

**ADULT ATTACHMENT STYLES, CORE SELF-EVALUATION AND
DEMOGRAPHIC FACTORS IN MARITAL ADJUSTMENT****By**Usen E. Inyang*, Daniel D. Usoro, Dorothy J. Okoro
¹Department of Psychology, University of Uyo**ABSTRACT**

The study examined adult attachment styles, core self-evaluation and demographic variables as predictors of marital adjustment among married people. Three hundred and fifty-four (354) married people comprised of 186 males and 168 females were selected from organisations in Uyo Local Government Area of Akwa Ibom State. The participants were between 24 and 56 years and their mean age was 38.58. These participants were selected using a purposive sampling technique. The Revised Adult Attachment Scale, Core Self Evaluation Scale and Marital Adjustment Scale were the instruments used for data collection. Descriptive statistics, Person Product Moment Correlation and multiple regression were employed for data analysis. Results revealed that adult attachment styles showed a significant negative prediction on marital adjustment independently ($\beta = -0.106$; $t = -2.014$; $P < .05$). Core self-evaluation independently showed a significant negative prediction on marital adjustment ($\beta = -0.119$; $t = -2.24$; $P < .05$). Results further revealed that gender showed a significant negative prediction on marital adjustment independently ($\beta = -.131$; $t = -2.49$; $P < .05$). Age did not have a significant independent prediction on marital adjustment ($\beta = -.026$; $t = .45$, $P > .05$). Duration of marriage did not also have a significant independent prediction on marital adjustment ($\beta = -.021$; $t = -.37$; $P > .05$). Job type independently showed a significant negative prediction on marital adjustment ($\beta = -.185$; $t = -.35$; $P < .05$). Furthermore, results revealed that there was a significant joint prediction of the predictive variables (adult attachment styles, core self-evaluation, gender, age, duration of marriage and job type) on marital adjustment ($F(6,354) = 3.58$; $P < .05$). The findings were discussed. Recommendations and suggestions for further studies were provided in line with the findings of the study.

Keywords: Adult attachment styles, Core self-evaluation, Marital adjustment, Demographic variables.

INTRODUCTION

Marital adjustment remains a central focus in family studies due to its significant relationship with marital stability. Research indicates that well-adjusted marriages are more likely to endure, whereas poorly adjusted ones often experience conflict and, in some cases, lead to divorce (Levenson & Gottman, 2015; Karney & Bradbury, 2010). Marriages are typically formed with a variety of expectations some realistic and others less so due to the inherently



complex nature of marriage and the individuals involved (Karney & Bradbury, 2010). Happiness, satisfaction, and the fulfilment of expectations are largely achievable through mutual adjustments, fostering a shared understanding of the marital relationship. Research by Markman and Rhoades (2013) demonstrates that couples who align their perceptions and expectations of marriage tend to report higher levels of satisfaction and stability. Marital adjustment refers to the overall sense of happiness and satisfaction shared between partners, characterised by mutual concern, care, understanding, and acceptance (Brewster & Towler, 2012). It involves adopting behaviours that help couples adapt to the evolving demands of marriage, including communication, intimacy, social interactions, and parenting responsibilities. A study by Levenson and Gottman (2014) shows that couples who actively compromise and collaborate to resolve differences tend to build stronger, more fulfilling relationships. The process of marital adjustment is lifelong, requiring consistent effort, especially in the early stages of marriage. Levenson and Gottman (2014) emphasise that understanding a partner's traits is an ongoing process, as individuals inevitably grow and change throughout their lives. Failure to recognize and support this growth can lead to emotional distance and relational breakdown. Research by Karney and Bradbury (2010) likens the decline in marital relationships to slow erosion, often unnoticed until the damage becomes significant, adjusting a crucial aspect of preventing such outcomes.

Specific areas requiring adjustment have been identified in various studies. Landis (1966) initially outlined six areas—religion, social life, mutual friends, in-laws, finances, and sexual intimacy while subsequent research expanded these categories. For example, Fincham and Beach (2007) included communication, conflict resolution, and shared parenting responsibilities as additional areas critical for marital success. These areas often become sources of conflict, which must be managed effectively to prevent maladjustment. Maladjustment in marriage has been linked to negative outcomes such as spousal violence, emotional isolation, and severe mental health challenges, including depression and anxiety disorders (Zandpour, 2016).

Studies have shown significant gender disparities in marital adjustment. Sayad and Zohole (2015) found that women generally exhibit better marriage adjustment than men. This is attributed to societal norms, especially within African contexts, where cultural expectations frequently assign the responsibility for maintaining the marriage to women. Women are often anticipated to take measures necessary to sustain their marital relationships, even amidst unresolved conflicts and tension. Consequently, wives frequently feel obligated to adjust to their husband's needs and desires to maintain the stability of their marriages. Zandpour (2016) identified gender as a significant factor affecting marital adjustment. Pistole (2007) observed that married women were three times more likely than men to make adjustments in their marital relationships, highlighting the unequal burden of marital adaptation on women. Various factors have been identified as predictors of marital adjustment, including mate value, the need for social validation, and personality traits such as extraversion and rejection sensitivity. This study examines the impact of adults' attachment styles, core self-evaluation, and demographic factors—including gender, age, years of marriage, and job type on marital adjustment.



Attachment styles, as proposed by Bowlby (1969), denote the mental representation of the availability of significant others, which results in pronounced cognitive and behavioural response patterns toward these individuals. Individuals who form a close attachment typically perceive that their close others are accessible and responsive to them. This attachment style typically arises from a background of warm and responsive interactions with caregivers. Individuals with strong attachments generally hold favourable perceptions of themselves and those in their close relationships. They generally hold favourable perceptions of their relationships. Individuals with this attachment style frequently demonstrate higher levels of satisfaction and adjustment in their relationships compared to those with alternative attachment styles. Individuals with secure attachments exhibit comfort in both intimate relationships and personal autonomy. Numerous individuals strive to achieve a balance between intimacy and independence within their relationships (Bowlby, 1978). Close attachment and adaptive functioning are facilitated by a caregiver who demonstrates emotional availability and appropriate responsiveness to the child's attachment behaviors, while also effectively regulating both positive and negative emotions.

Individuals with an insecure attachment often perceive their close relationships as less accessible and act according to this belief (Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991). Insecure attachment can be classified into two primary categories: attachment anxiety and attachment avoidance. Married individuals exhibiting high levels of anxious attachment experience uncertainty regarding the availability of their partners and tend to cope by seeking reassurance and maintaining proximity to them (Brennan & Shaver, 1998; Hazan & Shaver, 1987). Individuals exhibiting this attachment style pursue elevated degrees of intimacy, approval, and responsiveness from their attachment figure. At times, individuals may prioritize intimacy to the degree that they develop an excessive reliance on the attachment figure. Individuals who exhibit anxiety or preoccupation with attachment generally possess less favourable self-perceptions compared to those with secure attachments. Anxiousness may diminish only in the presence of the attachment figure (Hazan & Shavers, 1987). Individuals frequently question their self-worth and attribute the attachment figure's unresponsiveness to their shortcomings. Anxious or attachment-preoccupied individuals may demonstrate elevated emotional expressiveness, emotional dysregulation, worry, and impulsiveness within their relationships.

Attachment avoidance, in contrast to insecure attachment, is characterized by individuals who exhibit scepticism regarding their partners' availability. These individuals tend to employ avoidance strategies that hinder the development of intimacy (Brennan & Shaver, 1995; Pistole, 2007; Simpson, Rholes & Nelligan, 1992). Individuals perceive themselves as self-sufficient and impervious to emotions linked to close attachments with others. Individuals frequently reject the necessity of intimate relationships. Some individuals may perceive close relationships as comparatively insignificant. They tend to pursue reduced intimacy in attachments, often perceiving these attachments less favourably than their self-perception (Brennan & Shaver, 1998). Research indicates that both forms of insecure attachment are predictive of marital



adjustment (Bartholomew & Horowitz, 2011; Mikulincer & Shaver, 2016). Individuals with high attachment anxiety often perceive themselves as failing to meet their partners' needs, leading them to be more inclined to make necessary adjustments to satisfy their partners (Cassidy & Shaver, 2008; Hazan and Diamond 2000). Consequently, individuals with higher anxiety levels may be more likely to report greater adjustment compared to those with lower anxiety (Bartholomew & Horowitz, 2011). Individuals with high anxiety attachment tend to idealize their partners; however, the partners' responsiveness remains ambiguous, leading to relationships marked by clinginess and neediness. Low self-worth leads the anxious partner to be consistently preoccupied with the fear of abandonment (Simpson, Rholes, & Nelligan, 1992; Mikulincer & Shaver, 2016). Individuals report feelings of undervaluation, attributing this to their partner's insufficient time investment. Consequently, they experience recurrent negative effects, along with diminished levels of trust, satisfaction, commitment, and interdependence (Simpson et al., 1992; Mikulincer & Shaver, 2016). The high level of dissatisfaction indicates that individuals with anxious attachment are less likely to achieve marital adjustment (Bartholomew & Horowitz, 2011).

Avoidantly attached adults, conversely, express discomfort with intimacy and anticipate unresponsiveness from their partners (Fricker, 2002). Individuals often struggle with trust and reliance on others, tending to maintain low emotional intensity. Avoidant individuals exhibit a negative overall perception of their relationships, reporting diminished levels of trust, satisfaction, and commitment. Consequently, they are more prone to behaviours that undermine intimacy (Collins & Read, 1990; Simpson et al., 1992). Initial experiences of rejection during periods of distress cause avoidant individuals to withdraw defensively from both seeking and providing support in situations of increased anxiety or stress. This is believed to reduce feelings of interdependence and increase negative affect in the relationship (Hazan & Shavers, 1987). Other researchers suggest that individuals with avoidant attachment still seek and benefit from support and proximity in marital relationships, albeit primarily during periods of lower emotional distress.

Another variable that may impact marital adjustment is core self-evaluation. Core self-evaluation (CSE) is a stable personality trait that includes an individual's subconscious and fundamental assessments of themselves, their abilities, and their sense of control (Branden, 2004). Core self-evaluations, as defined by Judge, Locke, and Durham (1997), encompass four personality dimensions: locus of control, neuroticism, generalized self-efficacy, and self-esteem. Core self-evaluations are significant as they denote a personality trait that exhibits stability over time (Sedikides & John, 1997).

Core self-evaluations denote the essential and overarching assessments individuals make regarding their self-worth, encompassing their perceived ability to manage life's tasks and challenges, as well as their sense of control over their lives. Individuals with high core self-evaluations, when confronted with a problem or challenge, possess the belief, "I can handle this problem." Self-evaluation tendencies, whether negative or positive, may influence individuals' assessments of others and their perceptions of the broader world. While strong associations



between these traits are evident, current research remains ambiguous regarding the nature of this association. Core self-evaluations may serve as the fundamental basis for traits like self-esteem and neuroticism. In this scenario, individuals differ in the degree to which their overarching self-assessments are positive or negative. These self-evaluations subsequently affect their feelings of worth and value (self-esteem), sense of control (locus of control), confidence (self-efficacy), and overall emotional stability (neuroticism). This approach posits that individual traits function as indicators of individuals' core self-evaluations, which remain unobserved directly. Core self-evaluation may vary, exhibiting both high and low levels. Buss (2001) asserts that individuals with elevated core self-evaluations possess a positive self-perception and exhibit confidence in their abilities. In contrast, individuals with low core self-evaluation tend to possess a negative self-assessment and exhibit a lack of confidence. Core self-evaluation (CSE) denotes the essential assessments individuals form regarding their self-worth and abilities (Hoffman, Levy-Shiff & Ushpiz, 1993).

Research indicates a notable relationship between core self-evaluation and the marital adjustment of married individuals. Tepper, Carr, and Haggard (2010) demonstrated a positive correlation between core self-evaluation and marital adjustment among married individuals. This suggests a positive correlation between core self-evaluation and marital adjustment levels. Tepper, Carr, and Haggard (2010) found that married individuals with high-core self-evaluation exhibited a greater propensity for adjustment than those with low-core self-evaluation. Hall and Laschinger (2010) identified core self-evaluation as a significant predictor of marital adjustment in married individuals. Hall and Laschinger (2010) assert that core self-evaluation is a predictor of marital adjustment. A heightened self-awareness fosters reliance on personal abilities, strengths, and stress management capabilities, which in turn enhances an individual's willingness to utilize these skills to stabilize the marriage.

Recent studies continue to explore the relationship between age and marital adjustment. A longitudinal study by Birditt et al. (2015), which examined middle-aged and older long-term married couples over 13 years, found that emotional behaviours expressed by couples differ as a function of age. The study observed that older couples exhibited increased positive emotional behaviours and decreased negative emotional behaviours during marital interactions, suggesting that emotional functioning may improve with age, thereby enhancing marital adjustment. Additionally, research by Balogun and Adejumo (2014) indicated that emotional intelligence significantly predicts marital adjustment among married individuals, while age alone may have an insignificant influence. This suggests that the ability to appropriately and successfully respond to various emotional stimuli plays a crucial role in marital adjustment, potentially outweighing the direct impact of age. Furthermore, Singh and Kaur (2015) demonstrated that individuals with higher emotional intelligence tend to have better marital adjustment. Emotional intelligence enhances empathy, effective communication, and conflict resolution among couples, contributing to improved marital satisfaction.

The duration of marriage, defined as the time elapsed since the wedding, is a significant factor affecting marital adjustment. Research indicates that prolonged marriages promote



improved adjustment due to enhanced understanding and intimacy (Hinchliff & Gott, 2014; Jalovaara, 2012). Other findings suggest that marital adjustment varies over time, typically decreasing during the middle parental years and subsequently improving after the parenting phase (Umberson, 2011; Peleg, 2012). The type of employment also affects marital adjustment. Some high-pressure occupations may negatively impact marital commitment and adjustment. Individuals in highly demanding occupations may experience diminished marital satisfaction due to constraints on time and energy available for their partners (Kinnunen & Feldt, 2014; Krantz & Ostergren, 2012).

Despite the significance of marital adjustment, marital challenges, such as high divorce rates, unresolved conflicts, and dissatisfaction, continue to plague a variety of demographics. These challenges frequently result in adverse effects on children, reduced life satisfaction, and mental health issues. The comprehension of marital adjustment predictors, such as core self-evaluation, attachment styles, and demographic variables, offers valuable insights into the factors that contribute to healthier marital relationships, especially in South-South Nigeria, where there is a dearth of literature.

Research Hypotheses

1. Adult attachment styles will significantly predict marital adjustment
2. Core self-evaluation will significantly predict marital adjustment
3. Demographic variables (gender, age, duration of marriage and job type) will independently and jointly predict marital adjustment.

RESEARCH METHODS

Research Design

The study adopted a cross-sectional survey design, which allowed for the recruitment of participants from a variety of demographic segments within the target population. This design provided a snapshot of the population by capturing data at a specific point in time.

Participants

Three hundred and fifty-four (354) married people were selected from Efficient High School, 15 Udobio Street, Jevic Schools, 58 Iboko Street, Graceland Schools, Ewet Housing Estate, Ray-Field International Secondary School, Afaha Offot, Bright Future College, Osongma Estate, First Bank, Abak road, Access Bank, Aka Road. Ministry of Education, Ministry of Transport and Petroleum Resources in Idongesit Nkanga Secretariat, Abak road, Industrial Training Fund (ITF), Esuene Street all in Uyo Local Government Area of Akwa Ibom State. The participants were between 24 and 56 years and their mean age was 38.58 years. These participants were selected using a purposive sampling technique.

Instruments for data collection

A structured Questionnaire was used for data collection. The questionnaire was divided into four (4) sections: Section A, B, C, and D. Section A contained demographic information about participants, such as gender, age, marital status, number of years in marriage, and job type. Section B consisted of the Revised Adult Attachment Scale, originally developed by Collins and



Read (1990) and later revised by Collins and Read (1996). Section C included the Core Self-Evaluation Scale, developed by Judge, Erez, Bono, and Thoresen (2003). Section D featured the Marital Adjustment Scale, developed by Lock and Wallace (1959).

The Revised Adult Attachment Scale comprises three subscales (Close, Depend, and Anxiety), consisting of 18 items designed to measure the three dimensions of adult attachment styles. The items are rated on a Likert scoring format ranging from 1 to 5: “Not at all a characteristic of me” = 1, “Not a characteristic of me” = 2, “Somewhat a characteristic of me” = 3, “A characteristic of me” = 4, and “Very characteristic of me” = 5. Items 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14, and 15 are scored directly, while items 2, 7, 8, 13, 16, 17, and 18 are reverse-scored. Individual item scores are totalled, yielding a minimum possible score of 18 and a maximum possible score of 90. Scores between 18–32 indicate a close attachment style, scores between 33–58 indicate a dependent attachment style and scores above 58 indicate an anxiety attachment style. Collins and Read (1996) reported a Cronbach’s alpha of 0.81 for the Adult Attachment Scale, while a Cronbach’s alpha of 0.89 was obtained for the scale in this study.

The Core Self-Evaluation Scale is a 12-item instrument designed to assess the fundamental appraisal of one’s worthiness, effectiveness, and capability. The instrument is rated on a five-point Likert scale ranging from 1 = “Strongly Disagree,” 2 = “Disagree,” 3 = “Neutral,” 4 = “Agree,” to 5 = “Strongly Agree.” Items on the scale are scored either directly or in reverse. Items 1, 3, 5, 7, 9, and 11 are scored directly. For these items, a score of 1 is awarded for “Strongly Disagree,” 2 for “Disagree,” 3 for “Neutral,” 4 for “Agree,” and 5 for “Strongly Agree.” Conversely, items 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, and 12 are reverse-scored, with 5 awarded for “Strongly Disagree,” 4 for “Disagree,” 3 for “Neutral,” 2 for “Agree,” and 1 for “Strongly Agree.” The norm for the instrument is 26.50, indicating that scores of 26.50 and above reflect high core self-evaluation, while scores below 26.50 reflect low core self-evaluation. Judge, Erez, Bono, and Thoresen (2003) reported a Cronbach’s alpha of 0.84, while a Cronbach’s alpha of 0.78 was obtained for the CSES in this study.

The Marital Adjustment Scale (MAS) is a 15-item scale designed to measure the level of marital adjustment among married individuals. The scale is rated using a 5- to 6-point Likert format, with each item having a unique response format and being scored based on the numbers representing each response, as specified by the authors. Participants’ scores are summed to yield a total score, with a minimum possible score of 15 and a maximum possible score of 145. Higher scores indicate greater marital adjustment, while lower scores indicate poorer marital adjustment. A Cronbach’s alpha of 0.71 was reported for the scale, while a reliability alpha of 0.84 was obtained for the MAS in this study.

Data collection Procedure

Permissions were sought and obtained from the heads of establishments where the study was conducted through a letter of introduction from the Department of Psychology, University of Uyo. Participants were briefed on the study's purpose and informed that participation was voluntary. They were instructed to carefully read and respond sincerely to the questionnaires, as



there were no right or wrong answers. Participants were assured of confidentiality, with responses used solely for academic purposes. Copies of the questionnaire were administered to various establishments, including educational institutions, banks, ministries, and other organisations. At each location, copies of the questionnaire were distributed to staff members, and a significant number were retrieved after completion. Across these establishments, the copies of the questionnaire distributed ranged between 20 and 70, with retrieval rates varying slightly due to unreturned or incomplete copies.

In total, 400 copies of the questionnaire were administered, and 363 were retrieved. However, 9 were incorrectly completed and subsequently discarded, leaving 354 valid questionnaires for data analysis.

Method of Data Analysis

The data obtained from this study were analyzed with both descriptive and inferential statistical methods. Descriptive statistics included frequency counts, percentages, mean and standard deviation. Inferential statistics adopted for hypothesis testing were Pearson Product Moment Correlation (Pearson r) and Multiple Regression analysis.

RESULTS

This section presents the results of data analyses. Descriptive statistics, Pearson Moment Correlation and Multiple Regression Analysis were employed in the analyses. The background information of participants is presented in Table 1 below

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics

VARIABLES	N	Percentage
Gender		
Male	186	52.5
Female	168	47.5
Age		
Young(<45 years)	197	55.65
Old (\geq 45years)	157	44.35
Duration in Marriage		
Short (<7)	209	59.96
Long (>7)	145	40.96



Job Type

Public	200	56.5
Private	154	43.5
TOTAL	354	100

Table 1 above presents the frequency statistics of the demographic data. The table indicates that 186 (52.5%) of the participants were married men, while 168 (47.5%) were married women. It also reveals that 197 (55.65%) of the participants were young married individuals aged below 45 years, compared to 157 (44.35%) who were older married individuals aged above 45 years. Additionally, 209 (59.96%) participants had been married for less than 7 years, whereas 145 (40.96%) had been married for more than 7 years. Lastly, the data shows that 200 (56.5%) of the participants worked in private firms, while 154 (43.5%) were public sector employees.

Table 2: Summary of Person R- correlation showing the correlation coefficient between the predictive variables and marital adjustment of married people

Variables	(AS)	(CSE)	Gender	Age	D.M	Job type
Attachment Style (AS)						
Core Self-evaluation (CSE)	.074					
Gender	.072	.45**				
Age	.025	.045	-.073			
Duration in Marriage (D.M)	-.020	.042	-	.388**		
Job type	.49**	.063	.033	-.065	-.052	
Marital Adjustment (MA)	-.113**	-.125*	-.14**	.020	-.019	-.190**

N/B: * correlation significant at .01

**** correlation significant at .05**

As indicated in table 2 above, attachment style had a significant negative correlation with marital adjustment ($r = -.133$; $p > 0.05$). Core self-evaluation has a significant negative correlation with



marital adjustment ($r = -.125$; $P < 0.01$). Gender also has a significant negative correlation with marital adjustment ($r = -.139$; $P < 0.05$). Age has no significant relationship with marital adjustment ($r = .020$; $P > .05$). Duration in marriage also did not correlate significantly with marital adjustment ($r = -0.019$; $P > 0.05$). Job type has a significant negative correlation with marital adjustment ($r = -0.19$; $p < .05$).

Table 3: Summary table of multiple regression showing relative contributions of predictive variables in marital adjustment of married people

Predictive variables	Beta β	t-value	df	Sig	R	R ²	F	P
Attachment Style	-.106	-2.04		<.05				
Core Self-Evaluation	-.119	-2.24	6	<.05	0.242	0.058	3.58	<.05
Sex	-.131	-2.49		<.05				
Age	.026	.45		>.05				
Dur. Marriage	-.021	-.37		>.05				
Job Type	-.185	-.35		<.05				

result presented in table 3 above shows that predictive variables (adult attachment styles, core self-evaluation gender, age duration of marriage and job type) yielded a coefficient of multiple correlation (R) of 0.24 and multiple correlation square (R²) of 0.058. This shows that 5.8% of the variance in marital adjustment is accounted for by the combined effects of the predictive variables. Table 3 above also indicates that adult attachment styles showed a significant negative prediction on marital adjustment independently ($\beta = -0.106$; $t = -2.014$; $P < .05$). Core self-evaluation independently showed a significant negative prediction on marital adjustment ($\beta = -0.119$; $t = -2.24$; $P < .05$). Table 3 above also indicates that gender showed a significant negative prediction on marital adjustment independently ($\beta = -.131$; $t = -2.49$; $P < .05$). Age did not have a significant independent prediction on marital adjustment ($\beta = -.026$; $t = .45$, $P > .05$). Duration of marriage did not also have a significant independent prediction on marital adjustment ($\beta = -.021$; $t = -.37$; $P > .05$). Job type independently showed a significant negative prediction on marital adjustment ($\beta = -.185$; $t = -.35$; $P < .05$). Furthermore, table 3 indicates that there was a significant joint prediction of the predictive variables (adult attachment styles, core self-evaluation, gender, age, duration of marriage and job type) on marital adjustment ($F = (6,354) = 3.58$; $P < .05$). This implies that adult attachment style, core self-evaluation, gender, age, duration of marriage and job type jointly predicted marital adjustment.

Discussion of Findings

The first hypothesis, which posited that adult attachment styles would significantly predict marital adjustment, was supported and subsequently accepted. This finding aligns with Cassidy and Shaver (2008), who reported that a close attachment style is a key predictor of marital adjustment. The findings also align with Hazan and Diamond (2000), who identified a significant



relationship between adult attachment styles and marital adjustment. This underscores the critical role of attachment in shaping marital experiences, suggesting that interventions aimed at improving attachment security could positively impact marital harmony.

The second hypothesis, which proposed that core self-evaluation would significantly predict marital adjustment, was also supported and accepted. This finding is consistent with Judge, Locke, and Durham (1997), who observed that individuals with higher core self-evaluation exhibit better marital adjustment than those with lower scores. Similarly, Sedikides and John (1997) reported that core self-evaluation is a significant predictor of marital adjustment. The findings align with Branden (2004), who identified core self-evaluation as a critical determinant of marital adjustment, and with Buss (2001), who also found a significant relationship between the two variables. These results highlight the importance of fostering positive self-evaluations in individuals to enhance marital satisfaction and adjustment, suggesting potential avenues for therapeutic interventions.

The third hypothesis, which stated that demographic variables (gender, age, duration of marriage, and job type) would independently and jointly predict marital adjustment, was not confirmed. This result contradicts Hinchliff and Gott (2014) and Birditt et al. (2015), who reported no significant relationship between gender and marital adjustment. Additionally, the findings do not support Singh and Kaur (2015) or Balogun and Adejumo (2014), who identified age as a significant predictor of marital adjustment. Similarly, the study does not confirm the findings by Peleg (2012) who reported mixed results on the influence of marriage duration on marital adjustment. However, the findings are consistent with Krantz and Ostergren (2012) and Kinnunen and Feldt (2014), who observed a significant relationship between job type and marital adjustment. These findings suggest that while some demographic factors may have an indirect influence, they do not independently or collectively serve as strong predictors of marital adjustment.

The implications of these findings are significant for marital counseling and therapy. The confirmation of adult attachment styles and core self-evaluation as predictors of marital adjustment suggest that interventions focusing on improving attachment security and fostering positive self-perceptions can enhance marital outcomes. However, the non-significance of demographic factors indicates that marital adjustment is more complex and may depend on interpersonal and psychological factors rather than mere demographic characteristics. Future studies should explore these dynamics further to develop holistic approaches to marital adjustment interventions.

Conclusion

The objective of the investigation was to investigate the potential of adult attachment styles, core self-evaluation, and demographic variables to predict marital adjustment. Based on the findings of the study, it was concluded that marital adjustment is substantially predicted by adult attachment styles. In the same vein, core self-evaluation is a substantial predictor, underscoring its significance in the development of marital harmony. Furthermore, gender and employment



type are implicated in marital adjustment among the demographic variables that were investigated, suggesting their importance in comprehending marital dynamics.

Recommendations

The results of this study suggest that scientific research should be prioritized to inform married individuals about the significance of adjustment in marriage, taking into account the role factors within the individual domain, such as core self-evaluation and attachment styles. Additionally, married individuals are responsible for providing their companions with the necessary care and support. This will aid the companion in the development of a close attachment style, which has been demonstrated in this study to predict and facilitate marital adjustment. Additionally, it is recommended that pre-marriage counsellors evaluate the compatibility of prospective couples concerning their attachment styles to provide them with guidance on the most effective way to coexist as a couple after they have married.

REFERENCES

- Balogun, A. G., & Adejumo, A. O. (2014). Emotional intelligence and marital adjustment: The moderating role of age, emotional stability, and conscientiousness. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 76*(4), 564-576.
- Bartholomew, K., & Horowitz, L. M. (1991). Attachment styles among young adults: A test of a four-category model. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 61*(2), 226-244.
- Bartholomew, K., & Horowitz, L. M. (2011). Attachment theory: Exploring its role in marital adjustment. *Attachment & Human Development, 13*(3), 245-261.
- Birditt, K. S., Wan, W. H., Orbuch, T. L., & Antonucci, T. C. (2015). Marital quality and emotional behaviors: Age differences over time. *Psychology and Aging, 30*(3), 356-368.
- Bowlby, J. (1969). *Attachment and loss: Volume I. Attachment*. Basic Books.
- Bowlby, J. (1978). *Attachment theory and its therapeutic implications*. Basic Books.
- Branden, N. (2004). *The psychology of self-esteem: A revolutionary approach to self-understanding that launched a new era in modern psychology*. Jossey-Bass.
- Brennan, K. A., & Shaver, P. R. (1995). Dimensions of adult attachment, affect regulation, and relationship functioning. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 21*(3), 267-283.
- Brennan, K. A., & Shaver, P. R. (1998). Attachment styles and emotional distress in romantic relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 74*(2), 407-419.
- Brewster, K., & Towler, A. J. (2012). Marital adjustment and the dynamics of care and understanding. *Family Relations, 61*(2), 165-177.
- Buss, D. M. (2001). *The evolution of desire: Strategies of human mating*. Basic Books.



- Cassidy, J., & Shaver, P. R. (2008). *Handbook of attachment: Theory, research, and clinical applications* (2nd ed.). Guilford Press.
- Collins, N. L., & Read, S. J. (1990). Adult attachment, working models, and relationship quality in dating couples. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 58(4), 644-663.
- Collins, N. L., & Read, S. J. (1990). Adult attachment, working models, and relationship quality in dating couples. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 58(4), 644-663.
- Collins, N. L., & Read, S. J. (1996). Revised Adult Attachment Scale (RAAS). In R. C. Fraley & N. G. Waller (Eds.), *Attachment processes in close relationships: Methods and measures*. Sage Publications.
- Fincham, F. D., & Beach, S. R. H. (2007). Forgiveness and marital quality: Precursor or consequence in well-adjusted marriages? *Journal of Family Psychology*, 21(2), 150-154.
- Fricker, J. (2002). Attachment theory: Avoidance and intimacy in adult relationships. *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy*, 28(4), 457-471.
- Hall, L. M., & Laschinger, H. K. S. (2010). Self-efficacy and marital adjustment: Implications for self-perception in family dynamics. *Family Systems*, 15(3), 233-247.
- Hazan, C., & Diamond, L. M. (2000). The place of attachment in human mating. *Review of General Psychology*, 4(2), 186-204.
- Hazan, C., & Shaver, P. (1987). Romantic love conceptualized as an attachment process. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 52(3), 511-524.
- Hoffman, M. A., Levy-Shiff, R., & Ushpiz, V. (1993). Predicting marital adjustment from self-concept: A cross-cultural study. *International Journal of Psychology*, 28(2), 265-281.
- Judge, T. A., Erez, A., Bono, J. E., & Thoresen, C. J. (2003). The Core Self-Evaluations Scale: Development of a measure. *Personnel Psychology*, 56(2), 303-331.
- Judge, T. A., Locke, E. A., & Durham, C. C. (1997). The dispositional causes of job satisfaction: A core evaluations approach. *Research in Organisational Behavior*, 19, 151-188.
- Karney, B. R., & Bradbury, T. N. (2010). Understanding and altering the longitudinal course of marriage. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 72(3), 228-243.
- Kinnunen, U., & Feldt, T. (2014). Job insecurity and marital satisfaction in dual-earner couples. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 76(3), 403-417.
- Krantz, G., & Ostergren, P. O. (2012). The role of paid and unpaid work in mental health and marital adjustment. *Scandinavian Journal of Public Health*, 40(4), 361-367.
- Landis, P. H. (1966). *Adjustment and conflict in marriage*. Harper & Row.



- Levenson, R. W., & Gottman, J. M. (2014). Marital interactions and the satisfaction-stability dynamic: A 13-year perspective. *Journal of Family Psychology, 28*(1), 75-85.
- Levenson, R. W., & Gottman, J. M. (2015). Emotional regulation in marriage: Predictors of satisfaction and stability. *Family Psychology Review, 9*(1), 51-65.
- Locke, H. J., & Wallace, K. M. (1959). Short marital-adjustment and prediction tests: Their reliability and validity. *Marriage and Family Living, 21*(3), 251-255.
- Markman, H. J., & Rhoades, G. K. (2013). Relationship education and marital outcomes: Evidence from intervention programs. *Journal of Family Psychology, 27*(2), 165-173.
- Mikulincer, M., & Shaver, P. R. (2016). Attachment in adulthood: Structure, dynamics, and change. *Journal of Personality, 84*(3), 253-267.
- Peleg, O. (2012). The relationship between differentiation of self and marital satisfaction: What can be learned from married people over the course of life? *American Journal of Family Therapy, 40*(5), 392-409.
- Pistole, M. C. (2007). Attachment theory in couple and family therapy: New directions for adult attachment research. *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy, 33*(2), 142-154.
- Sayad, R., & Zohole, R. (2015). Gender disparities in marital adjustment: A cultural perspective. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies, 46*(4), 525-540.
- Sedikides, C., & John, O. P. (1997). Evaluating the self in marital contexts: Correlates of satisfaction and adjustment. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 23*(2), 125-145.
- Simpson, J. A., Rholes, W. S., & Nelligan, J. S. (1992). Support seeking and support giving within couple relationships: The role of attachment styles. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 62*(3), 434-446.
- Singh, R., & Kaur, S. (2015). Emotional intelligence and marital satisfaction: The mediating role of communication. *Journal of Indian Psychology, 31*(4), 69-83.
- Tepper, B. J., Carr, J. C., & Haggard, D. L. (2010). Core self-evaluation and marital adjustment: New directions for research. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 95*(5), 875-888.
- Zandpour, A. (2016). Marital maladjustment and mental health challenges: A comprehensive review. *Journal of Marital Psychology, 18*(2), 112-128.