples in Isfahan**

| Research variable  | Mean  | umber | Standard deviation |
|--------------------|-------|-------|--------------------|
| Emotional reaction | 16.23 | 300   | 2.08               |

|                                          |        |     |       |
|------------------------------------------|--------|-----|-------|
| <b>My position</b>                       | 21.38  | 300 | 4.12  |
| <b>Emotional cut</b>                     | 19.14  | 300 | 2.66  |
| <b>Fusion</b>                            | 20.77  | 300 | 4.19  |
| <b>Differentiation of self-inventory</b> | 132.69 | 300 | 11.55 |

**Table 2: Mean and standard deviation in the area of cut / rejection scores among couples in Isfahan**

|                                        | <b>Research variable</b>             | <b>Mean</b> | <b>Standard deviation</b> |
|----------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|-------------|---------------------------|
| <b>First area:<br/>cut / rejection</b> | <b>Instability</b>                   | 9.30        | 2.01                      |
|                                        | <b>Misconduct</b>                    | 9.20        | 2.40                      |
|                                        | <b>Emotional deprivation</b>         | 8.05        | 2.12                      |
|                                        | <b>Disability / Shame</b>            | 9.17        | 3.43                      |
|                                        | <b>Social isolation / alienation</b> | 8.56        | 3.12                      |

**Table 3: Mean and standard deviation of scores in the area of Self-management/ Impaired performance among couples in Isfahan.**

|                                             | <b>Research variable</b>       | <b>Mean</b> | <b>Standard deviation</b> |
|---------------------------------------------|--------------------------------|-------------|---------------------------|
| <b>The second area:<br/>and dysfunction</b> | <b>Dependence / Inadequacy</b> | 8.47        | 2.11                      |
|                                             | <b>Vulnerability</b>           | 8.19        | 2.05                      |
|                                             | <b>Immature / Trapped</b>      | 8.55        | 2.10                      |
|                                             | <b>Failure</b>                 | 9.16        | 2.44                      |

**Table 4: Mean and standard deviation of scores in the area of impaired constraints among couples in Isfahan**

|                                         | <b>Research variable</b>                      | <b>Mean</b> | <b>Standard deviation</b> |
|-----------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|-------------|---------------------------|
| <b>Third area: Impaired Constraints</b> | <b>Entitlement / Hauteur</b>                  | 9.54        | 3.14                      |
|                                         | <b>Continence and Inadequate self-control</b> | 8.13        | 3                         |

**Table 5: Mean and standard deviation in the area of other-orientation scores among couples in Isfahan**

|                                           | Research variable     | Mean | Standard deviation |
|-------------------------------------------|-----------------------|------|--------------------|
| <b>Fourth area:<br/>Other-orientation</b> | <b>Obedience</b>      | 8.90 | 2.55               |
|                                           | <b>Self-Sacrifice</b> | 7.14 | 2.11               |

**Table 6: Mean and standard deviation of scores in the doubt area among couples in Isfahan**

|                                                       | Research variable                             | Mean | Standard deviation |
|-------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|------|--------------------|
| <b>Fifth area: excessive<br/>doubt and Inhibition</b> | <b>Emotional inhibition</b>                   | 8.56 | 2.34               |
|                                                       | <b>Stubborn criterion /<br/>over-critical</b> | 8.69 | 3.11               |

**Table No. 7: Mean and standard deviation of coping style scores among couples in Isfahan**

| Research variable      | Mean  | Number | Standard deviation |
|------------------------|-------|--------|--------------------|
| <b>Problem solving</b> | 16.75 | 300    | 2.15               |
| <b>Emotional</b>       | 19.30 | 300    | 3.11               |
| <b>Avoidance</b>       | 22.66 | 300    | 4.82               |

**Table 8: Kolmogorov-Smirnov test result for normal distribution of scores.**

| Source of change         | Kolmogorov-S<br>statistics | Significance<br>level |
|--------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------|
| <b>Emotional Divorce</b> | 2.408                      | 0.942                 |

|                                   |       |       |
|-----------------------------------|-------|-------|
| Differentiation of self-inventory | 1.327 | 0.762 |
| Initial maladaptive schema        | 1.692 | 0.895 |
| Coping style                      | 1.217 | 0.601 |

**Table 9: Investigation of skewness and elongation for normality of research data**

| Variables                         | skewness | Elongation |
|-----------------------------------|----------|------------|
| Emotional Divorce                 | 0.573    | 0.352      |
| Differentiation of self-inventory | 0.612    | 0.596      |
| Initial maladaptive schema        | -0.803   | -0.664     |
| Coping style                      | 0.448    | 0.369      |

**Table 10: Durbin-Watson test results for observational independence**

| Research models                                  | Durbin-Watson (self-corre |
|--------------------------------------------------|---------------------------|
| Emotional divorce **<br>self-differentiation     | 1.699                     |
| Emotional divorce **<br>Early maladaptive schema | 2.01                      |
| Emotional divorce **<br>coping style             | 1.64                      |

**Table 11: Goodness-of-fit Test Results**

| F Statistics of Goodness-Of-Fit test | F Table | Significance Level | Error level |
|--------------------------------------|---------|--------------------|-------------|
| 61.4                                 | 4.12    | 0.001              | 05.0        |

**Table 12: Tolerance coefficient and variance inflation factor of research variables.**

| Variables         | Tolerance coefficient | Variance Inflation factor (VIF) |
|-------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------------|
| Emotional Divorce | 0.215                 | 4.640                           |

|                                   |       |       |
|-----------------------------------|-------|-------|
| Differentiation of self-inventory | 0.660 | 2.514 |
| Initial maladaptive schema        | 0.577 | 1.584 |
| Coping style                      | 0.254 | 1.335 |

**Table 13: Results of Pearson correlation coefficient between Differentiation of self-inventory and emotional divorce in couples in Isfahan**

| Predictive variables | Emotional Divorce | P-value |
|----------------------|-------------------|---------|
| Emotional reaction   | ** -0.216         | 0.001   |
| My position          | ** -0.288         | 0.002   |
| Emotional cut        | ** -0.169         | 0.007   |
| Fusion               | ** -0.210         | 0.003   |
| Self-differentiation | ** -0.567         | 0.001   |

P05/0>

**Table 14: Summary results of the differentiation of self-inventory regression analysis model and emotional divorce**

| Model | The correlation coefficient | The coefficient of determination | Adjusted R | Standard deviation of estimated error |
|-------|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|------------|---------------------------------------|
| 1     | 0.296                       | 0.292                            | 0.330      | 5.411                                 |

**Table 15: Results of Multivariate Regression Analysis of Emotional Divorce Based on differentiation of self-inventory among Couples in Isfahan**

|   | Model       | Non-standard coefficients |                  | Standard coefficients | T      | F       | P-value |
|---|-------------|---------------------------|------------------|-----------------------|--------|---------|---------|
|   |             | B                         | N error criteria | B                     |        |         |         |
| 1 | Fixed       | 230.62                    | 0.910            | -                     | 44.614 | 204.258 | 0.004   |
|   | My position | 0.888                     | 0.024            | 0.255                 | 7.213  |         |         |

**Table 16: Results of Pearson correlation coefficient between initial maladaptive schema and emotional divorce among couples in Isfahan**

| Predictive variables                     | Emotional Divorce | P-value |
|------------------------------------------|-------------------|---------|
| Cut / Rejection                          | **0.199           | 0.006   |
| self-management and impaired performance | **0.174           | 0.003   |
| impaired constraints                     | **0.129           | 0.001   |
| Other-orientation                        | **0.163           | 0.001   |
| excessive doubt and inhibition           | **0.185           | 0.005   |
| Total score of inconsistent schema       | **0.466           | 0.002   |

P>0.05\*\*

**Table 17: Summary results of emotional divorce regression analysis model and initial maladaptive schema.**

| Model | The correlation coefficient | The coefficient of determination | Adjusted R | Standard deviation of estimated error |
|-------|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|------------|---------------------------------------|
| 1     | 0.296                       | 0.292                            | 0.170      | 3.900                                 |

**Table 18: Results of Multivariate Regression Analysis of Emotional Divorce Based on Initial Maladaptive Schema in Isfahan Couples**

|   | Model                                    | Non-standard coefficients |                  | Standard coefficients |  | T      | F       | P-value |
|---|------------------------------------------|---------------------------|------------------|-----------------------|--|--------|---------|---------|
|   |                                          | B                         | N error criteria | B                     |  |        |         |         |
| 1 | Fixed                                    | 196.42                    | 0.643            | -                     |  | 31.055 |         |         |
|   | self-management and impaired performance | 0.635                     | 0.019            | 0.307                 |  | 4.819  | 123.664 | 0.002   |

**Table 19: Results of Pearson correlation coefficient between coping style and emotional divorce in couples in Isfahan**

| Predictive variables   | Emotional Divorce | P-value |
|------------------------|-------------------|---------|
| Problem solving coping | ** -0.290         | 0.003   |
| Emotional coping       | ** 0.162          | 0.002   |
| Avoidance              | ** 0.318          | 0.002   |

**Table 20: Summary results of emotional divorce regression analysis model and coping style**

| Model | The correlation coefficient | The coefficient of determination | Adjusted R | Standard deviation of estimated error |
|-------|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|------------|---------------------------------------|
| 1     | 0.230                       | 0.216                            | 0.193      | 2.725                                 |

**Table No. 21: Results of multivariate regression analysis of emotional divorce based on coping style among couples in Isfahan**

|   | Model                 | Non-standard coefficients |                  | Standard coefficients |  | T      | F      | P-value |
|---|-----------------------|---------------------------|------------------|-----------------------|--|--------|--------|---------|
|   |                       | B                         | N error criteria | B                     |  |        |        |         |
| 1 | Fixed                 | 165.23                    | 0.438            | ---                   |  | 28.974 |        |         |
|   | avoidant coping style | 0.584                     | 0.021            | 0.291                 |  | 3.266  | 90.531 | 0.004   |

**Table No. 22: Table of Coefficients (Indicators) Multivariate Regression Analysis Predicting Emotional Divorce Based on Resilience and Cognitive-Emotional Regulation**

| Predictive variable      | Predictive variables                     | Standard beta value | Constant | Square 2R | T value | P     |
|--------------------------|------------------------------------------|---------------------|----------|-----------|---------|-------|
| <b>Emotional Divorce</b> | <b>differentiation of self-inventory</b> | 0.36                | 57.66    | 0.413     | 2.13    | 0.002 |
|                          | <b>initial maladaptive schemas</b>       | 0.44                |          |           | 4.22    | 0.001 |
|                          | <b>Problem solving coping</b>            | 0.25                |          |           | 1.18    | 0.000 |
|                          | <b>Emotional coping</b>                  | 0.36                |          |           | 2.55    | 0.001 |
|                          | <b>Avoidance</b>                         | 0.38                |          |           | 1.63    | 0.000 |
|                          |                                          |                     |          |           |         |       |