

Original Article: Investigating the Relationship between Personality and Coping Styles with Marital Depression

Mahjoubeh Zanganeh Gheshlaghi¹*, Rezvaneh Namazi Yousefi¹, Hosna Karimi¹

¹Department of Psychology, Central Tehran Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran



Citation M.Z. Gheshlaghi, R.N. Yousefi, H. Karimi. Investigating the Relationship between Personality and Coping Styles with Marital Depression. *Int. J. Adv. Stu. Hum. Soc. Sci.* 2021, 10(4):171-183.

 <https://doi.org/10.22034/ijshss.2021.282587.1052>



Article info:

Received: 02 January 2021

Accepted: 16 May 2021

Available Online: 18 May 2021

Checked for Plagiarism: Yes

Peer Reviewers Approved by:

Dr. Amir Samimi

Editor who Approved Publication:

Professor Dr. Ahmad Alipour

Keywords:

Personality, Marital Burnout, Excitement, Family.

ABSTRACT

The main purpose of this study was to investigate the relationship between personality and coping styles with marital burnout. Traditionally, the basis for starting a family is marriage. Marriage is the first and most important stage in the family life cycle in which the choice of a spouse is made and success in other stages of life depends on success in this stage. Increasing attention to the role of burnout in daily life and its effect in relation to various aspects of personality and the methods that people use to deal with this stress has led to numerous studies. Evidence suggests that personality is associated with both burnout and coping style. Marital burnout is a gradual decrease in emotional attachment to the spouse, which is accompanied by feelings of alienation, apathy and indifference between couples to each other and the replacement of negative emotions instead of positive emotions. The results of the study indicated that agreeing can predict marital burnout, but other factors do not predict marital burnout. The results also showed that among the coping styles, emotion-oriented style and avoidance style can predict marital burnout.

Introduction

Marriage is the most important event in a person's life and is the most important stage of the family life cycle. For this purpose, the existence of a set of knowledge and information in order to improve the quality of marriage is necessary. Personality traits are an important factor that affects a person's quality of life. Knowing personality can help a person to know himself and others better; through personality we

can find out how a person behaves in a particular situation and what are his preferences. Another factor that can be important in the quality of marriage is coping styles. They have the side of separation and divorce. Burnout is a physical, emotional, and mental fallout that results from a mismatch between expectations. Burnout is a gradual process and rarely occurs suddenly. In fact, intimacy and love gradually fade and as a result the feeling of general fatigue happens. In its most severe form, this burnout causes the relationship to collapse. Burnout, by definition, is a physical,

*Corresponding Author: Mahjoubeh Zanganeh Gheshlaghi (zanganehmahjoubeh@gmail.com)

emotional, and mental impairment that results from a chronic mismatch between expectations and reality [1-3].

Many researchers of the traits approach believe that traits can be adjusted based on five broader, bipolar dimensions. These dimensions are read as five major factors that are irritability, extraversion, adaptation, receptivity to experience and responsibility. Costa and McCrae (1997) have defined five personality traits as follows: Neuroticism is related to adaptation, emotional stability, incompatibility and neuroticism. Having negative emotions such as fear, sadness, arousal, anger, guilt, permanent and pervasive feelings are the basis of this scale. Extroverts are social people, but being social is just one of the characteristics of these people. In addition, they are decisive, active, and talkative in practice. These people love excitement and mobility and hope to succeed in the future. The Extraversion Scale reflects people's interest in developing their industry and work. Adaptation emphasizes the tendencies of interpersonal communication.

The person who agrees is basically altruistic, sympathetic to others, and eager to help them. The constituent elements are openness to experience, active perceptions, sensitivity to beauty, attention to inner emotional experiences and independent judgment. They are curious in the fertility of inner experiences and the world around them, and their lives are full of experience. Being responsible and conscientious means having self-control over the active process of designing, organization and execution of tasks.

Historical background of the five-factor personality model

McDougall (2009) discusses the breadth of specific meanings of character and personality in two different terms in his first publication on character and personality. He put forward a hypothesis in which he states that personality may be based on a broad analysis of five distinguishable factors, namely, temperament, intelligence, temperament, temperament, anger, and rage. Each of these factors is complex and has many variables. Clayidge (2018) states that a careful analysis of language will help to understand personality. Based on the linguistic or lexical hypothesis, the most important differences of individuals in human interactions are

expressed in specific terms in all languages of the world [4].

One of the first scientists to make this hypothesis was Sir Francis Galton (1869), who used a dictionary to estimate the number of descriptive attributes. His path was continued by Allport and Ozeri (1944) - who used the second edition of the dictionary - and later by Norman (1947) - who used the third edition of the dictionary.

Thurston (1947) first obtained 55 traits using factor analysis, but did not continue the analysis later. Instead, he re-analyzed the scales created by Guilford. The oblique rotations of the 13 Guilford Scales led to the creation of seven factors in Thurston's list. Another person who used factor analysis to examine personality traits was Cattell. He claimed to have identified at least a dozen agents. But when the kettle variables were later analyzed by others, only five reproducible factors were obtained. Fiske (1949) could not achieve more than five combined factors by factor analysis of 22 Cattell bipolar scales. Thiops (1957) and Crystal (1941) reported their factor analysis based on the 30 Cattell bipolar scales used in previous studies. They found five major factors in reviewing the biographies. These researchers conducted lengthy studies to gain predictive validity [5].

Norman (1947) in his early studies proved the five-factor model with a selected set of Cattell variables. He conducted an extensive research program in which the five-factor model was replaced by a broader model. He began by expanding the collection of character words in English. He then categorized these words into categories such as states, attributes, and maps, and finally gathered normative information about 2,900 adjective words. The five factors he achieved included happiness, pleasantness, conscientiousness, emotionality and culture. Burgata (2019) compared the structures obtained from self-measurements with those obtained from peer measurements and found five factors, which he named as boldness, lovability, responsibility, excitement, and intelligence [6].

Smith (1999) also compared the structures obtained from the three large specimens (N = 324, 521, and 593) and found five strong factors that he called extroversion, kinship, temperament, excitement, and delicacy [7].

Table 1. The main factors of personality in different approaches

5	4	3	2	1	Factor Approach
Wisdom Seeker	Compatibility	Desire to progress	Emotional control	Social adjustment	
Culture	Being emotional	Duty	Being pleasant	Happiness	Norman
Intelligence	Being emotional	responsibility	The ability to love	Courage	Borgeta
Delicacy	Being emotional	The power of character	Pleasure	Extraversion	Esmith
wits	Newroz's	Tendency to progress	Friendly company	Extraversion	Digman
flexibility	Nowruz's	Duty	Being pleasant	Extraversion	Casta
flexibility	Emotional stability	Duty	To be pleasant	Extraversion	Gledborg

International Journal of
Advanced Studies in
Humanities and Social Science

Five personality factors

Among the current theoretical approaches to personality and its characteristics, the approach of the five major personality factors in the last two decades has attracted significant reputation and research support. According to this model, human personality consists of five factors or basic personality traits that are independent but to some extent interrelated that leave their manifestations in their behaviors and interactions in different environments [8].

Research background

Numerous studies on marital burnout show that there is a significant relationship between burnout and irrational beliefs and the quality of marital relationships and marital burnout, and marital burnout and job burnout. Yousefi and Bagherian (2015) addressed the criteria of marriage and marital burnout as predictor variables of couples seeking divorce and willingness to continue living together in terms of demographic characteristics that were similar to those seeking divorce. The results of the study showed that the variables of marital burnout and the content criterion of marriage were able to significantly predict the group membership of individuals to the divorce applicant class and the desire to continue living together and can be effective in determining counseling strategies, especially in premarital counseling.

Naderi and Azadmanesh (2012) compared marital boredom, family performance and intimacy of male and female employees. The sample included 200 employees (100 females and 100 males). The results showed that there was a significant difference between male and female employees in marital boredom and intimacy, but no significant difference was observed in family performance between male and female employees.

Mansour et al. (2013) dealt with the relationship between marital boredom, sexual misconduct beliefs and sexual fulfillment in women with diabetes mate and compared it with women with non-diabetic spouses concluded that marital boredom, sexual dysfunctional beliefs and sexual fulfillment were lower than the mean and in the component of marital boredom and sexual dysfunctional beliefs had a higher mean than women with non-diabetic spouses [9].

According to these results, it seems that one of the important factors in creating or increasing marital boredom, intensifying sexual misconceptions about sexual function and low rates of sexual fulfillment in women is sexual dysfunction and dysfunction in the husband [10].

Pineans-Venans (2003) aimed at examining the relationship between job boredom and marriage and the consequences of job and marital counseling. There are six cultures so that there is an inseparable relationship between Lane's two life experiences and the effects of culture. Andi (2012) examined the relationship between emotional intelligence and the five major factors of personality. The results of the

study showed that there is a strong correlation between the five major factors of personality and emotional intelligence. This is while the correlation between conscientiousness and harmonization is stronger than other factors [11].

Research variables

The predictor variables of the present study are: Personality traits including irritability, extroversion, openness, agreeing, and being conscientious; and coping styles including problem-oriented style, emotion-oriented style, and avoidance style.

The criterion variable of the present study is marital burnout including physical fatigue, emotional fatigue, and mental fatigue.

Sample and Sampling Method

The sampling method in this study was multi-stage cluster. The Cochran's formula is used to determine the sample size. Cochran's formula is one of the most widely used methods for calculating statistical sample size. In this formula, the maximum allowable error (d) is usually equal to 0.05, the reliability coefficient is 0.95, $t = 1.94$ and the values of p and q are each equal to 0.5 and the population size is = N. The value of P is considered equal to 0.5. Because if $P = 0.5$, n finds its maximum possible value and this causes the sample to be large enough. After selecting the sample group, in order to conduct the research, those who have the inclusion criteria are invited to cooperate for the research. If the person is ready to participate in the research, the Neo Personality Traits Questionnaire, Coping Strategies and Marital Burnout Questionnaire will be completed by him/ her.

Questionnaires that are completed without motivation or incomplete will be excluded from the calculation and only questionnaires that have accurate and all questions will be counted.

Instruments

Marital Burnout Questionnaire

The Marital Boredom Scale is a self-assessment tool designed to measure the degree of marital boredom among couples. The questionnaire has 21 items that include 3 main components of physical

fatigue (e.g .feeling tired, mental laxity such as feeling worthless, frustrated and angry with your spouse). All of these items are answered on a seven-point scale. Level 1 indicates the lack of experience of the phrase and level 7 indicates the high experience of the phrase. Completing the CMB takes 15 to 20 minutes.

Determining the degree of boredom

Step 1: The points given to the following are added together:

1-2-4-5-7-9-9-10-11-12-13-16-15-16-19-19-21

Step 2: The points given to 3-4-19-20 are added together.

Third stage: The points of the second stage are reduced from the number 32.

Step 4: The points of the first stage are added to the third stage.

Step 5: The fourth step number is divisible by 21. The resulting number indicates the degree of boredom.

Validity and Validity of the CMB Scale

Validity coefficient evaluation shows that it has an internal consistency between the variables in the range of 0.94 and 0.97. Validity is confirmed by negative correlations with positive communication characteristics such as positive opinion about communication, quality Conversation, feeling of security, self-fulfillment, feeling of purpose, attraction and emotional attraction towards the spouse and the quality of their sexual relationship. Translated versions of CMB have been used successfully in intercultural studies in Norway, Hungary, Mexico, Spain, Portugal, Finland and Israel. As can be seen, CMB has internal consistency and a high and satisfactory reliability coefficient and is suitable for measuring the rate of marital boredom. The test-retest reliability coefficient was 0.77 for a one-month period, 0.74 for a two-month period and 0.45 for a four-month period. Internal persistence was measured for most subjects with constant alpha coefficients, which ranged from 0.91 to 0.93.

In Iran, Navidi (2015) measured this questionnaire for 240 samples of 1200 nurses and 120 teachers and reported Cronbach's alpha by 0.94. Cronbach's alpha of the Marital Burnout Questionnaire in the present study was 0.93.

List of five new personality factors (NEOPI and its revised form NEO-FFI-R)

They are personality tools developed by McCreery and Costa for the normal population and have been used extensively in research and clinical applications over the past quarter century. The original version was published in 1993 and the current version was published in 1992. Using factor analysis, Costa and McCray (1993) concluded that five dimensions could be used for individual differences in personality traits.

These five traits or factors are: Nervousness (N), Extroversion (E), Flexibility or Acceptance (O), Pleasure (A), Conscientiousness and Conscientiousness (C), NEO Personality Questionnaire. It is named after three primary factors (dedicated to evaluating these factors). The main form of this questionnaire is 240 items. This test provides a conceptual model that integrates research based on factor analysis of previous decades on personality building. The factors presented in this test are provided by logical combination and factor analysis studies and the subject of various researches has been the study of clinical samples and healthy adults. In this study, a 55-item questionnaire was used. In each question, the subject scores from zero to four, each of which indicates one of the five major personality factors. The factors are N (annoyance), E (extraversion), O (openness), A (agreeing) and C (being conscientious), respectively, which cover 12 questions each, respectively. In general, the subject achieves a score from zero to 49 on each scale.

Validity and reliability of NEO-FFI questionnaire

Regarding the validity of NEO-FFI, the results of several studies indicate that NEO-FFI subscales have good internal consistency. For example, Costa and McCray (1992) reported Cronbach's alpha coefficient between 0.49 (for agreement) and 0.94 (for annoyance). Holden (1999) also reported the alpha coefficient of these five factors in the range of 0.74 (for openness) to 0.97 (for distress). The results of Moradian and Nazlak's (1995) studies also indicate that Cronbach's alpha of irritability, extroversion, openness, agreement and conscientiousness are 0.94, 0.49, 0.74, 0.93, 0.93, respectively. In the present study, Cronbach's alpha of irritability, extroversion, openness,

agreement and conscientiousness are equal to 0.27, 0.12, 0.19, 0.13 and 0.39, respectively. The total alpha of the questionnaire is 0.55. The NEO-FFI questionnaire in Iran has been standardized by Grossi (1998). Validity of this questionnaire using test-retest method for 209 students with an interval of 3 months was 0.93, 0.49, 0.90, 0.79, 0.79 for factors N, E, O, A, and C, respectively.

In addition, Mollazadeh (2012) reported that test-retest coefficients in 39 days in the case of 74 children of control, were 0.93, 0.79, 0.73, 0.79, 0.93 for irritability, external Orientation, openness, agreement and conscience, respectively. Cronbach's alpha was 0.94 for irritability, 0.93 for extraversion, 0.74 for openness, 0.74 for consent, 0.97 for conscientiousness, and 0.93 for total alpha.

Stress Coping Strategies Scale (CISS)

This questionnaire was prepared by Andler and Parker (2012) and translated by Akbarzadeh (2019). This test consists of 49 items whose answers have been determined by the Likert scale from never (1) to always (5). The CISS questionnaire covers three main areas of coping behaviors:

- Problem-oriented or active approach to the problem in order to manage and solve it,
- Emotional confrontation or focusing on emotional responses to the problem, and
- Avoiding confrontation or escape from the situation.

The questions for each subscale are:

- Aproblem-solving style: 1-2-4-10-15-21-24-27-34-39-41-42-43-45-47,
- Exciting style: 5-7-9-13-16-16-19-19-22-25-29-30-34-35-39-79 and
- Avoidance style: 3-4-9-11-12-19-20-23-29-31-32-33-37-40-45-49.

Due to the fact that it is 5-level Likert, the maximum score for each substance is 5 and the minimum is 1. The subject must answer all the questions. If the subject has not answered 5 questions or less than 5 questions, the researcher can mark option 3 on these questions at the time of scoring, but, if more than 5 questions are unanswered, the questionnaire will be scored.

The range of variation of the three types of coping behaviors is such that the score of each of the three coping styles, i.e., problem-oriented,

emotion-oriented and avoidance, is from 16 to 90. In other words, the dominant confrontation method is determined by the score obtained in the test.

That is, if each of the behaviors scores higher, that behavior is considered as a way of coping with the individual.

Reliability and validity of CISS coping styles questionnaire

To obtain the reliability of the Stress Coping Styles Questionnaire in the group of students, Cronbach's alpha was used, showing 0.92. The validity coefficient of the questionnaire with stressful situations was obtained at a high level through Cronbach's alpha in Qureshi research.

The validity of the questionnaire has also been proven during research conducted in Iran. In order to calculate the correlation of the factors of the stress coping questionnaire, Pearson correlation coefficient was used.

Data analysis

In this method, according to the research topic and the collected data, we used descriptive statistical

methods such as frequency distribution tables, mean and standard deviation to study the sample distribution and describe the sample status in terms of the desired indicators.

In the inferential statistics section, we used Pearson correlation coefficient and regression for significance test and considered the level of significance (rejecting or accepting the hypothesis) for all tests as $P < 0.05$.

Research data were analyzed using SPSS-21 software. In the performed tests, the level of $P < 0.05$ was considered significant. In this paper, first the descriptive findings were examined, then according to the considered hypotheses, the relationship between the variables was investigated using Pearson correlation coefficient and regression analysis.

Descriptive research findings

As shown in Table (2), out of 159 subjects participating in the study, the age range of the subjects was from 23 to 45 years and the mean age of the sample was 34.19 years. It should be noted that all participants in the present study were women.

Table 2. Mean and standard deviation of subjects by age

The standard deviation	average	Maximum	Minimum	Number	variable
5/04	34/19	45	23	159	Age

International Journal of
Advanced Studies in
Humanities and Social Science

Table 3. Mean and standard deviation of five personality factors variables

The standard deviation	average	Maximum	Minimum	Number	variable
2/9	29	40	23	159	Psychosis
3/45	25/92	34	16	159	Extraversion
3/77	27/19	39	19	159	Openness
3/7	23/16	32	12	159	Agree
4/4	24/11	39	16	159	Conscientiousness

International Journal of
Advanced Studies in
Humanities and Social Science

As shown in Table 4, the mean of the variables of coping styles, problem-oriented, emotion-oriented, avoidance, are 45.974, 42.05, and 40.79,

respectively. The mean of marital burnout variables, physical fatigue, emotional fatigue, mental fatigue, is 23, 21, and 22, respectively.

Table 4. Mean and standard deviation of variables of coping styles and marital burnout

The standard deviation	average	Maximum	Minimum	Number	variable
10/04	45/04	73	31	159	Circuit issue
11/57	42/05	74	21	159	Excitement circuit
9/4	40/79	47	25	159	Avoidance
3/4	23	40	9	159	Physical fatigue
4/5	21	39	7	159	Emotional fatigue
5/5	22	47	9	159	Mental fatigue

International Journal of Advanced Studies in Humanities and Social Science

Table 5. Correlation coefficients of variables of coping styles and marital burnout

Total burnout score	Mental fatigue	Emotional fatigue	Physical fatigue	Avoidance style	Excitement style	Circuit problem style	Variables
						0.98	Problem-oriented style
					0.98	0/03	Excitement style
				0.98	**0/21	**0/33	Avoidance style
			0.98	-0/16	**0/24	-0/05	Physical fatigue
		0.98	**0/90	**0/24	**0/35	-0/16	Emotional fatigue
	0.98	**0/70	**0/41	*-0/21	**0/41	*-0/19	Mental fatigue
0.99	**0/93	**0/92	**0/97	**0/23	**0/39	-0/13	Total burnout score

International Journal of Advanced Studies in Humanities and Social Science

Table 6. Regression results for predicting marital burnout by personality traits

Sig	R2	R	F	Ms	Df	SS	Sources of change
				1/27	5	4/34	Regression
0/03	0/09	0/29	2/49	0/50	139	70/27	Remaining
					163	74/43	Total

International Journal of Advanced Studies in Humanities and Social Science

Regression coefficients of predictor variables show that agreement (fourth factor of personality traits), $\beta = 0.23$, $t = 2.3$, can predict marital burnout, but other factors predict burnout. They are not married.

Table 7. Results of regression analysis for predicting marital burnout by coping styles

Significance level	t	β	Standard estimation error	B	Predictive variables
0/5	-0/59	-0/04	0/004	-0/003	Problem-oriented style
0/001	4/13	0/79	0/005	0/02	Exciting style
0/001	-4/04	-0/32	0/007	-0/02	Avoidance style

International Journal of Advanced Studies in Humanities and Social Science

Table 8. Regression Results for Predicting Marital Burnout by Personality Traits and Coping Styles

Sig	R2	R	F	Ms	df	SS	Sources of change
				3/12	9	25/004	Regression
0/001	0/32	0/57	9/19	0/39	135	51/43	Remaining
					163	74/43	Total

International Journal of Advanced Studies in Humanities and Social Science

The regression coefficient of the predictor variables shows that openness with $\beta = -0.27$, $t = -2.9$, agree with $\beta = 0.22$, $t = 2.5$, excitatory style

with $\beta = 0.47$, $t = 5.9$ and avoidance style with $\beta = -0.34$, $t = 4.4$, can predict marital burnout.

Table 9. Results of regression analysis to predict marital burnout by personality traits and coping style

Significance level	t	β	Standard estimation error	B	Predictive variables
0/7	0/3	0/02	0/01	0/005	Psychosis
0/4	0/49	0/03	0/01	0/009	Extroversion
0/004	-2/9	-0/27	0/01	-0/05	Openness
0/01	2/5	0/22	0/01	0/04	Agree
0/4	0/91	0/04	0/01	0/01	Conscientiousness
0/4	0/49	0/04	0/004	0/004	Problematic style
0/001	5/9	0/47	0/005	0/03	Excitement style
0/001	-4/45	-0/34	0/007	-0/03	Avoidance style

International Journal of
Advanced Studies in
Humanities and Social Science

The results of stepwise regression show that in the first step, the excitatory style entered the equation and the regression model with $F = 24.77$ at the level of $P < 0.001$ is significant.

It can be said that 0.16 variance of marital burnout is explained by emotion-oriented style, a subscale of coping style. In the second step, avoidance style entered the equation. Regression model in the second step with $F = 24.29$ at the level of $P < 0.001$ is significant.

In this model, 0.25 variance of marital burnout is explained by excitatory style and avoidance style. In the second step, the excitatory style with a coefficient of 0.45 and the avoidance style with a coefficient of -0.33 can predict marital burnout. In the third step, agreeing (subscales of personality traits) entered the regression equation. The regression model is significant in the third step with $F = 19.29$ at the level of $P < 0.001$. In this model, 0.29 variance of marital burnout is explained by coping style, emotion-oriented and agreeing. In the third step, the emotion-oriented style with a coefficient of 0.41, the avoidance style with a coefficient of -0.34 and agreeing with a coefficient of 0.16 can predict marital burnout.

In the fourth step, openness, a subscale of personality traits, was inserted into the equation. In this step, the model with $F = 16.21$ can explain 0.31 variance of the criterion variable. In the fourth step, each of the variables of excitatory style, avoidance style, agreement and openness with beta coefficients of 0.47, -0.33, 0.23, -0.22, respectively, can predict marital burnout.

Regression analysis was used to predict physical fatigue (components of marital burnout) based on the variables of personality traits and coping style. The results showed that the observed F was significant ($F = 4.16$) and the predictor variables together / 19.0 explain the variance of physical fatigue. Multiple correlations between variables were obtained by 0.45 ($R = 0.45$).

The regression coefficients of the predictor variables show that openness, a subscale of personality traits, $\beta = -0.31$, $t = -3.1$, excitatory style with $\beta = 0.34$, $t = 3.9$, avoidance style with $\beta = -0.29$, $t = -3.3$, can predict physical fatigue, but other factors do not predict physical fatigue. The results are shown in Table 10.

Table 10. Results of regression analysis to predict physical fatigue by personality traits and coping style

Significance level	t	β	Standard estimation error	B	Predictive variables
0/5	0/59	0/04	0/19	0/1	Psychiatry
0/3	0/9	0/09	0/15	0/16	Extraversion
0/002	-3/1	-0/31	0/16	-0/5	Openness

0/04	1/9	0/19	0/16	0/3	Agree
0/3	0/9	0/09	0/12	0/11	Conscientiousness
0/1	1/3	0/12	0/05	0/09	Problematic style
0/001	3/9	0/34	0/04	0/19	Exciting style
0/001	-3/3	-0/29	0/04	-0/21	Avoidance style

International Journal of Advanced Studies in Humanities and Social Science

The results of stepwise regression show that in the first step, the emotion-oriented style entered the equation and the regression model with $F = 10.73$ is significant at the level of $P < 0.001$.

It can be said that 0.07 variance of physical fatigue is explained by emotion-oriented style, a coping style subscale. In the second step, the

avoidance style was fed into the equation. The regression model is significant in the second step with $F = 9.42$ at the level of $P < 0.001$. In this model, 0.12 variance of physical fatigue is explained by excitatory and avoidant style. In this step, emotion-oriented and avoidance styles with a coefficient of 0.31 and -0.22, respectively, can predict physical fatigue.

Table 11. Stepwise regression to predict physical fatigue by personality traits and coping styles

Sig	t	β	B	R2	R	F	Predictive variable	Step
0/001	3/2	0/24	0/16	0/07	0/24	10/73	Exciting style	1
0/001	3/9	0/31	0/19				Exciting style	2
0/005	-2/9	-0/22	-0/19	0/12	0/34	9/42	Avoidance style	

International Journal of Advanced Studies in Humanities and Social Science

Regression analysis was used to predict emotional fatigue, components of marital burnout, based on the variables of personality traits and coping style. The results showed that the observed

F was significant ($F = 7.99$) and the predictor variables were 32 / 0 explain the variance of emotional fatigue. Multiple correlation between variables was also 0.54 ($R = 0.54$).

Table 12. Regression to predict emotional fatigue by personality traits and coping styles

Sig	R2	R	F	Ms	df	SS	Sources of change
				245/45	9	1955/7	Regression
						4124/9	Remaining
0/001	0/32	0/54	7/99	30/57	163	5592/4	Total

International Journal of Advanced Studies in Humanities and Social Science

The regression coefficients of the predictor variables show that openness (subscale of personality traits), $\beta = 0.19$, $t = 2.07$, agreement

with $\beta = -0.30$, $t = -3.3$, emotion-oriented style with $\beta = 0.45$, $t = 5.4$, and avoidance style with $\beta = -0.39$, $t = -4.9$, can predict emotional fatigue.

Table 13. Regression analysis for predicting emotional fatigue by personality traits and coping style

Significance level	t	β	Standard estimation error	B	Predictive variables
0/4	-0/41	0/04	0/16	-0/04	Psychiatry
0/3	0/94	0/04	0/16	0/12	Extraversion
0/04	2/07	0/19	0/15	-0/50	Openness
0/002	-3/2	-0/30	0/15	0/32	Agree
0/3	0/9	0/09	0/11	0/11	Conscientiousness
0/3	0/9	0/07	0/05	0/04	Problematic style
0/001	5/4	0/45	0/04	0/24	Exciting style
0/001	-4/9	-0/39	0/04	-0/3	Avoidance style

International Journal of Advanced Studies in Humanities and Social Science

The results of stepwise regression show that in the first step, the emotion-oriented style was fed into the equation and the regression model with $F = 20.45$ at the level of $P < 0.001$ is significant. It can be said that 0.12 variance of the emotional fatigue subscale is explained by the emotion-oriented style. In the second step, avoidance was put in the equation. The regression model is significant in the second step with $F = 23.45$ at the level of $P < 0.001$.

In this model, 0.25 variance of emotional fatigue is explained by emotion-oriented and avoidant style. In the second step, the excitatory style with a coefficient of impact of 0.43 and the avoidance style with a coefficient of impact of -0.34 can predict emotional fatigue. In the third step, the opening entered the regression equation. The regression model is significant in the third step with

$F = 19.43$ at the level of $P < 0.001$. In this model, 0.27 variance of emotional fatigue is explained by emotion-oriented style, avoidance style and openness.

In the third step, the excitatory style with an impact factor of 0.49, the avoidance style with an impact factor of -0.35 and the openness with an impact factor of -0.19 can predict emotional fatigue. In the fourth step, agreeing, a personality traits subscale, entered the equation. In this step, the model with $F = 15.45$ can explain 0.30 variance of the criterion variable. In the fourth step, each of the variables of emotion-oriented style, avoidance style, openness and agreement with beta coefficients of 0.45, -0.34, -0.24, 0.20, respectively, can predict emotional fatigue.

Table 14. Stepwise regression to predict emotional fatigue by personality traits and coping style

Sig	t	β	B	R2	R	F	Predictive variable	Step
0/001	4/45	0/35	0/2	0/12	0/35	20/45	Exciting style	1
0/001	5/9	0/43	0/24	0/25	0/50	23/45	Exciting style	2
0/001	-4/9	-0/34	-0/27				Avoidance style	
0/001	4/27	0/49	0/29				Exciting style	
0/001	-4/79	-0/35	-0/27	0/27	0/52	19/43	Avoidance style	3
0/03	-2/19	-0/19	-0/29				Openness	
0/001	5/97	0/45	0/24				Exciting style	
0/001	-4/97	-0/34	-0/27	0/30	0/55	15/45	Avoidance style	4
0/003	-2/99	-0/24	-0/40				Openness	
0/009	2/45	0/20	0/34				Agree	

International Journal of
Advanced Studies in
Humanities and Social Science

Regression analysis was used to predict mental fatigue, components of marital burnout, based on the variables of personality traits and coping style. The results showed that the observed F was

significant ($F = 7.90$) and the predictor variables were 31. / 0 explaining the variance of mental fatigue. Multiple correlation between variables was also 0.54 ($R = 0.54$).

Table 15. Regression results for predicting mental fatigue by personality traits and coping styles

Sig	R2	R	F	Ms	df	SS	Sources of change
0/001	0/31	0/54	7/90	169/07 22/42	9 135 163	16000/5 3024/9 4527/5	Regression Remaining Total

International Journal of
Advanced Studies in
Humanities and Social Science

The regression coefficients of the predictor variables show that agreement, a subscale of personality traits, $\beta = 0.20$, $t = 2.3$ and emotion style

with $\beta = 0.49$, $t = 5.9$, avoidance style with $\beta = -0.30$, $t = 3.9$ can predict mental fatigue.

Table 16. Results of regression analysis to predict mental fatigue by personality traits and coping style

Significance level	T	β	Standard estimation error	B	Predictive variables
0/9	-0/1	-0/009	0/16	-/01	Psychiatry
0/5	-0/45	-0/05	0/12	-0/07	Extraversion
0/1	-1/3	-0/12	0/13	-0/19	Openness
0/02	2/3	0/2	0/13	0/31	Agree
0/9	0/19	0/01	0/1	0/01	Conscientiousness
0/5	-0/52	-0/04	0/04	-0/02	Problematic style
0/001	5/9	0/49	0/03	0/23	Exciting style
0/001	-3/9	-0/30	0/05	-0/20	Avoidance style

International Journal of Advanced Studies in Humanities and Social Science

The results of stepwise regression show that in the first step, the emotion-oriented style entered the equation and the regression model with $F = 30.19$ at the level of $P < 0.001$ is significant. It can be said that 0.19 variance of the mental fatigue subscale is explained by the excitatory style.

In the second step, avoidance entered the equation. The regression model is significant in the second step with $F = 24.45$ at the level of $P < 0.001$. In this model, 0.24 variance of mental fatigue is explained by emotion-oriented and avoidant style.

In the second step, excitatory style with a coefficient of impact of 0.49 and avoidance style

with a coefficient of impact of -0.32 can predict mental fatigue. In the third step, agreeing entered the regression equation. The regression model is significant in the third step with $F = 19.59$ at the level of $P < 0.001$.

In this model, 0.29 variance of mental fatigue is explained by emotion-oriented style, avoidance style and agreeing style. In the third step, the emotion-oriented style with an impact factor of 0.45, the avoidance style with an impact factor of -0.32 and agreeing with the impact factor of 0.15 have the power to predict mental fatigue.

Table 17. Stepwise regression to predict mental fatigue by personality traits and coping style

Sig	t	β	B	R2	R	F	Predictive variable	Step
0/001	5/4	0/41	0/2	0/19	0/41	30/19	Exciting style	1
0/001	4/45	0/49	0/23	0/24	0/52	24/45	Exciting style	2
0/001	-4/34	-0/32	-0/21				Avoidance style	
0/001	5/91	0/45	0/21	0/29	0/54	19/59	Exciting style	3
0/001	-4/49	-0/32	-0/21				Avoidance style	
0/03	2/12	0/15	0/23				Agree	

International Journal of Advanced Studies in Humanities and Social Science

Conclusion

Burnout is a physical, emotional, and mental fallout that results from a mismatch between expectations. Burnout is a gradual process and rarely occurs suddenly. In fact, intimacy and love gradually fade accompanied by the feeling of general fatigue. In its most severe form, burnout causes decay. Burnout is by definition a physical, emotional, and mental exhaustion caused by a chronic mismatch between expectations and reality. Burnout occurs when a couple realizes that despite all their efforts, the

relationship has given and will never give any particular meaning to their lives (Van Pellet, 2009). The accumulation of stress that weakens love, the gradual increase in fatigue and monotony, and the accumulation of small resentments contribute to depression. A study of the theories and models proposed in the field of marriage clarifies that it is important to realize that various factors affect the stability and invisibility of marriage. One of the most important factors is the personality traits of spouses. The five-factor personality model is one of

the proposed models for the influence of personality factors. Using this model, researchers have examined the role of personality traits in marital adjustment. This model examines the five personality traits of nervousness, extroversion, openness, agreement and conscience.

Coping or coping is a person's specific cognitive, emotional, and behavioral effort to control external and internal demands that threaten or challenge the individual. In other words, coping is a person's attempt to deal with the stressor, resisting or coping with any effort, healthy or unhealthy, conscious or unconscious to prevent, eliminate or weaken stressors, or tolerate their effects, in a way that minimizes harm. According to the studies conducted in the research literature and due to the importance of personality traits and coping style, a logical relationship can be established between these two components and marital burnout.

Therefore, in this study, the researcher intended to predict marital burnout based on personality traits and coping styles. Pearson correlation test and regression analysis were used to examine the research questions and hypotheses. Many researchers of the traits approach believe that traits can be adjusted based on five broader, bipolar dimensions. These dimensions are considered as five major factors that are irritability, extroversion, adaptability, receptivity to experience and responsibility. In their theory, they have defined five personality traits in this way; neuroticism is related to adaptation, emotional stability, incompatibility and neuroticism. Having negative emotions such as fear, sadness, arousal, anger, guilt, permanent and pervasive feelings are the basis of this scale.

Extroverts are social people, but being social is just one of the characteristics of these people. In addition, they are decisive, active, and talkative in practice. These people love excitement and mobility and hope to succeed in the future. The Extraversion Scale reflects people's interest in developing their industry and work.

Adaptation emphasizes the tendencies of interpersonal communication. The person who agrees is basically altruistic, sympathetic to others, and eager to help them. The constituent elements are openness to experience, active perceptions, sensitivity to beauty, attention to inner emotional

experiences and independent judgment. They are curious in the fertility of inner experiences and the world around them, and their lives are full of experience. Being responsible and conscientious means having self-control to the active process of design, organization and execution of tasks.

Andler and Parker (1997) proposed three types of coping styles, including problem-oriented coping style, emotional-coping coping style, and avoidance coping style. In problem-solving style, the person focuses on the problem and tries to solve it.

In this style, the person collects information about the stressful event, thinks about it, evaluates the resources it has, and plans to use the resources available to them. Emotional coping emphasizes the control of emotions and emotional reactions. In this style of coping, people experience emotion and cope with crying, anger and shouting with psychological pressure.

In the avoidance coping style, the person tries to make cognitive changes and move away from stressful realities, and by distancing himself from the problem, he tries to escape and try to get emotional support. In this case, the person seeks to restore the disturbed calmness that has arisen due to the stressful situation and tries to relieve himself from the existing turmoil and distress.

Marital burnout is a gradual decrease in emotional attachment to the spouse, which is accompanied by feelings of alienation, apathy and indifference between couples to each other and the replacement of negative emotions instead of positive emotions. In a frustrated marriage, one or both couples, while experiencing feelings of separation from their spouse and diminished interests and relationships, have significant concerns about the growing deterioration of the relationship and the progression to separation and divorce. In order to explain the results of this hypothesis, we can point to the close relationship between the logic of personality traits and coping styles with marital burnout.

In this way, the emotions, behaviors and lifestyles of people are rooted in their personality traits and the way they take a stand on issues. Having a special type of personality trait and a certain style of dealing with problems can be a predictor and sometimes the cause of marital

burnout, because in marital burnout, it is the causes and factors of personality and confrontation that cause its formation. Having an undesirable and non-standard personality trait in marital relationships predicts marital burnout, and also the use of unverifiable and superficial coping style ends the couple's warm relationship with coldness and burnout.

References

- [1] P. Patre, S.M. Joshi, *Journal of Guidance, Control, and Dynamics*, **2014**, *37*, [[crossref](#)], [[Google Scholar](#)], [[Publisher](#)]
- [2] E.A. Mahdiraji, M. Amiri, *Journal of Engineering Technology and Applied Sciences*. **2020**, *5*, 133-147. [[crossref](#)], [[Google Scholar](#)], [[Publisher](#)]
- [3] B.J.M. Ale, L.J. Bellamy, J. Cooper, D. Ababei, D. Kurowicka, O. Morales, J. Spouge, *Reliability Engineering & System Safety*, **2010**, *95*, 469–477. [[crossref](#)], [[Google Scholar](#)], [[Publisher](#)]
- [4] J. Burkholder, G. Tao, *Journal of Guidance, Control, and Dynamics*. **2011**, *34*, 1605–1612. [[crossref](#)], [[Google Scholar](#)], [[Publisher](#)]
- [5] Z.X. Liu, C. Yuan, Y.M. Zhang, *IFAC-Papers OnLine* **2015**, *48*, 140-145. [[crossref](#)], [[Google Scholar](#)], [[Publisher](#)]
- [6] Z.X. Liu, C. Yuan, Y.M. Zhang, *Unmanned Systems*, **2016**, *4*, 197-211, [[crossref](#)], [[Google Scholar](#)], [[Publisher](#)]
- [7] L.P. Yan, D.H. Zhou, M.Y. Fu, Y.Q. Xia, *IETS Signal Processing*, **2010**, *4*, 728–739. [[crossref](#)], [[Google Scholar](#)], [[Publisher](#)]
- [8] E.A. Mahdiraji, *Journal of Scientific Perspectives*, **2020**, *4*, 245-254. [[crossref](#)], [[Google Scholar](#)], [[Publisher](#)]
- [9] W. Shao, V. Vittal, *IEEE Trans. Power Syst.*, **2015**, *20*, 1877-1885. [[crossref](#)], [[Google Scholar](#)], [[Publisher](#)]
- [10] R.H. BacherGlavitsch, “Loss reduction by network switching,” *IEEE Trans. Power Syst.*, **1988**, *3*, 447-454. [[crossref](#)], [[Google Scholar](#)], [[Publisher](#)]
- [11] B.F. Hobbs, *Proc. Power Eng. Soc. Summer Meeting*, **2001**, *1*, 558 -563. [[crossref](#)], [[Google Scholar](#)], [[Publisher](#)]