

## **A Comparison of Personality Traits and Attachment Styles of Adolescent Girls under the Protection of the State Welfare Organization with Adolescent Girls under the Protection of the Family in Isfahan-Iran**

Shayesteh Sharifpour<sup>1</sup>, Dr. Gholamreza Manshaee<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Master of General Psychology, Islamic Azad University of Isfahan (Khorasgan Branch), Isfahan, Iran

<sup>2</sup>Assistant Professor of Psychology Department, Islamic Azad University of Isfahan (Khorasgan Branch), Isfahan, Iran

*Received: January 27, 2015*

*Accepted: March 31, 2015*

### **ABSTRACT**

The present study aims to compare the personality traits and attachment styles of adolescent girls under the protection of the State Welfare Organization with adolescent girls who enjoy family support. The research sample consists of 30 adolescent girls with family support and 30 adolescent girls under the protection of the State Welfare boarding houses. The samples were selected using the simple random sampling method. The data collection tools include the adult attachment inventory (AAI) developed by Hazan and Shaver (1987) and the NEO personality inventory (NEO-PI) developed by Costa and McCrae (1992). The research findings have been analyzed using a multivariate analysis of variance.

The results of the multivariate analysis of variance showed that there is no significant difference between adolescent girls under the protection of the State Welfare Organization and adolescent girls with family support in terms of personality traits of extraversion, agreeableness and openness to experience ( $P > 0.05$ ), but there is a significant difference between them regarding the mean of neuroticism and conscientiousness ( $P < 0.05$ ).

**KEYWORDS:** personality traits, attachment style, adolescent girl. State Welfare centers, family

### **INTRODUCTION**

Adolescence is the period of personality development and finding identity and this growth will occur in the family (Ghaemi, 1999). Different psychologists have called this period as the period of sentimentalism, affection worship, creative crises, and pressure and storm (Prout, 2004). Communication problems with friends and the lack of family feeling has a negative impact on personality and mental state of adolescents (Peker, 2004; Dogra and Erkokmaz, 2008; Celikel, 2008; quoted by Bicaki, 2011). In the meantime, orphanage adolescents are faced with many problems such as poverty, attachment disorders, lack of social skills, and mental health problems. For various reasons, these adolescents are at risk for emotional and behavioral problems (Ebrahim et al., 2012).

Living in orphanages and welfare centers influences the attachment of adolescents, because structural problems and the breakdown of the family as well as not touching life due to the presence in these centers since childhood has caused them always to grow in environments full of fear and terror (Noori, Makaremi, and Ebrahimi, 2000).

Adolescents who live in boarding centers are at a higher risk for disorders such as epilepsy, hysteria, anxiety fields, neurotic reactions, and personality problems, because the lack of a safe family environment has caused them to be faced with fear, anxiety, insecurity, and difficulty in establishing intimate and long-lasting relationships.

In these centers, since adolescents are shown love and affection on duty, they may feel that they should not be attached to any element in these places; as a result, they do not believe and trust in anything there (Fayyaz and Kiani, 2011). This may have its roots in the evolution of attachment.

Attachment is a behavioral system which was firstly introduced by Bowlby who extracted the concept from the natural ethics. According to Bowlby, attachment occurs when there is a warm, sincere and lasting relationship between the child and parent, so that the relationship is satisfactory to both of them (Ahmadi, 2001). Thompson (quoted by Ainsworth) enumerates attachment behaviors as crying, smiling, vocalization, visual-motor orientation, crying while leaving the pattern of attachment, following, scrambling, imitating, burying face in mother's lap, clinging, lifting arms in greeting, and clapping hands in greeting. He believes that infants usually start showing such behaviors at the end of the first month (Khodapanahi, 2004). Bowlby divides attachment styles into three general categories including secure, avoidant, and ambivalent attachment.

\* **Corresponding Author:** Dr. Gholamreza Manshaee, Master of General Psychology, Islamic Azad University of Isfahan (Khorasgan Branch), Isfahan, Iran

Secure children are confident and use parents as a secure base while they explore the world and gain a sense of peace and safety when they have a reunion with parents in an unfamiliar position and immediately engage in exploration and play. Avoidant children are okay with strangers and play normally when a stranger is present. These children show little interest when parents return and clearly avoid confrontation with them. Some of them generally overlook their parents and some also show reactions both in contrast to parents and avoiding interaction with them. It is harder for ambivalent children to relax in unfamiliar positions and they are undecided between going to parents or an interesting object. They get upset when parents leave the room and are ambivalent towards parents in reunion with them (Breck, 2008). Bowlby also believes that the attachment theory is not just a theory of infancy and has application to adolescents and adults and hence is a life span model (Mazaheri, 2000; quoted by Behzadipoor, Pakdaman, and Besharat, 2010). Attachment behaviors and their consequences are active and present throughout life and become manifest in personality characteristics and traits of individuals (Simpson et al., 2007; quoted by Behzadipoor, Pakdaman, and Besharat, 2010).

The term personality trait generally refers to relatively enduring patterns of perception, interpersonal relations, and thinking about the environment and oneself that are exhibited in a wide range of social and personal contexts. Costa and McCrae (1992), using the factor analysis method, provided the five-factor model of personality. These 5 factors include “neuroticism”, “extraversion”, “openness to experience”, “agreeableness”, and “conscientiousness”.

Extraversion is defined by physical, verbal, and gregarious activities. Extroverted people are known with features such as gregariousness, warmth, assertiveness, activity, excitement seeking, and positive emotions. Agreeableness is defined as the tendency for self-sacrifice, altruism, and kindness. Conscientiousness is defined as the tendency to discipline, commitment, accountability, and efficiency. Conscientious people are known by characteristics such as discipline, accuracy, conscientiousness, and strive for success and continence. Neuroticism is defined as an indicator tendency for emotional and affective instability. Neurotic people are known by characteristics such as anxiety, depression, impulsiveness, anger, and frustration. The trait of openness to experience is defined as the tendency for experience for its own sake, rationality, and openness to new ideas and practices. Openness-to-experience people are known by characteristics such as curiosity, creativity, imagination orientation, aesthetics, art orientation, and modernism (Donnella, Brent, Rand, and Bryant, 2004). These factors, in addition to adults, have been observed in children as well (Schultz and Schultz, 2008).

Personality dimensions and attachment quality are variables affected by environmental conditions of boarding institutions. In adolescence, living in stressful situations of boarding houses along with qualitative and quantitative restrictions on social relations and educative stimuli causes the adolescents to suffer occasionally from physical, emotional, and behavioral problems (Saffari, 2006). The results of studies conducted by Niemann and Weiss (2012) and Dries et al. (2009) also show that living in orphanages and welfare centers has a negative impact on the formation of secure attachment and leads to insecure attachment in children and adolescents (quoted by Aslipoor, Kafi, Khosrow J., and Fakhri, 2013).

In modern societies, due to rising divorce rates, poverty and addiction which are the result of the industrialization of human societies, the phenomenon of being orphaned and the number of orphan children are significantly increasing (Tabatabaei, 2001); as a result, the number of children in orphanage has substantially risen up and the results of studies also show great differences between this group of children and adolescents and the children and adolescents who grow in family environments; for example, the studies conducted by Soleimani, Farahati, and Ghanbari (2013) showed that ambivalent attachment style is dominant among orphaned girls while girls with family support apply secure and avoidant styles in their relations more; also, the results of these studies report that there is a significant difference between orphaned and non-orphaned girls in terms of attachment subscales as well as anxiety levels were significantly higher in orphaned girls.

Considering the issues discussed so far and the gaps in this field, the present research aims to investigate whether there is any difference between personality traits and attachment styles of adolescent girls under the protection of the state welfare centers and adolescent girls under the protection of the family?

## THE RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Since the present research compares the personality traits and attachment styles of adolescent girls under the protection of the state welfare centers with adolescent girls under the protection of the family, it is considered as a descriptive study which is comparative-causal too. The research population consists of all adolescent girls who are 13-18 years old, under the protection of the welfare boarding centers as well as under the protection of the family, and were studying in high schools of Isfahan-Iran in school year 2014, from which 30 adolescent girls under the protection of the family and 30 adolescent girls under the protection of the welfare boarding centers were selected as the statistical sample using the random sampling method.

### **The data collection tools**

Here, the adult attachment inventory (AAI) developed by Hazan and Shaver (1987) and the NEO personality inventory (NEO-PI) developed by Costa and McCrae (1992) were used to collect the necessary data of the research.

### **The Hazan and Shaver's adult attachment inventory**

This inventory has been developed using the attachment test material of Hazan and Shaver (1987) and normalized regarding Iranian student and general population samples (Besharat, 2005). The inventory has 15 items which have been scored based on the 5-point Likert scale ranging from never (= 0) to almost always (= 4). There are 5 items for each attachment subscale whose score is obtained by the mean score of these 5 items; in this way that to determine the attachment style of each sample, the numerical value of the items related to that style are added together and divided by 5. In this inventory, items 1, 5, 11, 9, and 13 determine the secure attachment style; items 12, 10, 6, 2, and 14 determine the avoidant attachment style; and items 8, 7, 4, 3, and 15 determine the ambivalent attachment style. For a 1480-people sample consisted of 860 women and 620 men, the Cronbach's alpha coefficients of questions related to secure, avoidant, and ambivalent subscales were respectively calculated equal to 0.85, 0.84, and 0.85 for women and 0.84, 0.85, and 0.86 for men, which implies the internal consistency of the adult attachment inventory (AAI). To assess the test-retest reliability, on two occasions with an interval of four weeks, the correlation coefficients between the scores of subjects in a 300-people sample were calculated equal to 0.86, 0.82, and 0.85 for women and 0.88, 0.83, and 0.83 for men, which implies the satisfactory test-retest reliability of the scale (Besharat, 2005). Hazan and Shaver have reported a good content and criterion validity of the test; also, they have reported a very favorable structure validity of the questionnaire (Bahadori, Jahanbakhsh, Amiri, and Anisi, 2012).

Also, in this research, after running the questionnaire on 60 people, the reliability and internal consistency of the questionnaire was calculated equal to 0.72 using the Cronbach's alpha coefficient, which implies desired reliability and internal consistency of the questionnaire?

### **The NEO personality inventory (NEO-PI)**

In this research, the short 60-item form of NEO-PI has been used. Costa and McCrae (1992) originally developed the inventory for the normal population; and in the past decade, it has been mostly used in research and clinical pragmatics. The original version of this inventory (developed by Costa and McCrae, 1992) was set to measure a five-factor model of personality including the factors of neuroticism, extraversion, openness (to experience), agreeableness, and conscientiousness.

The alpha coefficient reported for this test varies from 0.74 to 0.89 with an average of 0.81 (Fathi A. and Dastani, 2009). Also, in a study conducted by Haghshenas (2008) on a 502-people sample in Shiraz-Iran, the Cronbach's alpha coefficients of the 5 factors have been reported equal to 0.81, 0.71, 0.57, 0.71, and 0.83 for neuroticism, extraversion, openness to experience, agreeableness, and conscientiousness, respectively. In addition, with an interval of six months, the test-retest reliability of the scale has been equal to 0.53, 0.74, 0.76, 0.68, and 0.83 for neuroticism, extraversion, openness, agreeableness, and conscientiousness, respectively.

Considering the fact that the tools used in this research have been already used in several studies inside Iran and their reliability has been proven as well as due to insufficient sample size in this research, it was referred to the reliability and validity coefficients used in previous similar studies.

### **The data analysis method**

Parameters used in descriptive statistics include frequency, percentage, mean, and standard deviation. Also, the multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was used to assess personality traits and attachment styles in two groups of adolescent girls under the protection of the state welfare centers and adolescent girls under the protection of the family. In addition, the Kolmogorov-Smirnov, Levene, and Box tests were used to assess prerequisites for parametric analysis of variance. The data of the research were analyzed using the SPSS 22 (Statistical Package for Social Science) software.

### **The research findings**

Table 1 shows the descriptive indices (mean and standard deviation) of the research variables for the entire sample.

**Table 1: the descriptive indices (mean and standard deviation) of the research sample based on the research variables**

Variables	Statistical Indices	Mean	Standard Deviation
	Groups		
Neuroticism	Under the Protection of the Welfare	24.46	6.21
	Under the Protection of the Family	19.10	6.03
Extraversion	Under the Protection of the Welfare	24.90	5.80
	Under the Protection of the Family	26	3.98
Openness to Experience	Under the Protection of the Welfare	24.76	5.28
	Under the Protection of the Family	26.33	2.69
Agreeableness	Under the Protection of the Welfare	27.50	5.02
	Under the Protection of the Family	25.60	3.56
Conscientiousness	Under the Protection of the Welfare	35.16	5.77
	Under the Protection of the Family	30.03	5.56
Secure Attachment Style	Under the Protection of the Welfare	10.70	2.81
	Under the Protection of the Family	12.30	2.52
Insecure Attachment Styles	Under the Protection of the Welfare	9.43	3.43
	Under the Protection of the Family	8.53	2.50

Table 2 shows the results related to the assumption of distribution normality. The assumption is made based on the fact that the scores distribution of these two sample groups does not significantly differ from their normal distribution in the population. Here, the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test has been used to test the assumption.

**Table 2: the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test regarding the normality of scores of personality traits and attachment styles**

Statistical Indices	Sample Groups	Statistic	Degrees of freedom	Significance Level
Variables				
Neuroticism	State Welfare Organization	0.11	30	0.20
	Under the Protection of the Family	0.13	30	0.14
Extraversion	State Welfare Organization	0.13	30	0.14
	Under the Protection of the Family	0.10	30	0.20
Openness to Experience	State Welfare Organization	0.12	30	0.20
	Under the Protection of the Family	0.14	30	0.08
Agreeableness	State Welfare Organization	0.14	30	0.08
	Under the Protection of the Family	0.14	30	0.08
Conscientiousness	State Welfare Organization	0.20	30	0.002
	Under the Protection of the Family	0.12	30	0.15
Secure Attachment Style	State Welfare Organization	0.10	30	0.20
	Under the Protection of the Family	0.13	30	0.15
Avoidant Attachment Style	State Welfare Organization	0.15	30	0.08
	Under the Protection of the Family	0.16	30	0.04
Ambivalent Attachment Style	State Welfare Organization	0.16	30	0.04
	Under the Protection of the Family	0.16	30	0.04
<b>P&lt;0.05</b>				

According to table 2, in all cases except ambivalent attachment style and conscientiousness, the scores distribution of the two sample groups does not significantly differ from their normal distribution in the population; hence, the assumption of distribution normality is satisfied and can be used for parametric analysis of variance.

Table 3 shows the results of the Levene's test which has been used to measure the assumption of variances equality for variables "personality traits" and "attachment styles".

**Table 3: the Levene's test regarding the assumption of variances equality for the scores of variables "personality traits" and "attachment styles"**

Statistical Indices	Levene	Degrees of freedom 1	Degrees of freedom 2	Significance Level
Variables				
Neuroticism	0.66	1	58	0.19

Extraversion	2.2	1	58	0.14
Openness to Experience	15.16	1	58	0.000
Agreeableness	0.72	1	58	0.39
Conscientiousness	0.10	1	58	0.74
Secure Attachment Style	0.12	1	58	0.72
Insecure Attachment Style	0.27	1	58	0.60

According to table 3, in all cases except openness to experience, there is no significant difference between the variances of the two groups and the variances are equal; hence, the parametric analysis of variance can be used. Regarding the all variables except conscientiousness, since the sizes of both groups are equal, there is no need to satisfy the above assumption. Many statisticians (such as Shiolson, translated by Kiamanesh, 2002) believe that analysis of variance like the comparison of two means(t) is resistant to violation of the two assumptions (including the normality of distribution and the equality of scores variability) in all populations under study; and even, in the case of approximate equality of groups in terms of the sample size and also with a group variance four times larger than the other group, it is permissible to use analysis of variance (Hooman, 1991); accordingly, here, the analysis of variance has been used that the results are presented below.

Table 4 shows the results obtained from the analysis of variance regarding the comparison of adolescents under the protection of the welfare centers and adolescents with family support in terms of personality traits.

**Table 4: the multivariate analysis of variance used to compare the adolescents under the protection of the welfare centers and the adolescents with family support in terms of personality traits**

Statistical Indices Source of Changes	Personality Traits	Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Squares	F	Significance Level	Size of Effect	Test Power
<b>Main Effects</b>	Neuroticism	2847.081	1	2847.081	758.81	0.001	0.92	1
	Extraversion	38862.15	1	38862.15	1.569	0.001	0.96	1
	Openness to Experience	39168.150	1	39168.150	2.227	0.001	0.97	1
	Agreeableness	42294.150	1	42294.150	2.229	0.001	0.97	1
	Conscientiousness	63765.60	1	63765.60	1.981	0.001	0.97	1
<b>Group</b>	Neuroticism	432.01	1	432.01	11.51	0.001	0.16	0.91
	Extraversion	18.150	1	18.150	0.73	0.39	0.012	0.13
	Openness to Experience	36.817	1	36.817	2.09	0.15	0.035	0.29
	Agreeableness	54.150	1	54.150	2.853	0.09	0.04	0.38
	Conscientiousness	392.26	1	392.26	12.27	0.001	0.17	0.93
<b>Error</b>	Neuroticism	2176.16	58	37.52	-	-	-	-
	Extraversion	1436.70	58	24.77	-	-	-	-
	Openness to Experience	1020.03	58	17.58	-	-	-	-
	Agreeableness	1100.700	58	18.97	-	-	-	-
	Conscientiousness	1867.13	58	32.19	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	Neuroticism	3.079	60	-	-	-	-	-
	Extraversion	40317	60	-	-	-	-	-
	Openness to Experience	40225	60	-	-	-	-	-
	Agreeableness	43449	60	-	-	-	-	-
	Conscientiousness	66028	60	-	-	-	-	-
<b>P&lt;0.05</b>								

According to table 4 and considering the value of F (11.5) and the significance level (0.001) which is lower than 0.05, it can be concluded that the research hypothesis indicating that there is a difference between the adolescents under the protection of the welfare centers and the adolescents under the protection of the family in terms of the personality trait of neuroticism is confirmed. The size of effect for the variable "Group" is reported equal to 0.16 meaning that 16% of the variance in neuroticism can be attributed to the difference between the two groups in terms of living environment (welfare centers or family). The statistical power for the variable of "Group" is reported equal to 0.91 which indicates the high power of the test in examining the differences and the adequacy of the sample size.

Also, considering the information of table 2 as well as the significance level which is higher than 0.05, it can be concluded that there is no difference between the adolescents under the protection of the welfare centers and the adolescents under the protection of the family in terms of the personality traits of extraversion, openness to experience, and agreeableness; but based on the value of F (12.27) and the significance level (0.001) which is lower than 0.05, it can be concluded that there is a difference between the adolescents under the protection of the welfare centers and the adolescents under the protection of the family in terms of the personality trait of conscientiousness. The size of effect for the variable “Group” is reported equal to 0.17 meaning that 17% of the variance in conscientiousness can be attributed to the difference between the two groups in terms of living environment (welfare centers or family). The statistical power for the variable of “Group” is reported equal to 0.93 which indicates the high power of the test in examining the differences and the adequacy of the sample size.

Table 5 shows the results obtained from the analysis of variance regarding the comparison of adolescents under the protection of the welfare centers and adolescents with family support in terms of attachment styles.

**Table 5: the multivariate analysis of variance used to compare the adolescents under the protection of the welfare centers and the adolescents with family support in terms of attachment styles**

Statistical Indices Source of Changes	Attachment Styles	Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Squares	F	Significance Level	Size of Effect	Test Power
<b>Main Effects</b>	Secure Attachment Styles	7935	1	7935	1.110	0.001	0.96	1
	Insecure Attachment Styles	6314.004	1	6314.004	1.389	0.001	0.96	1
<b>group</b>	Secure Attachment Styles	384.40	1	384.40	5.37	0.024	0.01	0.11
	Insecure Attachment Styles	2.604	1	2.604	0.573	0.45	0.01	0.11
<b>Error</b>	Secure Attachment Styles	414.60	58	7.14	-	-	-	-
	Insecure Attachment Styles	263.64	58	4.546	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	Secure Attachment Styles	8388	60	-	-	-	-	-
	Insecure Attachment Styles	6580.250	60	-	-	-	-	-

According to table 5, and considering the value of F (5.37) and the significance level (0.024) which is lower than 0.05, it can be concluded that there is a difference between the adolescents under the protection of the welfare centers and the adolescents under the protection of the family in terms of secure attachment style; but the size of effect (0.01) and the statistical power (0.11) for the variable “Group” shows that the difference between the two groups is very low and cannot be attributed to the difference between the two groups in terms of living environment. Also, considering the information of table 3 as well as the value of F (0.573) and the significance level (0.45) which is higher than 0.05, it can be concluded that the research hypothesis indicating that there is a difference between the adolescents under the protection of the welfare centers and the adolescents under the protection of the family in terms of insecure attachment style is not confirmed; namely, the insecure attachment style of adolescents is not affected by environmental conditions such as boarding houses or family.

## DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

As observed in table 2, there is a different between adolescent girls under the protection of the state welfare centers and adolescent girls under the protection of the family in terms of the personality traits of neuroticism, extraversion, openness (to experience), agreeableness, and conscientiousness. According to the information presented in table 2 and considering the value of F (11.5) and the significance level (0.001) which is lower than 0.05, it can be concluded that there is a different between adolescent girls under the protection of the state welfare

centers and adolescent girls under the protection of the family in terms of the personality trait of neuroticism. These findings are consistent with the results of studies conducted by Aslipoor et al. (2013) and Khoda Bakhshi K. et al. (2014), but not consistent with the findings of Fayyaz and Kiani (2011).

On the other hand, the results of this study show that living in stressful situations of boarding houses along with qualitative and quantitative restrictions on social relations and educative stimuli causes the adolescents to suffer from physical, emotional, and behavioral problems (Saffari, 2006). Orphaned children due to different reasons (such as being deprived of family and parents' love, living a large number of people in a limited space along with the reduction of positive attention and being under control) suffer from neurotic problems and living conditions in state welfare boarding centers has a negative impact on the neuroticism dimension of their personality.

According to the data of table 2 and considering the value of  $F$  (0.73) and the significance level (0.39) which is higher than 0.05, it can be concluded that there is no difference between adolescents under the protection of welfare centers and adolescents with family support in terms of extraversion. No similar study was found in this regard, but the possible explanation for this finding can be that the conditions of welfare boarding houses are close to the family environment in terms of fostering the personality trait of extraversion. In fact, the atmosphere at welfare centers is a collective and gregarious atmosphere and this may affect the extraversion of adolescents there.

Also, as observed in table 2 and considering the value of  $F$  (2.09) and the significance level (0.15) which is higher than 0.05, it can be concluded that there is no difference between adolescents under the protection of welfare centers and adolescents with family support in terms of openness to experience. No similar study was found in this regard, but it can be said that the conditions of welfare boarding houses and family environment have no impact on the personality trait of openness to experience; and for both adolescent groups, there are equal conditions in terms of fostering curiosity, creativity, imagination orientation, aesthetics, art orientation, and modernism.

Also, according to table 2 and considering the value of  $F$  (2.853) and the significance level (0.09) which is higher than 0.05, it can be concluded that there is no difference between adolescents under the protection of welfare centers and adolescents with family support in terms of agreeableness. No similar study was found in this regard, but according to Milfont and Sibley (2012), at both individual and national levels, agreeableness is a trait strongly related to environment, but this fact is not consistent with the research findings; so it can be said that environmental conditions in welfare centers and family have no impact on the personality trait of agreeableness; in other words, both family and welfare centers have created similar conditions for fostering interpersonal tendencies of self-sacrifice, altruism, and kindness.

Also, as observed in table 2 and considering the value of  $F$  (12.27) and the significance level (0.001) which is lower than 0.05, it can be concluded that there is a difference between adolescents under the protection of welfare centers and adolescents with family support in terms of conscientiousness. In fact, results showed that the adolescents under the protection of the welfare centers are more conscientious than the adolescents with family support. Milfont and Sibley (2012) concluded in their study that at both individual and national levels, conscientiousness is a trait strongly related to environment. This finding is somewhat consistent with the results of this research, but not consistent with results of the study conducted by Ghanbari H. (2011). Thus, it can be said that welfare centers have applied more educational practices and control, because the personality trait of conscientiousness is significantly affected by the environment and educational practices. In fact, welfare centers differ from family environment in terms of structure, roles, and responsibilities, because in these centers, adolescents learn to perform their duties well. In other words, in welfare centers, staff and trainers emphasize features such as being hard working, accountability, and insisting on optimal performance of duties; and this provides the appropriate ground for fostering and forming the trait of conscientiousness in adolescents. In contrast, it is likely that educational practices related to conscientiousness are given less importance in family environments, because parents may not have the necessary knowledge or apply the practices weakly.

The data of table 3 are related to the other hypothesis of the research which investigates the difference between the adolescents under the protection of the welfare centers and the adolescents under the protection of the family in terms of secure and insecure attachment styles.

As observed in table 3, the value of  $F$  is equal to 5.37 and the significance level (0.024) is lower than 0.05, but the size of effect (0.01) and the statistical power (0.11) for the variable "Group" shows insignificant differences between the two groups in terms of secure attachment style and insufficient sample size; so the results cannot be generalized to the population and interpreted without condoning. Accordingly, it is needed to conduct further research with a larger sample size and higher statistical power. Also, there are other variables (such as the age of entering welfare centers or designating caregiver like mother, nurse, and so forth) affecting the attachment style of adolescents in welfare centers; so it is needed to investigate these variables in future studies to achieve more accurate results.

Also, according to table 3 and considering the value of F (0.57) and the significance level (0.45) which is higher than 0.05, it can be concluded that there is no difference between the adolescents under the protection of the welfare centers and the adolescents under the protection of the family in terms of insecure attachment styles. In the explanation of this finding, it can be said that caregivers play an important role in the incidence of insecure attachment styles and there are several caregivers in welfare centers who can provide the necessary care; so in both family and welfare environments, the quality of care was in such a way that it has prevented insecure attachment styles in adolescents. Also, considering the research results and limitations such as inadequate sample size and low statistical power and effect size, the results cannot be generalized to the population and interpreted without condoning. Accordingly, it is needed to conduct further research with a larger sample size and higher statistical power to achieve more accurate results.

Totally, the results of this research showed that there is no significant difference between the adolescents in welfare centers and the adolescents with family support in terms of the personality traits of extraversion, agreeableness, and openness to experience, but the adolescents of welfare centers were more neurotic, which can be for reasons such as the environment of welfare centers, the low number of caregivers, and the lack of attention, love, and positive relationship or the environment of these centers cannot provide a safe environment like the family and as a result, the adolescents face with many problems in this regard and cannot experience an environment full of affection and love. On the other hand, the results of this study showed that the mean of conscientiousness is higher regarding the adolescents in welfare centers. According to the research observations, there are more emphasis on educational practices and conscientiousness in welfare centers; accordingly, it can be said that the environment of welfare centers and educational practices (applied by authorities and trainers there) have been effective on the formation of the personality trait of conscientiousness; in other words, it can be said that the environment of welfare centers psychologically has a negative effect on neuroticism of adolescents under the protection of these centers, but it has been effective in fostering the trait of conscientiousness.

## REFERENCES

- 1- Ahmadi, Shamsodin, (2001), "Investigating the relationship between the quality of child's attachment to mother and development of social skills and coping with stress in preschool children", Council of Education Research of Qom
- 2- Eslami, Reza; Hashemian, Peyman; Jarahi, Lida; Modares Gh., Morteza, (2013), "The effectiveness of group reality therapy on happiness and life quality of adolescents with irresponsible parents in Mashhad", Journal of Mashhad University of Medical Sciences, Vol. 56, No. 5, pp. 300-306
- 3- Aslipoor, Adeleh; Kafi, Moosa; Khosrow J., Mahnaz; Fakhri, Mohammad K., (2013), "A comparison of psychological characteristics of children living in orphanages with children living with family based on the apperception test for children", Journal of School Psychology, Vol. 2, No. 1, pp.6-22
- 4- Breck, Laura, (2001), "Developmental psychology", Tehran, translated by Yahya, Seyed Mohammadi, (2008), Pub. Arasbaran, p. 26
- 5- Besharat, Mohammad A., (2005), "Normalization of adult attachment scale", Research Report, Tehran University
- 6- Bahadori, Mohammad H.; Jahanbakhsh, Marzieh; Amiri, Shoeleh; Anisi, Jafar, (2012), "Predicting depressive symptoms in girls with maternal attachment", Journal of Behavioral Sciences, Vol. 6, No. 4, pp. 339-345
- 7- Behzadipoor, Sareh; Pakdaman, Shahla; Besharat, Mohammad A., (2010), "The relationship between attachment styles and concerns about weight in adolescent girls", Journal of Behavioral Sciences, Vol. 4, No. 1, pp. 69-76
- 8- Prout, Thompson; Brown, Douglas, (1992), "Psychotherapy and counseling for children and adolescents (practical applications in health centers and schools)", translated by Hassan, Farahi, (2004), Pub. Arjmand
- 9- Khodabakhshi K., Anahita; Baseri S., Niloofar; Roshan Ch., Rasool; Falsafinejad, Mohammad R., (2014), "A comparison of maladaptive cognitive schemas, irrational beliefs, and communication skills in orphaned and non-orphaned adolescents", Journal of Mental Health Nursing, Vol. 2, No. 1, pp. 1-12
- 10- Khodapanahi, Mohammad K., (2004), "Motivation and emotion", Tehran, Pub. Samt

- 11- Razzaqi, Narges; Ghobari, Bagher; Mazaheri, Mohammad A., (2005), "Comparing the attachment patterns of children under the protection of boarding centers with children under the protection of the family", *Research in the Field of Exceptional Children*, 5<sup>th</sup> year, No. 2, pp. 165-183
- 12- Soleimani, Ali; Soleimani, Ali A.; Farahati, Mehrdad; Ghanbari, Samira, (2013), "The attachment style in orphaned and non-orphaned girls and its relationship with feelings of loneliness", *Sixth International Conference on Child and Adolescent Psychiatry*, Tabriz University of Medical Sciences and Health Services
- 13- Schultz, Dawn, (1990), "Personality theories", Tehran, translated by Yousof, Karimi; Farhad, Jamri; Siyamak, Naghshbandi; Behzad, Goodarzi, Pub. Arasbaran
- 14- Saffari, Raheleh, (2007), "Comparing the levels of depression and excitement in adolescent girls studying at schools in border areas with other girls", MS Thesis, Shahid Beheshti University
- 15- Tabatabaei, Naser, (2001), "The impact of assertiveness on the self-esteem of orphaned girls in State Welfare of Isfahan", MS Thesis, Islamic Azad University of Khorasgan
- 16- Fayyaz, Irandokht; Kiani, Jaleh, (2011), "Investigating the mental health of adolescents in SHahid Dastgheib and Namzi orphanages of Shiraz", *Psychology of exceptional people*, No. 2, 1<sup>st</sup> year, pp. 1-30
- 17- Qaemi, Ali, (1999), "Children and dysfunctional family", Tehran, Pub. Parent Teacher Association
- 18- Ghanbari H., Bahram A., (2011), "Comparing emotional intelligence in orphaned children with normal children", *Journal of Educational Psychology*, No. 21, 7<sup>th</sup> year, pp. 1-17
- 19- Namdar M., Zahra, (2012), "Comparing the attachment style and source of control in 11 to 18-year orphaned and non-orphaned adolescents in Kerman-Iran", MS Thesis, Islamic Azad University of Khorasgan
- 20- Noori, Abolqasem; Makremi, Azar; Ebrahimi, Minoo, (2000), "Comparison of documentary style of orphaned and non-orphaned adolescents in Shiraz-Iran", *Knowledge and Research in Applied Psychology*, 1<sup>st</sup> year, No. 1, pp. 1-16
- 21- Aboud Fand Samuel M., (2002), "Intellectual, social and nutritional states of children in an Ethiopian Orphanage", *Journal of social science 7 Medicine: Vol. 33*, pp. 275-280
- 22- Bicakci, Modriye Yilduz, (2011), "Analysis of social adaption and friend relationships Among Adolescents living in orphanage and Adolescents Living with their Family", *Social and natural science university, Ankara*, Vol. 3, pp. 25-30.
- 23- Borkenau Peter, Reiman Rainer, Angleither Alois, Spinath Frank M., (2001), "Genetic and Environmental Influences on observed personality: Evidence from the German observational study of Adult twins", *Journal of personality and social psychology*, Vol. 80, No. 4, pp. 655-668.
- 24- Donnelan, M. Brent; Conger, Rand D.; Bryant, Chalandra M., (2004), "The big five and enduring marriages", *Journal of Research in Personality*, 39,(1), pp. 206-207.
- 25- Milfont, Tacino L.; Sibley, Chris. G., (2012), "The big five personality traits and environmental engagement: Associations at the individual and societal level", *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 32, pp. 87-95, available at: [www.elsevier.com/locate/jep](http://www.elsevier.com/locate/jep).