



In Maintaining a Marriage, Examination of the Relationship Between Mutual Happiness Levels, and Adult Attachment Styles and Psychological Resilience Levels

Gülhan Dinç, Specialist Psychological Counselor, MONE, gulhan.dinc67@gmail.com

 0000-0002-6139-8767

M. Zeki İlgar, PhD, Biruni University, zilgar@biruni.edu.tr

 0000-0002-5516-0752

Keywords

Marriage
Divorce
Mutual Happiness
Adult Attachment Styles
Psychological Resilience

Article Info:

Received : 30-06-2021
Accepted : 10-01-2022
Published : 04-08-2022

Abstract

In this study, it was aimed to determine whether the relationship between mutual happiness levels and adult attachment styles and psychological resilience levels in maintaining a marriage differed significantly at the $p < .05$ level by examining in terms of gender and marital status. Based on the relational survey model, the sample of the study conducted in December 2020 consists of 405 people, 51 of whom are divorced, who participated in the Google Form Research Questionnaire invitation, which was published in order to reach the married and divorced adults in the researcher's communication pool. The data of the inventories filled in the Google form were transferred to the SPSS 26.0 program to be used in the process of finding answers to the problems of the study via Excel database. As a result of the study, following findings were reached. Mutual Happiness Levels of married and divorced adults did not differ significantly by gender. Mutual Happiness Levels of women and men did not differ significantly according to marital status. The sub-dimensions of Adult Attachment Style, Avoidant Attachment and Anxious/Ambivalent Attachment, of married and divorced adults did not differ significantly by gender, while Secure Attachment differed significantly. It was seen that the sub-dimensions of Adult Attachment Style of women and men, Avoidant Attachment, Anxious/Ambivalent Attachment and Secure Attachment, differed significantly according to marital status. Married and divorced adults did not differ significantly by gender in the Self-Perception, Structured Style, Social Competence and Social Resources sub-dimensions of Psychological Resilience for Adults, but significantly differed in the Planned Future and Family Cohesion sub-dimensions. Women and men did not differ significantly according to marital status in the Self-Perception, Planned Future, Structured Style and Social Resources sub-dimensions of Psychological Resilience for Adults, but significantly differed in the Social Competence and Family Cohesion sub-dimensions. The findings were discussed in the light of the literature and interpreted.

DOI: 10.52963/PERR_Biruni_V11.N2.01

To cite this article: Dinç, G., & İlgar, M. Z. (2022). In Maintaining a marriage, examination of the relationship between mutual happiness levels, and adult attachment styles and psychological resilience levels. *Psycho-Educational Research Reviews*, 11(2), 1-22. doi: 10.52963/PERR_Biruni_V11.N2.01

INTRODUCTION

As a person is a bio-psycho-social being, it is not possible to escape from close relationships such as family, marriage and couple relationships as long as it lives. The marital relationship, which represents the primary emotional attachment of the adult, is one of the areas where emotions and emotion transfer are most important in life. In the marital relationship, emotions are more aroused than in any other relationship, and it offers the person the opportunity to be mutually connected, to have their feelings and needs respected, to be the most important person for another person. Marriage, which is like the home of one's emotional life, provides trust, intimacy, openness and intense emotional expression. Marriage is an institution with its own social and psychological boundaries. Therefore, psychological resilience, secure attachment and mutual happiness relations are extremely important for a healthy marriage. Mutual happiness and secure attachment are associated with mental health and psychological resilience (Neria et al., 2001). Numerous studies have been conducted on the fact that psychological resilience is closely related to personal, social and familial characteristics (Siebert, 2005). Considering the familial characteristics of individuals with high psychological resilience; it is seen that they can manage the crisis they face, have high familial functionality and maintain a qualified and healthy relationship together (McCubbin & McCubbin, 1996).

Attachment is defined as the ongoing psychological relation between people, and it has been proven that the relation formed in the early period has a very important effect on the development of the individual and the behaviours that form the basis of their later life. The healthy and qualified relationship that individuals establish with their caregivers is the most important factor of psychological resilience (Olsson et al., 2003).

The framework of positive relationships; The family life cycle, which is the environment in which the concepts of living together, sharing experiences, the need to belong, the tendency not to be alone, and love are experienced. Love is a subject at the centre of positive psychology (Hendrick & Hendrick, 2009). People need other people. People have a pervasive motive to develop and maintain lasting, positive, and meaningful interpersonal relationships. People are motivated to form social relations and not to break them. Both cognitive and emotional processes develop around such relations. Positive relations are associated with positive outcomes, and negative relations are associated with negative outcomes (Baumeister & Leary, 1995).

Marriage harmony should not be seen as a labyrinth with hard-to-reach corridors. Marital harmony is a skill that couples can learn and turn into a lifestyle. One of the most important and basic principles of harmony is that individuals can make each other happy.

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

MARRIAGE AND DIVORCE

Marriage is the one of an important process in the life of individuals. It is a relationship system where two people share their lives, have a desire to live together, have different wishes, needs and interests, and also want to have a child. At the same time, it is a social phenomenon that puts the family on legitimate foundations. It is a universal institution where two people come together for a lasting togetherness and aim to maintain their own kind and interact with each other. Marriage is like the home of many people's emotional lives. Marriage is an institution with its own social and psychological limits. Marriage works well when these limits are well learned. It has been determined that personal characteristics, interaction style of the couple and psychological resilience are important factors besides happiness in the formation of stable and satisfactory marriages (Bradbury & Karney, 2004). Spouses who have the ability to regulate anger and negative emotions in their personal characteristics show a compatible marriage. Reason of fail in marriage not because conflicts increase, but because intimacy and emotional responsiveness decrease. In fact, the biggest factor that determines how stable a marriage will be is emotional insensitivity rather than conflict level (Johnson,

2020). Spouses who are similar in abilities, attitudes, interests, and moral values are more likely to achieve marital satisfaction, stay married, avoid conflict and infidelity, and provide a stable home environment for their children (Buss, 2000). If the difference between our equal and our spouse is minimal, the probability of infidelity is also minimal. If spouses support and appreciate each other, if their interaction style is based on respectful and open communication, satisfaction will be higher and this will lead to more happiness (Harvey & Pauwels, 2009). Couples with strong social support networks and whose expectations do not cause stress have higher marital satisfaction than others. It had been determined that happy people's capital is their spouses and beliefs (Myers, 2000). In a study in which 2000 cases in Germany were examined longitudinally for 19 years by (Lucas & Clark, 2006), it was determined that after the first increase in life satisfaction, married people gradually returned to their premarital levels within a period of about 5 years. (Soons et al., 2009) found that leaving and divorce reduced subjective well-being. People get married, but happiness in marriage is not stable. Demographic factors such as high level of education, high socio-economic status, similarity in interests, intelligence and personalities of spouses were found to be associated with marital satisfaction (Conger et al., 2010; Fincham & Beach, 2010; Gottman & Notarius, 2002; Newman & Newman, 2008).

Divorce has a many aspects, including legal termination of marriage and transactional and emotional ones. Family transformation that is through leaving, divorce, and remarriage can be conceptualized as a process involving a series of stages. Divorce is a normative transition within the family, not a deviation in the family cycle (Amato, 2010; Fine & Harvey, 2006). In the first stage, the decision to divorce appears and it is the basic duty to accept one's own share in the fall of a marriage. Many contextual factors contribute to divorce, such as age, socio-economic and occupational status, education level, marital status of parents, ethnic similarity, marital harmony and disagreement, and fidelity (Amato, 2010). The frequency of divorce is higher for couples with children, previously married, belonging to different ethnic groups and marital discord, and has a story of domestic violence and infidelity. Relationships that support the development of a person as an authentic and free individual become much more binding and satisfying, and develop intimacy and love. Real and satisfying partnerships will only be possible as long as men and women can accept and hear each other as human beings apart from their socially determined sexual roles.

MUTUAL HAPPINESS

One of the basic needs of human beings is happiness. Because when individuals are happy, they feel more successful and more secure. Happiness is the feeling we feel at the end of the work we do and it is our reward (Öztekin, 2016). Happiness is the consciousness of a state of contentment that shows integrity and continuity in a meaningful existence built on truth. Psycho-social research shows that the basic factors of happiness are love, friendship and emotional relations. True happiness is created by the relation of marriage. It is the same feeling of identity and mutuality that unites couples like friends. Identity and mutuality is being the other own with whom we share the same longings, the same likings and areas of interests, the same moral values, and probably the same life projects. We feel the highest level of self-awareness when we are in acts of mutuality that is based on goodness, altruism, and empathy. Therefore, our nature is capable of altruism and mutual happiness. We can heal the wounds of life, not only when we are loved, but also when we discover the treasures of goodness buried in our own hearts. The more you help others, the happier you are. The greater the happiness, the greater the desire to help others (Lenoir, 2016). Factors such as living conditions, education level, personal structure, age and gender affect the level of happiness of people. Happiness is not the ability to get what we want, but the ability to learn to be happy with what we get (Saygılı, 2015). It is known that women and men experience the same level of effect in point of individual happiness. Two approaches scrutinized the relationship between happiness and marriages are the selection and conservation hypothesis. According to choice theory, the reason why happy people have a higher marriage rate is that happy people are more attractive as marriage partners. According to the conservation hypothesis, the benefits and observable aspects of a marriage are mostly discussed. In

studies on married and single people have found that married people are happier than singles. A longitudinal study examining over 15,000 cases over 17 years found that divorced people were unhappy not only during a marriage but also before a marriage.

(Bradbury & Karney, 2004) state that the most important factor in maintaining a marriage is that the couples achieve happiness with each other. It has been determined that incompatible and unhappy marriages are negatively related to subjective well-being, life satisfaction, self-esteem and general health (Hawkins & Booth, 2005). As a result of the researches, it has been determined that happiness in a marriage is conceptualized as marital satisfaction and harmony of spouses, and if marital harmony is to be discussed, the concept of happiness in a marriage should also be scrutinized. Considering that ensuring happiness in marriage is an important part of an adult's private life, it is predicted that it will also contribute to the individual's subjective happiness.

ATTACHMENT

Relationships, especially family relationships, are one of the important topics of positive psychology (Diener & Diener McGavran, 2008). There are many theories about romantic love (Sternberg & Weis, 2006). One of them is the adult attachment theory. Based on John Bowlby's attachment theory, it has been suggested that the underlying process of romantic relationships and parent-child relationships is the same (Shaver & Mikulincer, 2006). According to the findings of the relationships established with the family during childhood, it was revealed that the individuals who stated that they had relationships based on warm love were securely attached, those who stated that they had rejecting or repulsive relationships were avoidant, and those who stated that their relationships were sometimes based on love and sometimes rejection or avoidance were anxious/ambivalent attachments.

It has been found that adults with a strong secure attachment style can establish satisfactory relationships characterized as trust, support, loyalty, closeness, emotional significance, and the ability to solve problems (Feeney, 2008).

1. Secure Attachment Style: It is a form of attachment that reflects a stable and positive emotional relation.
2. Avoidant Attachment Style: It is a form of attachment that reflects independence and a lack of emotional involvement.
3. Anxious/Ambivalent Attachment Style: It is a form of attachment that reflects duality, or both closeness and distance at the same time.

PSYCHOLOGICAL RESILIENCE

It is one of the most emphasized positive psychology concepts, the importance of which has been emphasized in recent studies (Singh & Yu, 2010; Walsh, 2003). When we look at its etymology, it means to resist, not giving up in the face of difficulties, to recover, to develop a method of coping against all kinds of difficulties, to stand up again. It is also an internal dynamic process. It includes psychological, social and physical compatibility (Luthar, Cicchetti & Becker, 2000). When we examine the studies in the literature on resistance, it is seen that it was first used in the field of developmental pathology in the 1960's and 1970's and it was discussed with the concepts of invincible sturdy child (Benard, 2004).

Psychological resilience offers people great opportunities for personal and professional development. Psychological resilience includes which is readiness related to success, personal qualifications, and character, to enable change. Healthy established relationships are the major factor that makes the individual resistant and helps to overcome difficult times. One of the strong character traits is psychological resilience, which is also mentioned in the literature as fortitude and indomitable. In the studies conducted in the same period, three factors of psychological resilience were emphasized

and the effects of the factors related to these three factors were discussed (Masten, 2007). These three factors focused on risk, proclivity and protectiveness. When it is said to risk factors, personal, familial and environmental effects should be considered. Because the problem and any means, structure and process that causes negative consequences of the problem is a risk factor (Luthar & Cichetti, 2000).

Personal risk factors are anti-social behaviours, stressful life processes, being a minority, difficult personality, being male and unavoidable medical problems. Familial risk factors are family history of dissociative disorders, pathological conditions (depression, alcohol use, etc.), violence, and divorce, growing up in an extended family, and having a mother who is a child bride. Environmental risk factors are low income level, poverty, negative friend groups, deviant environment, malnutrition, inability to meet the needs of the child (Luthar & Cichetti, 2000). Predisposition the ability that is a born out of habit is a state of being embraced, and the habitual tendency. The factor that reveals the predisposition is the experience of the more exaggerated negative life experiences or risk factors (Masten et al., 2009).

One of the most important factors that positively affect the psychological resilience of the individual is the environmental and social support systems. Psychological resilience has been examined with two approaches: individual-focused and variable-focused. In the individual-focused psychological resilience approach, it has been emphasized on the criteria and conditions that distinguish individuals from other individuals and make them resistant (Masten, 2007). In the variable-focused psychological resilience approach, on the other hand, risk factors, predisposition level and protective factors, compliance processes with statistical data and management processes have been emphasized (Masten et al., 2009). Although there are many factors that have a role in the explanation of psychological resilience, studies suggest that these factors can be grouped under three general categories (Haase, 2004). These categories family cohesion and support, personal structural characteristics and external support systems (social environment, colleagues, etc.) that can be expressed. In line with this point of view, (Friborg et al., 2005) propose a six-factor structure in the explanation of the resilience structure: self-perception, planned future, structured style, social competence, family cohesion, and social resources. Self-perception refers to a person's awareness of itself and its thoughts about who it is basically. Planned future points to the perspective of the person towards the future and the positive perspective has an important role in the process of psychological resilience. Structured style is an individual's personal characteristics such as self-confidence, strengths, and self-discipline. While social competence is a factor related to whether people are socially supported or not, family harmony shows the harmony of the person with their closest relatives. In this context, family cohesion and social support have an important role in the process of psychological resilience. Finally, social resources show the social relations that a person has. Another sub-branch of psychological resilience is social support, and this dimension has an important role in the success of the individual in coping with stressful situations. Those who have received adequate support from their environment during childhood and adolescence face the problems they encounter in adulthood and are more successful in producing solutions.

METHOD

RESEARCH DESIGN

In this study, the relational survey model, which is one of the general survey models of quantitative research methods, was used. Relational survey model aims to determine the existence of co-variance between two or more variables. In this model, it is tried to determine whether the variables change together, and if there is, how this happens (Karasar, 2011). In this study, it was aimed to determine whether the relationship between Mutual Happiness Levels and Adult Attachment Styles and Psychological Resilience Levels in Maintaining a Marriage differed significantly at the $p < .05$ level

by examining in terms of gender and marital status. In this context, the following hypotheses have been developed.

HYPOTHESES OF THE STUDY

1. In maintaining a marriage there is a significant relationship between Mutual Happiness Levels and Adult Attachment Styles.
2. In maintaining a marriage there is a significant relationship between Mutual Happiness Levels and Psychological Resilience Levels.
3. In maintaining a marriage there is a significant relationship between Adult Attachment Styles and Psychological Resilience Levels.
4. Mutual Happiness Levels of married individual is more than divorced.
5. Mutual Happiness Levels of men is more than women.
6. Adult Attachment of married individual is more than divorced.
7. Adult Attachment of men is more than women.
8. Psychological Resilience Levels of married individual is more than divorced.
9. Psychological Resilience Levels of men is more than women.

THE UNIVERSE AND SAMPLE

Based on the relational survey, the sample of the study conducted in December 2020 consists of 405 people, 51 of whom are divorced, who participated in the Google Form Research Questionnaire invitation, which was published in order to reach the married and divorced adults in the researcher's communication pool. Many divorced individuals who were reached and informed to participate in the research they refrained from filling out the research form because of their unwillingness to be visible and known, their mood disorders, their anxiety, and their perception of negative social pressure. The data of the inventories filled in the Google form were transferred to the SPSS 26.0 program to be used in the process of finding answers to the problems of the research via Excel database.

The mean scores of all dimensions of the variables were calculated, normality tests were performed, and it was evaluated that some data negatively affected the results. The average scores were converted to Z scores, and the data of 30 people who were found to have answered without being sensitive enough were found to be at extreme values (outside of the +/- 2.5 standard deviation values), so they were deleted and excluded from the process, and the analyses were continued with the data of 375 people. Before the analyses, the normality tests of all dimensions were repeated and it was seen that there was no missing data.

Descriptive Statistics of Variables and Normality Test Results are given in Table 1.

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics of Variables and Normality Test Results

	<i>Mutual Happiness Scale</i>	<i>Adult Attachment Style Scale</i>			<i>Psychological Resilience Scale for Adults</i>					
	<i>Mutual Happiness</i>	<i>Avoidant Attachment</i>	<i>Anxious/Ambivalent Attachment</i>	<i>Secure Attachment</i>	<i>Self Perception</i>	<i>Planned Future</i>	<i>Structured Style</i>	<i>Social Competence</i>	<i>Family Cohesion</i>	<i>Social Resources</i>
N	375	375	375	375	375	375	375	375	375	375
X	3.94	.51	.28	.56	3.95	3.84	3.76	3.73	3.89	3.97
Ss	.62	.28	.23	.27	.66	.86	.78	.74	.72	.73
Median	4.00	.50	.17	.50	4.00	4.00	3.75	3.67	4.00	4.14
Minimum	2.22	.00	.00	.00	2.33	1.50	1.75	1.83	2.00	2.14
Maximum	5.00	1.00	.83	1.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00
Sum	13295	1148	609	1255	8896	5766	5644	8396	8756	10427
Skewness	-.505	-.080	.646	-.014	-.256	-.567	-.155	-.136	-.366	-.473
Kurtosis	.046	-.940	-.318	-.785	-.792	-.329	-.670	-.700	-.445	-.698
Ss/Mean (%)	15.82	54.30	83.86	47.44	16.77	22.29	20.59	19.94	18.51	18.31
Kolmogorov-Smirnov - p	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000

DATA COLLECTION**PERSONAL INFORMATION FORM**

The Personal Information Form, consisting of 3 questions in total, was prepared by the researcher in order to obtain age, gender and marital status information from the research participants.

MUTUAL HAPPINESS SCALE

The Mutual Happiness Scale consists of a 5-point Likert-type rating system, one dimension and 9 questions. The total score is obtained from the total score of 9 items. There is no reverse item in the scale. The Turkish adaptation, validity and reliability study of the scale was carried out by (Ekşi, Demirci & Ses, 2017). Cronbach's alpha of The Mutual Happiness Scale used in the research is calculated as 0.765.

ADULT ATTACHMENT STYLE SCALE

The Adult Attachment Style Scale is based on the triple attachment model and consists of two parts. The first part was developed by (Hazan & Shaver, 1987). The second part of the scale was created by (Mikulincer et al., 1990). The original version of this section consists of 15 items and participants are asked to score between 1 and 7 for each item. The Turkish adaptation, validity and reliability study of the scale was first carried out by (Sabuncuoğlu & Berkem, 2006). However, while the internal consistency of the scale is acceptable for anxious/ambivalent and avoidant attachment (Cronbach's alpha= 0.61 and 0.66), it is low (0.42) for secure attachment. For this reason, the Turkish adaptation, validity and reliability study of the scale was re-performed by (Kesebir, Dereboy & Kökçü, 2012). As a result of this study, the items that were thought to be incomprehensible were divided and the number of items increased to 18. The 7-point Likert-type rating system used for scoring in the original version of the scale was removed and the items were evaluated in two categories as true and false. Cronbach's alpha of The Adult Attachment Style Scale used in the research is calculated as 0.692.

PSYCHOLOGICAL RESILIENCE SCALE FOR ADULTS

The Resilience Scale for Adults (YPDÖ), which was originally named Resilience Scale for Adults and was developed by (Friborg et al., 2006), was adapted into Turkish by (Basım & Çetin, 2011). This adaptation study was carried out on two different sample groups, students and employees. As a result of the confirmatory factor analyses performed on the student group to test the construct validity of the scale, a structure consisting of 6 factors and 33 items emerged as in the original scale: Self-Perception (1, 7, 13, 19, 28, 31), Planned Future (2, 8, 14, 20), Structured Style (3, 9, 15, 21), Social Competence (4, 10, 16, 22), 25, 29), Family Cohesion (5, 11, 17, 23, 26, 32), Social Resources (6, 12, 18, 24, 27, 30, 33).

In order to determine the criterion-dependent validity of the Psychological Resilience Scale for Adults Scale, the Social Comparison Scale (Şahin, Basım & Çetin, 2009), which is used to test people's positive or negative self-perceptions by comparing themselves with others, and the Locus of Control Scale (Dağ, 1991), which is used to test the level of external locus of control, were used. It was determined that there were statistically significant positive relationships between the Social Comparison Scale and all sub-dimensions of the Psychological Resilience Scale for Adults in both student and employee samples. On the other hand, it has been observed that the Locus of Control Scale has statistically significant negative correlations with the Self-Perception, Planned Future and Structured Style sub-dimensions of the Adult Resilience Scale in both student and employee samples.

As a result of the internal consistency analysis performed to test the reliability of Psychological Resilience Scale for Adults, the Cronbach Alpha value was calculated as (α) .86 for both the student and the employee group. The following correlational values (r) were found between the sub-dimensions as a result of the test-retest application performed on the student group with an interval

of 23 days: .72 for Self-Perception, .75 for Planned Future, .68 for Structured Style, .78 for Social Competence, .81 for Family Cohesion, .77 for Social Resources. Cronbach's alpha of The Resilience Scale for Adults used in the research is calculated as 0.857.

DATA ANALYSIS

The data of current study were analysed by using SPSS 26.0 program's Descriptive Statistics, Normality Tests, Pearson Correlation Analysis, Multivariate Linear Regression Analysis and Independent Sample T – Tests.

When Descriptive Statistics on Demographic Variables given in Table 2 are evaluated;

It was determined that married and divorced women have higher scores than men in terms of Avoidant and Anxious/Ambivalent Attachment and Social Competence and Social Resources, and they have lower scores than men in all other dimensions.

It was determined that married and divorced men have higher scores than women in all dimensions except for the Mutual Happiness Levels, Secure Attachment, Social Competence, and Social Resources, and have lower scores than women in terms of Avoidant and Anxious/Ambivalent Attachment styles.

It was determined that married adults have higher scores in terms of Mutual Happiness Levels, Secure Attachment styles, Planned Future, Social Competence, Family Cohesion and Social Resources, compared to divorced adults.

It was determined that the Avoidant and Anxious/Ambivalent Attachment styles, Self-Perception and Structured Style scores of divorced adults were higher than those of married adults.

Table 2. Descriptive Statistics on Demographic Variables

Demographic Variables	Options	Participant	Mutual Happiness		Avoidant Attachment		Anxious/Ambivalent Attachment		Secure Attachment		Self-Perception		Planned Future		Structured Style		Social Competence		Family Cohesion		Social Resources	
	Ranges	N	X	Ss	X	Ss	X	Ss	X	Ss	X	Ss	X	Ss	X	Ss	X	Ss	X	Ss	X	Ss
Gender	Female	290	3.92	.63	.51	.28	.28	.23	.54	.26	3.93	.69	3.80	.88	3.75	.79	3.77	.75	3.86	.75	3.98	.74
	Male	85	4.01	.61	.50	.28	.25	.21	.63	.27	4.02	.57	4.01	.76	3.81	.74	3.61	.71	4.03	.62	3.97	.68
Marital Status	Married	331	3.96	.61	.50	.27	.26	.22	.58	.25	3.94	.66	3.85	.86	3.75	.77	3.76	.73	3.93	.71	3.99	.73
	Divorced	44	3.79	.72	.60	.29	.38	.26	.40	.29	4.05	.70	3.81	.85	3.90	.79	3.50	.83	3.61	.74	3.83	.73

FINDINGS

The mean values of dimensions obtained from the answers given by the research participants to the questions asked on the 5-point Likert scales of Mutual Happiness and Psychological Resilience for Adults; Mutual Happiness ($X=3.94$), Self-Perception ($X=3.95$), Planned Future ($X=3.84$), Structured Style ($X=3.76$), Social Competence ($X=3.73$), Family Cohesion ($X=3.89$) and Social Resources ($X=3.97$); were determined in the range of 3.41 – 4.20 points, corresponding to a Likert 4 answer, “I largely agree”.

Pearson Correlation Analysis was performed to determine the correlation between the variables and the results are given in Table 3.

It has been determined that the correlation between the Mutual Happiness Scale and the 3 sub-dimensions of the Adult Attachment Style Scale is as follows.

- A weak negative and significant correlation was found between Mutual Happiness and Avoidant Attachment ($r(373)=-.290, p<.01$).
- A weak negative and significant correlation was found between Mutual Happiness and Anxious/Ambivalent Attachment ($r(373)=-.291, p<.01$).
- A weak positive and significant correlation was found between Mutual Happiness and Secure Attachment ($r(373)=.311, p<.01$).

As the scores of married and divorced adults from the Mutual Happiness Scale increase, the scores they get from the Secure Attachment sub-dimension of the Adult Attachment Style Scale increase, and the scores they get from the Avoidant Attachment and Anxious/Ambivalent Attachment sub-dimensions decrease. (Hypothesis 1, accepted according to Table 3.)

Table 3. Pearson Correlation Analysis Results Regarding the Relationship Between Variables

	Pearson Correlation Analysis Results									
	<i>Mutual Happiness Scale</i>	<i>Adult Attachment Style Scale</i>			<i>Psychological Resilience Scale for Adults</i>					
	<i>Mutual Happiness</i>	<i>Avoidant Attachment</i>	<i>Anxious/Ambivalent Attachment</i>	<i>Secure Attachment</i>	<i>Self-Perception</i>	<i>Planned Future</i>	<i>Structured Style</i>	<i>Social Competence</i>	<i>Family Cohesion</i>	<i>Social Resources</i>
Mutual Happiness	1	-.290**	-.291**	.311**	.391**	.423**	.248**	.331**	.354**	.381**
Avoidant Attachment	-.290**	1	.426**	-.443**	-.180**	-.228**	-.147**	-.329**	-.195**	-.337**
Anxious/Ambivalent Attachment	-.291**	.426**	1	-.137**	-.261**	-.224**	-.147**	-.128*	-.188**	-.235**
Secure Attachment	.311**	-.443**	-.137**	1	.180**	.238**	.068	.441**	.124*	.308**
Self-Perception	.391**	-.180**	-.261**	.180**	1	.636**	.470**	.401**	.392**	.548**
Planned Future	.423**	-.228**	-.224**	.238**	.636**	1	.487**	.347**	.458**	.472**
Structured Style	.248**	-.147**	-.147**	.068	.470**	.487**	1	.172**	.277**	.292**
Social Competence	.331**	-.329**	-.128*	.441**	.401**	.347**	.172**	1	.242**	.520**
Family Cohesion	.354**	-.195**	-.188**	.124*	.392**	.458**	.277**	.242**	1	.552**
Social Resources	.381**	-.337**	-.235**	.308**	.548**	.472**	.292**	.520**	.552**	1

** . The correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

* . The correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

It has been determined that the correlation between the Mutual Happiness Scale and the 6 sub-dimensions of the Psychological Resilience Scale for Adults is as follows.

- A weak positive and significant correlation was found between Mutual Happiness and Self-Perception ($r(373)=.391, p<.01$).
- A weak positive and significant correlation was found between Mutual Happiness and Planned Future ($r(373)=.423, p<.01$).
- A very weak positive and significant correlation was found between Mutual Happiness and Structured Style ($r(373)=.248, p<.01$).
- A weak positive and significant correlation was found between Mutual Happiness and Social Competence ($r(373)=.331, p<.01$).
- A weak positive and significant correlation was found between Mutual Happiness and Family Cohesion ($r(373)=.354, p<.01$).
- A weak positive and significant correlation was found between Mutual Happiness and Social Resources ($r(373)=.381, p<.01$).

As the scores of married and divorced adults from the Mutual Happiness Scale increase, the scores they get from all sub-dimensions of the Psychological Resilience Scale for Adults also increase. (Hypothesis 2, accepted according to Table 3.)

It was determined that the correlation between the 3 sub-dimensions of the Adult Attachment Style Scale and the 6 sub-dimensions of the Adult Psychological Resilience Scale is as follows.

- A very weak negative and significant correlation was found between Avoidant Attachment and Self-Perception ($r(373)=-.180, p<.01$).
- A very weak negative and significant correlation was found between Avoidant Attachment and Planned Future ($r(373)=-.228, p<.01$).
- A very weak negative and significant correlation was found between Avoidant Attachment and Structured Style ($r(373)=-.147, p<.01$).
- A weak negative and significant correlation was found between Avoidant Attachment and Social Competence ($r(373)=-.329, p<.01$).
- A very weak negative and significant correlation was found between Avoidant Attachment and Family Cohesion ($r(373)=-.195, p<.01$).
- A weak negative and significant correlation was found between Avoidant Attachment and Social Resources ($r(373)=-.337, p<.01$).
- A weak negative and significant correlation was found between Anxious/Ambivalent Attachment and Self-Perception ($r(373)=-.261, p<.01$).
- A very weak negative and significant correlation was found between Anxious/Ambivalent Attachment and Planned Future ($r(373)=-.224, p<.01$).
- A very weak negative and significant correlation was found between Anxious/Ambivalent Attachment and Structured Style ($r(373)=-.147, p<.01$).
- A very weak negative and significant correlation was found between Anxious/Ambivalent Attachment and Social Competence ($r(373)=-.128, p<.05$).
- A very weak negative and significant correlation was found between Anxious/Ambivalent Attachment and Family Cohesion ($r(373)=-.188, p<.01$).
- A very weak negative and significant correlation was found between Anxious/Ambivalent Attachment and Social Resources ($r(373)=-.235, p<.01$).
- A very weak positive and significant correlation was found between Secure Attachment and Self-Perception ($r(373)=.180, p<.01$).
- A very weak positive and significant correlation was found between Secure Attachment and Planned Future ($r(373)=.238, p<.01$).
- There is no correlation between Secure Attachment and Structured Style ($r(373)=.068$).

- A weak positive and significant correlation was found between Secure Attachment and Social Competence ($r(373)=.441, p<.01$).
- A very weak positive and significant correlation was found between Secure Attachment and Family Cohesion ($r(373)=.124, p<.05$).
- A weak positive and significant correlation was found between Secure Attachment and Social Resources ($r(373)=.308, p<.01$).

As the scores of married and divorced adults in the Adult Attachment Style Scale's Avoidant Attachment and Anxious/Ambivalent Attachment sub-dimensions decrease, the scores they get from all sub-dimensions of the Adults Psychological Resilience Scale increase. Points move in the opposite directions.

As the scores of married and divorced adults from the Secure Attachment sub-dimension of the Adult Attachment Style Scale increase, the scores they get from all sub-dimensions of the Adult Psychological Resilience Scale also increase. Points move in the same direction. (Hypothesis 3, accepted according to Table 3.)

Multivariate Linear Regression Analyses were conducted to determine whether the demographic factors of gender and marital status affect the dependent variables, if they do, in which direction and level. It was understood that there was no multicollinearity problem among the variables, and the Summary of Multivariate Linear Regression Analysis is given in Table 4.

Table 4. *Multivariate Linear Regression Analysis Summary Positive and Significant Predictions of Dependent Variables by Demographic Factors*

<i>Dependent Variables</i>		<i>Gender</i>		<i>Marital Status</i>	
1	Mutual Happiness	-		-	
2	Avoidant Attachment	-		✓	R ² _{adjusted} =.067
3	Anxious/Ambivalent Attachment	-		✓	R ² _{adjusted} =.063
4	Secure Attachment	-		✓	R ² _{adjusted} =.070
5	Self-Perception	-		-	
6	Planned Future	-		-	
7	Structured Style	-		-	
8	Social Competence	✓	R ² _{adjusted} =.044	-	
9	Family Cohesion	-		-	
10	Social Resources	-		-	

Note: It was determined that Mutual Happiness, Self-Perception, Planned Future, Structured Style, Family Cohesion and Social Resources dependent variables were not positively or significantly predicted by gender and marital status demographic factors.

Table 5. *Independent Samples T-Test Results Regarding Variables*

<i>Marital Status</i>		<i>Gender</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>X</i>	<i>Ss</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
Mutual Happiness Levels		Female	290	3.92	.63	373	-1.198	.232
		Male	85	4.01	.61			
	Married		331	3.96	.61	373	1.748	.081
		Divorced	44	3.79	.72			

Significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

It is seen that the Mutual Happiness Levels of women and men ($t(373)=1.748, p>.05$) do not differ significantly according to marital status. (Hypothesis 4, rejected according to Table 5.)

It is seen that the Mutual Happiness Levels of married and divorced adults ($t(373)=-1.198$, $p>.05$) do not differ significantly by gender. (Hypothesis 5, rejected according to Table 5.)

Table 6. Independent Samples T-Test Results Regarding Variables

Sub-Dimensions	Marital Status	Gender	N	X	Ss	df	t	p
Adult Attachment Styles	Avoidant Attachment	Female	290	.51	.28	373	.461	.645
		Male	85	.50	.28			
		Married	331	.50	.27	373	-2.261	.024
		Divorced	44	.60	.29			
		Female	290	.28	.23	373	.909	.364
		Male	85	.25	.21			
	Anxious/Ambivalent Attachment	Married	331	.26	.22	51.814	-3.039	.004
		Divorced	44	.38	.26			
		Female	290	.54	.26	373	-2.785	.006
		Male	85	.63	.27			
		Married	331	.58	.25	373	4.372	.000
		Divorced	44	.40	.29			

Significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

It was found that the sub-dimensions of Adult Attachment Style, Avoidant Attachment ($t(373)=-2.261$, $p<.05$), Anxious/Ambivalent Attachment ($t(51,814)=-3.039$, $p<.05$) and Secure Attachment ($t(373)=4.372$, $p<.05$), differed significantly according to marital status. (Hypothesis 6, accepted according to Table 6.)

It was determined that the sub-dimensions of Adult Attachment Style of married and divorced adults, Avoidant Attachment ($t(373)=.461$, $p>.05$) and Anxious/Ambivalent Attachment ($t(373)=.909$, $p>.05$), do not differ significantly by gender, while Secure Attachment ($t(373)=-2.785$, $p<.05$) differs significantly. (Hypothesis 7, accepted according to Table 6.)

Table 7. Independent Samples T-Test Results Regarding Variables

	Sub-Dimensions	Marital Status	Gender	N	X	Ss	df	t	p
Psychological Resilience for Adults	Self-Perception	Married	Female	290	3.93	.69	164.143	-1.194	.234
			Male	85	4.02	.57			
			Female	290	3.94	.66	373	-1.016	.310
			Male	85	4.05	.70			
	Planned Future	Married	Female	290	3.80	.88	155.318	-2.228	.027
			Male	85	4.01	.76			
			Female	290	3.85	.86	373	.259	.796
			Male	85	3.81	.85			
	Structured Style	Married	Female	290	3.75	.79	373	-.624	.533
			Male	85	3.81	.74			
			Female	290	3.75	.77	373	-1.232	.219
			Male	85	3.90	.79			
	Social Competence	Married	Female	290	3.77	.75	373	1.776	.077
			Male	85	3.61	.71			
			Female	290	3.76	.73	373	2.172	.030
			Male	85	3.50	.83			
	Family Cohesion	Married	Female	290	3.85	.75	162.838	-2.202	.029
			Male	85	4.03	.62			
			Female	290	3.93	.71	373	2.824	.005
			Male	85	3.61	.74			
Social Resources	Married	Female	290	3.97	.74	373	.108	.914	
		Male	85	3.97	.68				
		Female	290	3.99	.73	373	1.339	.181	
		Male	85	3.83	.73				

Significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

It was found that men and women did not differ significantly in the sub-dimensions of Self-Perception ($t(373)=-1.016, p>.05$), Planned Future ($t(373)=.259, p>.05$), Structured Style ($t(373)=-1.232, p>.05$) and Social Resources ($t(373)=1.339, p>.05$) of Psychological Resilience for Adults, while there was a significant difference in the sub-dimensions of Social Competence ($t(373)=2.172, p<.05$) and Family Cohesion ($t(373)=2.824, p<.05$). (Hypothesis 8, accepted according to Table 7.)

It was determined that married and divorced adults did not differ significantly in the sub-dimensions of Self-Perception ($t(164.143)=-1.194, p>.05$), Structured Style ($t(373)=-.624, p>.05$), Social Competence ($t(373)=1.776, p>.05$) and Social Resources ($t(373)=.108, p>.05$) of Psychological Resilience for Adults, while there was a significant difference in the Planned Future ($t(155.318)=-2.228, p<.05$) and Family Cohesion ($t(162.838)=-2.202, p<.05$) sub-dimensions. (Hypothesis 9, accepted according to Table 7.)

DISCUSSION, CONCLUSION AND IMPLICATIONS

It was found that Mutual Happiness Levels were related significantly to the sub-dimensions of Adult Attachment Styles: Avoidant Attachment, Anxious/Ambivalent Attachment and Secure Attachment, in maintaining a marriage, and this relationship were found to be in the same direction with Secure Attachment and in the opposite direction with Avoidant Attachment and Anxious/Ambivalent Attachment. (Hypothesis 1, accepted.)

Relationships can be a source of happiness and anxiety. Focusing and sharing positive events is very important in maintaining and satisfying a marriage. Marriages built with strong and secure relations feel deeper love. This situation is called happiness sharing. Attachment includes consistency in interaction, stability in relationship, and physical contact. The physical closeness established between the infant and the parent is used to describe how adults experience relationships with their romantic partners (Hazan & Shaver, 1987). The distribution of attachment styles may vary culturally. Attachment styles can change over time with new and different relationship experiences (Feeney, Noller & Roberts, 2000). There is a lot of research that shows that the vast majority of people are happier when they are connected than when they are not.

It was found that Mutual Happiness Levels are in the same direction and act together significantly with all sub-dimensions of Psychological Resilience for Adults in maintaining a marriage. (Hypothesis 2, accepted.)

Mutual close relationships are vital in maintaining a marriage. People, who take the time to build, strengthen and maintain relationships are happy. There is a positive relationship between happiness and love. Happiness is riveted with love. Love also develops altruism and empathy. Therefore, the mutual happiness that develops between the spouses expands the interest and builds healthy and psychologically resistant relationships. It is a fact that happiness is contagious. If the people we are in close relationship with are happy, we will be happy too (Fowler & Christakis, 2008). Happiness sharing allows building individual and social resources. Daily social support is a factor that increases happiness. Parameters that strengthen positive relationships such as interrelating, loving and feeling close are very important for social support. Psychological resilience and mutual happiness can be discovered, acquired, studied, developed, and make strengthen, balance, support each other, and also all people can have these characteristics, although it varies from person to person (Wood et al., 2011).

It was found that Adult Attachment Styles are associated with Psychological Resilience for Adults in maintaining a marriage, and this significant relationship is in the same direction with Secure Attachment and opposite with Avoidant Attachment and Anxious/Unstable Attachment. (Hypothesis 3, accepted.)

It is seen that psychological resilience and mutual happiness in maintaining a marriage have a positive effect on the individual in secure attachment, grasping their competences, realizing their goals and happy life.

It was found that Mutual Happiness Levels did not differ significantly according to marital status. (Hypothesis 4, rejected.)

It was found that Mutual Happiness Levels did not differ significantly by gender. (Hypothesis 5, rejected.)

Marriage is the most important of close relationships involving personal involvement, emotional attachment and constant interaction. Therefore, it is understood that the factors are ahead of affecting mutual happiness in maintaining a marriage rather than the demographic variables such as gender and marital status can be given for an example are the individual has issues such as irregular marriage and family relations, approach-avoidance conflicts, disorientation, and oscillation between clinging and

resentment (Carr, 2006). When the literature is scanned, it is seen that there are findings contrary to the research findings. There are researches findings that married people are happier than those who are divorced, separated, or never married (Diener & Diener McGarvan, 2008; Myers, 2000). The relationship between happiness and being married is valid in all countries and cultures (Stack & Eshleman, 1998).

In the national and international literature, it has been seen that the subject of mutual happiness is generally handled together with factors such as self-perception, empathic disposition and life satisfaction, and the studies that deal with demographic variables such as gender and marital status are very limited. There is a need for further research on mutual happiness and demographic variables together.

Although the spouses have similar views on being close and psychological resilience in the marital relationship, it has been determined that the perception of closeness and mutual happiness between men and women are different.

According to (Greeff & Malherbe, 2001), the emotional intimacy experiences of men and women are different from each other. For women, intimacy leads to satisfaction and happiness. On the other hand, men carry the effect of close relationship to other functional areas such as sexuality.

Mixed results are obtained in studies that examine mutual happiness in relationships according to gender differences. According to the surveys by (Cutrona, 1996), it indicates that men benefit from marriage more than women.

(Homans, 1961) pointed out that people who interact positively, as their interactions increase, they will like each other more, and their attraction to each other will increase. People have to be close to each other to be happy. According to this view, people in the same place will interact more often, find each other more attractive, which will increase their mutual happiness.

In a study conducted by (Acitelli, Rogers & Knee, 1999), it was revealed that women are more diligent than men because they think positively about their romantic relationships. However, positive thinking about the relationship, seeing oneself as a part of a couple, and the effects of having a couple identities on relationship satisfaction were found to be similar between men and women.

It was found that all sub-dimensions of Adult Attachment Styles differed significantly according to marital status. (Hypothesis 6, accepted.)

In studies conducted with married individuals, it has been revealed that those with the highest marital adjustment score have a secure attachment style, while those with the lowest adjustment score have an avoidant attachment style. Securely attached people are more resilient to adversity. Studies have shown that there is a negative relationship between insecure attachment styles and relationship satisfaction, and a positive relationship between secure attachment and relationship satisfaction (Feeney, 2002). As a relationship progresses, the attachment dimension also develops. Attachment is the declaration of an individual's intention to maintain the relationship. Observational studies have found that infants and parent interactions have an integrative effect.

It was found that Adult Attachment Styles did not differ significantly in the sub-dimensions of Avoidant Attachment and Anxious/Ambivalent Attachment according to gender, while it differs significantly in the Secure Attachment sub-dimension. (Hypothesis 7, accepted.)

According to the research findings, there was a significant gender difference in the secure attachment of married and divorced adults, since men can develop more stable and positive emotional relations than women. This difference is due to the characteristics of men and women and the difference in the values they give to their relationships (Burger, 2006). Studies show that father's love is as important as mother's love in the development and functionality of infants and children.

It was found that the Self-Perception, Planned Future, Structured Style, and Social Resources sub-dimensions of psychological resilience for adults did not differ significantly according to marital status, while the Social Competence and Family Cohesion sub-dimensions differ significantly. (Hypothesis 8, accepted.)

In divorce anxiety increases and health gets worse. Negative emotions are experienced, the individual is crushed and even risk factors for suicide may develop (Myers, 2000). When the literature is examined, it has been found that divorced people are in a worse situation than married people in many respects (Amato, 2000). It has been found that close relationships and family cohesion are very important parameters in maintaining a marriage. With the divorce, the regular family life deteriorates and the discord in the fragmented family structure emerges.

It was found that the Self-Perception, Structured Style, Social Competence and Social Resources sub-dimensions of psychological Resilience for adults did not differ significantly by gender, while the Planned Future and Family Cohesion sub-dimensions differ significantly. (Hypothesis 9, accepted.)

Divorce has negative economic consequences, especially since it reduces income for women (Barber & Eccles, 1992). It has been determined that the lack of social support causes a negative perception of women's happiness levels. Women seek social support when they are anxious or struggling with something.

It is thought that it would be meaningful to determine the effects of demographic factors such as age, occupation and duration of being married in a new research study. In addition, it is thought that it would be effective to conduct this study in a larger study group and in different cultures. It is predicted that conducting the same studies in focus groups consisting of married and divorced adults will contribute to reaching more inclusive findings with the aim of examining Mutual Happiness Levels, Adult Attachment Styles and Psychological Resilience for Adults in maintaining of a marriage.

In the research findings, it was seen that mutual happiness and attachment styles were significant predictors of the maintaining of marriage. From this point of view, seminars on mutual happiness, secure attachment and psychological resilience should be given by family counselors, information and psycho-education processes should be developed in order to develop and maintain quality relationships between spouses and thus reduce divorce rates.

Although there are valid and reliable scales evaluating the compatibility between spouses in our country, it is considered that scales specific to our culture should be developed in this regard.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTION

This study was prepared by the first author under the supervision of the second author.

REFERENCES

- Acitelli, L. K., Rogers, S., & Knee, C. R. (1999). The role of identity in the link between relationship thinking and relationship satisfaction. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 16(5), 591-618. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0265407599165003>
- Amato, P. R. (2000). The consequences of divorce for adults and children. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 62(4), 1269-1287. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3737.2000.01269.x>
- Amato, P. R. (2010). Research on divorce: Continuing trends and new developments. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 7(3), 650-666. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3737.2010.00723.x>
- Barber, B. L. & Eccles, J. S. (1992). Long-term influence of divorce and single parenting on adolescent family- and work-related values, behaviors, and aspirations. *Psychological Bulletin*, 111(1), 108-126. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.111.1.108>
- Basım, H. N. & Çetin, F. (2011). Yetişkinler için Psikolojik Dayanıklılık Ölçeği'nin güvenilirlik ve geçerlilik çalışması. *Türk Psikiyatri Dergisi*, 22(2), 104-114.

- Baumeister, R. F. & Leary, M. R. (1995). The need to belong: Desire for interpersonal attachments as a fundamental human motivation. *Psychological Bulletin*, 117(3), 497-529. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.117.3.497>
- Benard, B. (2004). *Resiliency: What We Have Learned*, San Francisco, CA: WestEd
<http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.7721/chilyoutenvi.15.1.0432>
- Bradbury, T. N. & Karney, B. R. (2004). Understanding and altering the longitudinal course of marriage. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 66(4), 862-879. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0022-2445.2004.00059.x>
- Burger, J. M. (2006). *Kişilik (çev. İnan Deniz Erguvan Sarıoğlu)*. İstanbul: Kaknüs Yayınları,
- Buss, D. M. (2000). The evolution of happiness. *American Psychologist*, 55(1), 15-23. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.55.1.15>
- Carr, A. (2006). *Family therapy: Concepts process and practice (Second Edition)*. Chichester: Wiley,
- Conger, R. D., Conger, K. J. & Martin, M. J. (2010). Socioeconomic status, family processes, and individual development. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 72(3), 685-704. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3737.2010.00725.x>
- Cutrona, C. E. (1996). *Social support in couples*, Thousand Oaks, California, CA: Sage
- Dağ, İ. (1991). Belirti Tarama Listesi (Scl-90-R)'nin üniversite öğrencileri için güvenilirliği ve geçerliği. *Türk Psikiyatri Dergisi*, 2(1), 5-12.
- Diener, M. L. & Diener McGavran, M. B. (2008). What makes people happy?: A developmental approach to the literature on family relationships and well-being. In M. Eid & R. J. Larsen (Eds.), *The Science of Subjective Well-Being* (pp. 347-375). New York: Guilford Press.
- Ekşi, H., Demirci, İ. & Ses, F. (2017). Psychometric features of the interdependent happiness Scale (IHS). XIV. *European Conference on Social and Behavioral Sciences*, Odessa, Ukraine.
- Feeney, J. A., Noller, P. & Roberts, N. (2000). Attachment and close relationships. In C. Hendrick & S. S. Hendrick (Eds.), *Close relationships: A source-book* (pp. 185-201). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage
- Feeney, J. A. (2002). Attachment, Marital Interaction, and Relationship Satisfaction: A Diary Study. *Personal Relationships*, 9(1), 39-55. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1475-6811.00003>
- Feeney, J. A. (2008). Adult Romantic Attachment: Developments in the Study of Couple Relationships. In J. Cassidy and P. R. Shaver (Eds.), *Handbook of Attachment: Theory, Research, and Clinical Applications (Second Edition)* (pp. 456-481). New York: Guilford Press.
- Fincham, F. D. & Beach, S. R. H. (2010). Marriage in the new millenium: A decade in review. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 72(3), 630-649. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3737.2010.00722.x>
- Fine, M. A. & Harvey, J. H. (2006). *Handbook of Divorce and Relationship Dissolution*, Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.,
- Friborg, O., Barlaug, D., Martinussen, M., Rosenvinge, J. H. & Hjemdal, O. (2005). Resilience in relation to personality and intelligence. *International Journal of Methods in Psychiatric Research*, 14(1), 29-42. <https://doi.org/10.1002/mpr.15>
- Friborg, O., Hjemdal, O., Rosenvinge, J. H. & Martinussen, M. (2006). A new rating scale for adult resilience: what are the central protective resources behind healthy adjustment? *International Journal of Methods in Psychiatric Research*, 12(2), 65-76. <https://doi.org/10.1002/mpr.143>
- Fowler, J. H. & Christakis, N. A. (2008). Dynamic spread of happiness in a large social network: Longitudinal analysis over 20 years in the Framingham Heart Study. *British Medical Journal*, 337(a2338), 1-9. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.a2338>
- Gottman, J. M. & Notarius, C. I. (2002). Marital research in the 20th Century and a research agenda for the 21rd Century. *Family Process*, 41(2), 159-197. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1545-5300.2002.41203.x>
- Greeff, A. P. & Malherbe, H. L. (2001). Intimacy and marital satisfaction in spouses. *Journal of Sex and Marital Therapy*, 27(3), 247-257. <https://doi.org/10.1080/009262301750257100>
- Haase, J. E. (2004). The Adolescent Resilience Model as a guide to interventions. *Journal of Pediatric Oncology Nursing*, 21(5), 289-299. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1043454204267922>

- Harvey, J. H. & Pauwels, B. G. (2009). Relationship Connection: A redux of the role of minding and the quality of feeling special in the enhancement of closeness. In S. J. Lopez & C. R. Snyder (Eds.), *Oxford handbook of positive psychology (Second Edition)* (pp. 385-392). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Hawkins, D. N. & Booth, A. (2005). Unhappily ever after: Effects of long term, low quality marriages on well-being. *Social Forces*, 84(1), 451-471. <https://doi.org/10.1353/sof.2005.0103>
- Hazan, C. & Shaver, P. (1987). Romantic love conceptualized as an attachment process. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 52(3), 511-524. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.52.3.511>
- Hendrick, C. & Hendrick, S. S. (2009). Love. In S. J. Lopez & C.R. Snyder (Eds.), *Oxford handbook of positive psychology (Second Edition)* (pp. 447-454). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Hisli-Şahin, N., Basım, H. N. & Çetin, F. (2009). Kişilerarası çatışma çözme yaklaşımlarında kendilik algısı ve kontrol odağı. *Türk Psikiyatri Dergisi*, 20(2), 153-163.
- Homans, G. C. (1961). *Social behavior: Its elementary forms*, New York: Har-court, Brace & World
- Johnson, S. (2020). *Bana sıkıca sarıl (p. 40)*. Ankara: Ck Yayınevi,
- Karasar, N. (2011). *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemi (11. Baskı)*. Ankara: Nobel Yayınevi,
- Kesebir, S., Dereboy, F. & Kökçü, F. (2012). Erişkin Bağlanma biçimi ölçeği geçerlilik ve güvenilirlik çalışması. *Yeni Symposium*, 50(2), 99-104.
- Lenoir, F. (2016). *Mutluluk üstüne felsefi bir yolculuk*. İstanbul: Bilge Kültür Sanat.
- Lucas, R. E. & Clark, A. E. (2006). Do people really adapt to marriage. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 7, 405-426. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10902-006-9001-x>
- Luthar, S. S. & Cicchetti, D. (2000). The construct of resilience: implications for interventions and social policies. *Development and Psychopathology*, 12(4), 857-885. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0954579400004156>
- Luthar, S. S., Cicchetti, D. & Becker, B. (2000). Research on Resilience: Response to Commentaries. *Child Development*, 71(3), 573-575. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8624.00168>
- Masten, A. S. (2007). Resilience in developing systems: Progress and Promise as the Fourth Wave Rises. *Development and Psychopathology*, 19(3), 921-930. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0954579407000442>
- Masten, A. S., Cutuli, J. J., Herbers, J. E. & Reed, M. G. J. (2009). Resilience in development. In C. R. Snyder & S. J. Lopez (Eds), *The Oxford handbook of positive psychology* (pp. 117-132). New York: Oxford University Press
- McCubbin, H. I. & McCubbin, M. A. (1996). Resiliency in families: A conceptual model of family adjustment and adaptation in response to stress and crises. In H. I. McCubbin, A. I. Thompson, & M. A. McCubbin (Eds.), *Family assesment: resiliency, coping and adaptation-inventories for research and practice* (pp. 1-64). Madison: University of Wisconsin System
- Mikulincer, M., Florian, V. & Tolmacz, R. (1990). Attachment styles and fear of personal death: A case study of affect regulation. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 58(2), 273-280. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.58.2.273>
- Myers, D. G. (2000). The funds, friends and faith of happy people. *American Psychologist*, 55(1), 56-67. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.55.1.56>
- Neria, Y., Guttman-Steinmetz, S., Koenen, K., Levinovsky, L., Zakin, G. & Dekel, R. (2001). Do attachment and hardiness relate to each other and to mental health in real-life stress? *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 18(6), 844-858. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0265407501186006>
- Newman, B. M. & Newman, P. R. (2008). *Development through life (Tenth Edition)*. Pasific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole,
- Olsson, C. A., Bond, L., Burns, J. M., Vella-Brodrick D. A. & Sawyer, S. M. (2003). Adolescent resilience: A concept analysis. *Journal of Adolescence*, 26(1), 1-11. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-1971\(02\)00118-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-1971(02)00118-5)
- Öztekin, H. (2016). *Mutlu insanların küçük sırları (1. Baskı)*. Nokta e-kitap,
- Rohner, R. P. & Veneziano, R. A. (2001). The importance of father love: History and contemporary evidence. *Review of General Psychology*, 5(4), 382-405. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1089-2680.5.4.382>
- Sabuncuoğlu, O. & Berkem, M. (2006). Bağlanma biçimi ve doğum sonrası depresyon belirtileri arasındaki ilişki: Türkiye'den bulgular. *Türk Psikiyatri Dergisi*, 17(4), 252-258.
- Saygılı, S. (2015). *Evlilikte Mutluluk Sanatı (17. Baskı)*. İstanbul: Türdav Yayın Grubu,

- Siebert, Al. (2005). *The resiliency advantage: Master change, thrive under pressure, and bounce back from setbacks*, San Francisco: Berrett Koehler
- Singh, K. & Yu, N. X. (2010). Psychometric evaluation of the Connor-Davidson Resilience Scale (CD-RISC) In a sample of Indian students. *Journal of Psychology*, 1(1), 23-30. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09764224.2010.11885442>
- Shaver, P. R. & Mikulincer, M. (2006). A behavioural systems approach to romantic love relationships: attachment, care giving, and sex. In R. J. Sternberg & K. Weis (Eds.), *The New Psychology of Love* (pp. 36-64). New Haven CT: Yale University Press
- Soons, J. P. M., Liefbroer, A. C. & Kalmijn, M. (2009). The long-term consequences of relationships formation for subjective well-being. *Journal of Marriage and The Family*, 71(5), 1254-1270. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3737.2009.00667.x>
- Stack, S. & Eshleman, J. R. (1998). Marital status and happiness: A 17-nation study. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 60(2), 527-536. <https://doi.org/10.2307/353867>
- Sternberg, R. J. & Weis, K. (2006). *The new psychology of love*, New Haven CT: Yale University Press
- Walsh, F. (2003). Family Resilience: A framework for clinical practice. *Family Process*, 42(1), 1-18. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1545-5300.2003.00001.x>
- Wood, A. M., Linley, P. A., Maltby, J., Kashdan, T. B. & Hurling, R. (2011). Using personal and psychological strengths leads to increases in well-being over time: A longitudinal study and the development of the strengths use questionnaire. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 50(1), 15-19. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2010.08.004>