

WCPCG-2010

Designing a model based on mindfulness, nonexistential resistance to life and sociability focusing on search for meaning in life in divorced women

Azadeh Farghadani ^a*, Shokouh Navabinejad ^b, Abdollah Shafiabady ^c

^aPh.D student at counselling department of Islamic Azad University, Sciences and Research Branch, Tehran, 14778 93855, Iran

^b Counselling Department, Teacher Training University, Tehran, 15719 14911, Iran

^c Counselling Department, Allameh Tabatabai University, Tehran, 14896 84511, Iran

Received January 14, 2010; revised February 20, 2010; accepted March 9, 2010

Abstract

To study the structural relationship between mindfulness, non-existential-resistance-to-life, sociability variables and their relationship with search-for-meaning-in-life (model's central point), 216 divorced women (20-45 yrs.) were selected from Tehran counseling centers through cluster random selection. The tool devised by the researcher was a questionnaire based on the four variables of mindfulness, non-existential-resistance-to-life, sociability and search-for-meaning-in-life. Following the data analysis using AMOS, a model including 6 direct, 2 indirect paths with proper fitness was devised. Thus, designing theoretical frameworks would provide the possibility of designing more precise therapeutic, educational interventions for researchers, counselors and psychologists.

© 2010 Elsevier Ltd. Open access under [CC BY-NC-ND license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/).

Keywords: Mindfulness; Nonexistential resistance to life ; Sociability; Search for meaning in life; Divorced women

1. Introduction

The collapse of a relationship, as one of the most stressful interpersonal lacks (Duffy, 2005) makes people, with such backgrounds, undergo more mental, behavioral and emotional problems and fluctuations compared to those who do not have the said experience (Chang, Farmer, Grant, Newton, Payne, Perry, Saunders, Smith, Stone, 2003).

Negative consequences of divorce like immune system deficiency, depression, suicide and alcoholism, mood disorders, anxiety disorders, drug abuse, change in lifestyle and self-image, occupational performance decline, change in relationship and social support reduction (Kelly & Hetherington, 2002; Horwitz & Sweeny, 2001; Chatav & Whisman, 2007; Portnoy, 2006; Turvey & Olson, 2006; Waller Steinand & Blackeslee, 1989; cited by Garner, 2008) highlights the necessity of attending to choices that can be considered in post-divorce adaptation.

Women, particularly the younger ones, experience more post-divorce harms than men (Williams & Siegel, 1989; cited by Chang, 2003; Blecksaune & Barrett, 2005). Social vulnerability in divorced women was more than men

* Azadeh Farghadani. Tel.: +98 -21- 22319780; fax: +98 -21-88671363

E-mail address: azadehfarghadani@yahoo.com

(cited by Tafti akhavan, 1382). However, the social aspect of divorced women's life has been slightly emphasized in Iran.

Sociability in the present research focuses on the last principle of George Kelly's personal constructs approach. He believes that sociability is defined as the interpretation of the belief system of others and having a role in a social process that includes others. People are actively involved in interpersonal relationships and know that a part of the construct system includes other people. In this view, the concept of role refers to a behavioral pattern which is resulted from the awareness of a person towards the constructs of people with whom she interacts. The extent of people's involvement in playing their roles can influence their mental health because weakening the major role of individuals leads to highlighting peripheral roles (Feist & Feist, 2002; cited by Sayed Mohammadi, 2007); however, people use their major (central) role for describing themselves and this role forms their identity. Hence, damage takes place when people are away from their healthy role relationship and lose their organization (identity). In these conditions, people play a social, multi-dimensional self and do not experience right and real selves (Kenny, 1989; Spencer, 2000; Butt, 2004; Humphreys, 2005; Feist & Feist; cited by Sayed Mohammadi, 2007). In personal constructs approach, roles of people as students, employees, daughters ... are considered to be peripheral roles (Feist & Feist, 2002; cited by Sayed Mohammadi, 2007). This does not mean that peripheral selves are necessarily wrong; however, they are not taken into the structure of major roles (Kelly, 1969; cited by Butt, 2004).

A divorced woman is expected to live according to her new conditions and label (divorced). Considering the definitions of role, being divorced is a peripheral role for a woman and overemphasizing this role would put the true self of her, as a woman, under the influence of the social self, as expected by the society. George Kelly uses the two expressions of organization and structure to express the extent of normal involvement in roles among people. Organization forms the identity and the major essence of a person and structure represent the peripheral roles. It cannot be expected that people fully and absolutely live free from their expected roles because they ought to have different identities in different situations. These various identities form the structure in human personality and her main identity shapes her organization (Kenny, 1989; Raskin, 2006).

Since a part of women's identity can be sought in relationships ("self" based on the relationship theory) (Firouzbakht, 2002) and the sociability of girls is formed according to their self-definition in their relationship context and as a part of their self-value is based upon their ability to form and preserve relationships (Haeton¹, 1999; cited by Baum², 2006). Considering the vulnerability of the social status of a divorced woman (Chasteen³, 1994), would it be possible to expect her not to merely behave according to the expectations of the society from the one labeled divorced and not to sacrifice her true self for the social self?

Nevertheless, social cooperation reduction in divorced women leads to a decline in their feeling of capability (Kazak, 1980) and social isolation is a threat for the psychological well-being of a woman (Everett, 1992). In comparison to men, women show higher rates of psychiatric disorders in their social roles (Ericsson & Ciarlo, 2000). A divorced woman, even in her new situation, wishes to have relationships and social cooperation. In case she wants to preserve her social image, expected by the society (the extremist admission of do's and don'ts) she would harm her true self and main identity. On the other hand, social support is important for the acceptance of an individual. Durkheim believes that having a sense of meaning can be an intermediation for lack of social roles and depression (Burton, 1999; cited by Marscaro & Rosen, 2008). Now, the question is, whether the variables have a relationship with sociability which, as George Kelly and personal constructs psychology mention. Would the relationship between the variables and their association with sociability lead to designing a model? In order to answer this question, the three variables of mindfulness, nonexistential resistance to life and search for meaning in life will be examined in the present study.

A divorced woman feels that she is abandoned in the past and has become a part of it. As long as she remains in the past, she would not be able to live and focus on the present time. If she thinks that she does not have any control over the issues and cannot deal with the torrent of post-divorce emotions, thoughts and changes, she would deprive herself of a full life. Meanwhile, her meaning of life would be deteriorated or forgotten. Hence, taking into account the mentioned variables considering the negative consequences of divorce seems reasonable.

Among all harms, feeling of insecurity, distress, hope collapse and forgetting the meaning of life are very prevalent (Lorenz, Simons & Chao, 1996; Lagrand, 1998; cited by Chaung, 2003). Search for meaning in life, as in internal motivation for finding meaning in life, is so important that not reaching it can lead to psychological distress (Steger & Fraizier, 2006). Instead, the person would be after joy or avoiding suffers; this is followed by self-

destruction (Mascaro, 2006). In the present study, search for meaning in life is considered as the central point of the model.

Frankl (1965) believes that people are distinguished by their will for meaning and their innate conductive for finding meaning and goal in life and search for meaning is most emphasized by scholars like Frankl (1965) and is specified due to responding to chaotic events (Thompson, Sobolwe-Shubin, Graham & Janigian, 1988). Aspects of meaning in life include the significance of life ontology from the point of view of individual experiences (Crumbaugh & Maholic, 1964), personal life coherence (Battista & Almond, 1973), and meaning-related definitions (What is the meaning of my life?) (Yalom, 1980), contacting one's self and others, life or the world (Debats, Drost & Hansen, 1995; cited by Leath, 1999), goal directing or purposefulness (Ryff & Singer, 1998), progress, relationship, religion, self-transcendence, self-acceptance, intimacy and fair behavior (Wong, 1998; cited by Mascaro, 2006), understanding the opportunities ahead for rewarding emotional experiences (Leath, 1999), internal harmony, individual perspectives towards life and goal, absence of confusion and spirituality (Heather, Purnell, Richardson, Golden-Kreutz & Anderson, 2005).

Because of the very variety in perspectives considering the manner of achieving meaning in life, there is no global meaning compatible with an individual's life. In expressing search for meaning, people are searching for resources to add to the existing resources of search for meaning in their lives or a deep understanding of what has made their life meaning or are seeking new resources to be replaced with the old ones (Steger & Fraizier, 2006). Besides the difference in definition and origins of meaning in life, its presence is essential and brings about authenticity (Kenyon, 2000). What seems to have a highlighted role in divorced women considering search for meaning in life is based on the belief of Frankle on the difference between attitude and experimental values in the experimented value, a source like the experience of having relationships with others and obtaining their approval is considered to be the most important source of search for meaning in life and by losing the relationships and social approvals, the meaning of life would be totally lost. On the contrary, if a person is after the attitude value, losing relationships would not be annoying and the person's attitude would help her to overcome the present situation and even tolerate the suffer (Frankl, 1965; cited by Salehian & Milani; Parrott, 2003). Brehm (1992) believes that low compatibility following the collapse of a relationship is due to the lack of understanding and control (Clark & Collins, 1989 cited by Chaung, 2003). The derangement of a person's assumptions on life due to a traumatic event can disturb the "self" (Denborough, 2005). In such a situation, meaning in life can also be disturbed; therefore, it is expected that there would be different choices if a divorced woman wants to look for meaning in life.

Search for meaning in life is considered from two aspects. Some consider it as a sign of psychological health and an initial incentive as well as a healthy and natural part of life while others take it as a sign of inefficiency (Baumeister, 1991; Klinger, 1998). The third viewpoint includes both probabilities (Reker, 2000). From among presence-search and search-presence models, the conceptual models of presence-search have received more empirical support. According to this model, search in meaning is a pleasant psychological quality and people seek it when they feel that their life has little meaning or has lost its meaning (Steger, Kashdan, Sullivan & Lorentz, 2008). Based on G. J and Lee (2002) structural model on middle aged women, meaning in life has a positive and direct relationship with self-esteem and it is positively and indirectly the intermediation of health status of individuals with their self-esteem. In conceptualizing search for meaning, people who are open to experience are opposite those who tend to suppress impulses and risk taking (Tellegan, 1982; cited by Steger, et al 2008). There is a positive and meaningful relationship between meaning in life and psychological well-being and sociability (Zika & Chamberlain, 1992), autonomy (Steger, Kashdan & Sullivan, 2002; cited by Steger et. al., 2008), coping with issues like incurable diseases, cancer and being a victim of rape (Hamera, Shontz, Stones, 1983; Taylor, Lichtman & Wood, 1984; Silver, Boon, Stones, 1983; cited by Wong, In press). Meaning in life is so important that not searching for that in life can be the intermediation for the relationship between uncontrolled stress and drug abuse, depression and self-destruction for women and thinking about committing suicide for men (Harlow, Newcomb & Bentler, 1986; cited by Wong, In press). The absence of meaning in life is positively associated with crime and murder (Reker, 1977) as well as antisocial behaviors (Shek, et al. 1994).

Mindfulness which is rooted in Buddhism has come into psychology following the emergence of phenomenology, existentialism and humanism. By increasing awareness and attention capacities, the method of processing mindfulness makes readiness for reality and initial contact with the world as it is; also it maintains the possibility of providing more flexible, behavioral and more explicit psychological answers by preventing habitual,

classified and descriptive thinking (Brown & Ryan, 2003). Although there are several definitions for mindfulness such as self-discipline capacity (Brown & Ryan, 2003), acceptance skill (Linehan, 1994; cited by Brown, Ryan & Creswell, 2007) and metacognitive skills (Bishop, Lau, Shapiro, Carlson, Anderson & Carmody, 2004), a common and simple definition of mindfulness can include the surrounding stimuli awareness, body senses, thoughts and feelings (Mishra, 2000; cited by Brown et. al., 2007). Mindfulness has a positive and meaningful relationship with mental health variables (Feldman, Bart, Gross, Chistensen, Benvenuto, 2001), less chaotic and exciting responses (Barnes, Brown, Krusemark, Campbell & Rogge, 2007), self-order behavior and positive emotions (Brown & Ryan, 2003), high well-being levels like lower negative emotions, higher positive emotions, life satisfaction, vitality and self-actualization (Carlson & Brown, 2005), more flexible and compatible responses to events and minimizing habitual or automatic impulsive reactions (Deci & Ryan, 2004; cited by Brown et. al., 2007), creativity (Brown & Ryan, 2003) and more autonomous stimulation in daily behaviors (Brown & Levesque, 2006; cited by Brown et. al., 2007).

Growth after divorce, as a traumatic experience (Chaung, 2003), requires the reorganization of the person's schema on herself and the world (Becker & Zyafer, 2001). Therefore, it seems that characteristics of mindfulness can be related to search for meaning in life by providing awareness on what is taking place and the increase in the acceptance capacity of unpleasant emotions (Borkovec, 2002) because confronting repulsive realities or experiences would reduce defensive or impulsive reactions against them (Ryan, 2005; cited by Brown et. al., 2007). The inability of people in passing painful experiences is referred to in dealing with individual characteristics of people in search for meaning in life (Nolen-Hoksema, Mc Bride & Larson, 1997; Zimbardo & Boyd, 1999; cited by Steger et. al., 2008).

Non-existential resistance to life, as another variable of the present research model, indicates the level people are experiencing. The degree of experience shows the extent they have truly and fully live. Denying awareness or avoiding opportunities may lead to not accomplishing what people are experiencing and this ends in ruining their potential abilities and facilities; at this point, existential resistance to life comes up (Hartman & Zimberoff, 2004). In such cases, the person will experience lack of commitment to life and unwillingness for accepting it by experiencing the sense of "I don't want to be here". Defense mechanisms which lead to existential resistance to life include avoidance (excessive emotional self-sufficiency, unapproved emotional needs, not being involved in life and not taking risks, manipulation of the environment to avoid facing unsolved traumas (Kobak, Sceery & Kennedy, 1999; cited by Hartman & Zimberoff, 2004)), control (inflexibility, prevention, rejecting unexpected information, need for mastering the environment and ignoring emotions) and ambivalence (mental involvement with what they wanted and what does not exist (Main, 1990; cited by Hartman & Zimberoff)), lack of enthusiastic commitment in facing ambiguities, not tolerating positive and negative emotions, absence of a healthy relationship with "self", others and God as well as having problem with decision making (Hartman & Zimberoff, 2004). Thus, it seems that raising the concept of nonexistential resistance to life can represent the full life of people as well as the absence of the said signs.

The theoretical and experimental background of this research reveals that no studies have been conducted with the four variables of the study in for of a structural model and cannot answer the question of the researcher on the possibility of designing a structural model based on relationships between mindfulness, nonexistential resistance to life, sociability and by centralizing search for meaning in life. On the other hand, the necessity of designing models for expressing the theoretical relations of concepts associated with divorce consequences is evident. Due to the possibility of testing the theoretical, suggested outline of researcher, the equivalent structural model can be a proper framework for designing a model. Thus, the next step of researchers for designing therapeutic and educational interventions in this group of women by focusing on an approved theoretical basis would be more precise and scientific; though, it would need modifications throughout time.

2. Methods

2.1. Population, Sample & Sampling Method

The statistical population of the present study includes the divorced women referred to counseling centers of Tehran certified by the I. R. of Iran Counseling & Psychology Organization Council. A list of all centers was prepared and 26 centers were randomly selected from among them, accordingly. The sample consists of 216, 20-45 year-old divorced women referred to the Counseling centers. The subjects should have studied for at least eight years and four years should have passed from the date of their divorce. The random cluster method was the method of choice; 26 centers were randomly selected and the samples were also randomly chosen. Kline (1998) states that if the variables are made 20 times more than the original ones, an ideal sample volume would be obtained; however, decreasing the number of variables to 5 times or less would not suffice for the meaningfulness test of the model impacts. Wahlund (1992), also, asserts that 100-200 persons should be gathered for two to four variables, i.e. the minimum sample volume for one variable in designing a model is 50 subjects.

2.2. Instrument

The tool devised by the researcher was a questionnaire based on the 5 variables of mindfulness, nonexistential resistance to life, sociability, search for meaning in life and concept of simulative role taking that was obtained in factor analysis but was not taken into account and the model was designed based on four variables (i.e. mindfulness, nonexistential resistance to life, sociability and search for meaning in life). The questionnaire contained 59 questions. Face and content validity of the questionnaire was studied and approved by specialist university professors. The reliability of the instrument was reported at 0.96 based on Chronbach's α . In order to determine the construct validity, factor analysis using the principal component and varimax were applied. The reliability of the four factors including search for meaning in life, mindfulness, nonexistential resistance to life, sociability and simulative role taking are 0.98, 0.97, 0.98, 0.99, and 0.97, respectively.

2.2.1 Stages of designing the tool

In order to make a reliable test, the questions should be an inclusive sample of the goals and content of the topic under study. Therefore, the required data was collected through studying the research content and the review of literature, talking to specialist university professors and examining the existing questionnaires. Then, some questions were devised to the target-content table and in form of Likert scale from very low to very high. Some of the questions related to search for meaning in life and mindfulness were adopted from the following relevant and creditable international questionnaires:

TMS (Toronto Mindfulness Scale, Lau et. al., 2006), PMP (Personal Meaning, Jaarsma et. al., 2007), FMI (Frieberg Mindfulness Inventory, Walach et. al., 2005), MAAS (Mindfulness Attention Awareness Scale, Brown & Ryan, 2003), MLQ (Meaning in Life Questionnaire, Steger et. al., 2006), CEI (Curiosity and Exploration Inventory, Kashdan et. al., 2006), MiLS (Meaning in Life Scale, Heather et. al., 2005), PiL (Purpose in Life test, Crumbaugh & Maholic, 1964), SOC (Sense Of Coherence, Antonovsky, 1987), POREE (Perceives Opportunities for Rewarding Emotional Experience, Leath, 1999).

For the other two sections of the questionnaire i.e. nonexistential resistance to life and sociability, the questions were devised based on the theoretical concepts. In the primary pilot execution, 4 out of 63 preliminary questions were omitted according to Chronbach α and the reliability coefficient of the remaining questions was calculated at 96%. In order to determine the validity of the instrument, construct validity as well as face and content validity were used. Component analysis using the main components method was applied to determine the construct validity. In the beginning, KMO test (Kaiser-Mayer-Olkin) was performed to examine the properness of the data and the obtained coefficient was satisfactory (KMO= 0.946). Furthermore, in Bartlett's test for sphericity, $\lambda^2=29510.018$ and it is meaningful at $P=0.001$ level. The Varimax rotation was applied for diagnosing the possible component which bases the test. Based on Eigen value, factors 1-3 are bigger than 1 and this shows that three factors with an Eigen value of >1 can be extracted. The three factors totally express 86.225% of the total variance of the questions. The first factor expresses 70.044% the second component expresses 10.659 and the third component expresses 5.522% of variance. According to the Screeplot, also, the three factors were determined; the first factor had the major share of variance in expressing the questionnaire. In order to reach a simple structure, the three factors were rotated towards the varimax. The Eigen value of the components 1-3 were respectively 3.256, 6.289 and 41.326 before rotation; after

the rotation, the values were 21.378, 17.644 and 11.142, correspondingly. After studying the component matrix, in order to simplify the components, loads are chosen as acceptable component loads. As a result, after 24 test rotations, a simple structure was accomplished. In this phase, 23, 19, 11 questions were specified for sociability, search for meaning in life and nonexistential resistance to life, respectively; their reliabilities were correspondingly 99%, 98% and 99%. Since the first component is very inclusive, it was re-analyzed and the previous phases were repeated. The obtained results are: KMO= 0.959, Bartlett's test for sphericity: $\lambda^2=12861.691$ which is meaningful at $P=0.001$ level. The Eigen values of components 1 and 2 are >1 and totally express 88.835% of the variance for all questions. The first component expresses 80.365 and the second component expresses 5.351% of the variance before rotation. Also, according to the scree plot, two components can be extracted. In order to reach a simple structure, the two determined components are rotated towards the varimax; the Eigen values of the components (1 & 2) were respectively 23.306 and 1.552 before rotation; however, after rotation, the values were 22.413 for the first and 20.799 for the second component. After studying the component matrix, their rotation is necessary to facilitate the interpretation of the data and simplify the components. The components loads of 0.30 were considered as acceptable loads for calculating meaningfulness: after 24 test rotations, a simple structure was obtained. In this phase, 18 questions for simulative role taking and 11 questions for mindfulness were determined and their reliabilities were calculated at 0.99 and 0.97, respectively. It is to be noted that the research model was designed according to the first 4 variables of search for meaning in life, mindfulness, nonexistential resistance to life and sociability; simulative role taking was not taken into account. However, after designing and determining the fitness of the basic model, the researcher, due to her curiosity, examined the mentioned variable along with the four preliminary variables. As a result, a model with proper fitness was obtained and no paths were suggested from the four variables to the simulative role taking. (Questionnaire is in Appendix 1)

2.3. Method of data analysis

This is a descriptive, correlative study which was performed by distributing a questionnaire, gathering and entering the data into the computer in order to analyze the data and provide the model. AMOS software (6th edition) was used for designing the model and performing the fitness model. The four indices of GFI, AGFI, RMSEA and λ^2 are more important than the others and the results are reported.

Table 1. Statistical descriptive indices of intrinsic & extrinsic variables

Variable Index	Sociability	Search for meaning in life	Non-existential resistance to life	Mindfulness
Mean	52.79	40.73	21.92	98.18
Median	47	38	22	5
Mode	29	38	22	11
Standard deviation	24.554	14.789	8.793	9.374
Variance	602.894	218.711	77.319	87.879
Minimum	29	19	11	11
Maximum	108	72	43	44
Total	11402	8797	47.35	41

According to the table above, the mean and median of sociability are 52.79 and 47, respectively. The variance obtained from the variable is 602.894. The mean, median and variance of search for meaning in life are correspondingly 40.73, 38 and 218.711. The mean for nonexistential resistance to life is 21.92 and the median as well as the obtained variance are 22 and 77.319. The mean, median and variance of the last variable, i.e. mindfulness, are reported at 18.98, 15 and 87.879, respectively.

Table 2. Correlation matrix of variables

Variable	Mindfulness	Non-existential resistance to life	Search for meaning in life	Sociability
Mindfulness	1			
Nonexistential resistance to life	0.711**	1		


Search for meaning in life	0.642**	0.830**	1	
Sociability	0.947**	0.636**	0.739**	1

** P value <0.01

The highest correlation coefficients of the very matrix are obtained among the following variables, respectively: mindfulness and sociability (0.947), nonexistential resistance to life and search for meaning in life (0.830), search for meaning in life and sociability (0.739), mindfulness and nonexistential resistance to life (0.711), mindfulness and search for meaning in life (0.642), nonexistential resistance to life and sociability (0.636).

According to the equations of variables prediction in the final model, 97.7 percent of the sociability variance is expressed by mindfulness, search for meaning in life and non-existential resistance to life. Also, 69.2 percent of search for meaning in life variance is articulated by non-existential resistance to life and mindfulness; 50.4 percent of the variance of nonexistential resistance to life is also conveyed through mindfulness. According to the analysis of the step-wise phase regression, the strongest predictor of sociability is mindfulness ($B=0.937$, $t=62.269$, $P<0.01$). The mentioned variable meaningfully expresses 0.931 percent of the sociability variance ($R^2=0.931$, $F=1858.222$, $P<0.01$); the next variable is search for meaning in life ($B=0.504$, $t=26.628$, $P<0.01$) which meaningfully describes 0.548 percent sociability variance ($R^2=0.548$, $F=1297.145$, $P<0.01$). The third variable entered the analysis is nonexistential resistance to life ($B=-0.448$, $t=-22.011$, $P<0.01$) that expresses 0.475 percent of the sociability variance ($R^2=0.475$, $F=2989.186$, $P<0.01$).

Fitness tests of the model indicate that λ^2 is not meaningful. The relativity index of λ^2 to freedom degree in this research was 1.474 which shows the fitness of the model. GFI and AGFI indices are respectively 0.995 and 0.959 which indicate the fitness of the model. Likewise, RMSEA is also reported at 0.47.



**P<0.01

F₁: Sociability

F₂: Search for meaning in life

F₃: Nonexistential resistance to life

F₄: Mindfulness

Figure 1. The approved model of the research

The analysis of the model paths demonstrates the following information. There are 6 direct and 2 indirect paths in the present research model. Mindfulness has a positive, direct and meaningful relationship with nonexistential resistance to life ($P<0.01$, $t=14.840$, $B=0.711$, estimated amount: 0.667). The said variable has a direct and positive relationship with search for meaning in life ($P<0.05$, $t=1.891$, $B=0.105$, estimated amount: 0.027) and sociability ($P<0.01$, $t=64.033$, $B=0.947$, estimated amount: 0.94). Moreover, mindfulness and nonexistential resistance to life intermediations are positively and indirectly associated with search for meaning in life ($P<0.01$, $t=9.33$, $B=0.537$, estimated amount: 0.14). There is a positive, direct and meaningful relationship between nonexistential resistance to life and search for meaning in life ($P<0.01$, $t=13.179$, $B=0.756$, estimated amount: 0.21). Nonexistential resistance to life has a negative, direct relationship with sociability ($P<0.01$, $t=-21.652$, $B=0.472$, estimated amount: -0.50) and a positive, indirect relationship with search for meaning in life intermediation and sociability ($P<0.001$, $t=18.2$, $B=0.395$, estimated amount: 0.42). Search for meaning in life is positively and directly linked to sociability ($P<0.01$, $t=23.269$, $B=0.523$, estimated amount: 1.987). It is to be mentioned that the estimated amounts reported above are

rounded off in the model by the software and the model has reported them likewise. The general impact of mindfulness on search for meaning in life, nonexistential resistance to life on search for meaning in life as well as search for meaning in life on sociability is 0.642, 0.756 and 0.523, correspondingly.

3. Discussion

In the recent study, 8 paths in form of 6 direct and 2 indirect paths linked with the four variables of mindfulness, nonexistential resistance to life and sociability by focusing on search for meaning in life, are discussed. The direct and positive relationship between mindfulness and nonexistential resistance to life indicates that increasing mindfulness increases nonexistential resistance to life. Along with this, regardless of the failure resulting from divorce, the divorced women under study could concentrate on the current potential facilities and avoid rejecting their opportunities and abilities by living in the present time.

Awareness resulting from full presence at the moment together with the reduction of impulsive reactions (Ryan, 2005; cited by Brown et. al., 2007) leads to the growth in one's insight towards herself, others and the conditions (Brown et. al., 2007). When thought has the choice of being or not being involved, at the time of raising a problem, thoughts are less biased (Niemiec, Brown, Ryan, 2006; cited by Brown et. al., 2007). A person with nonexistential resistance to life also does not have some specific pre-defined choices which are resulted from her unawareness (Hartman & Zimberoff, 2004). It is expected that nonexistential resistance to life does not exist in a mindful person for she is aware of the consequences. The positive and direct relationship between mindfulness and search for meaning in life indicates the increase in the person's mindfulness, increases the person's motivation for search for meaning in crisis. Therefore, by abandoning past and consequences of divorce, the process of life meaning growth is facilitated based on the present reality. Reception, as the major characteristic of mindfulness (Deikman, 1997; Martin, 1982; cited by Brown & Ryan, 2003), facilitates the possibility of negotiating life situations, the active processing of challenging situations as well as post-trauma growth (Langer; cited by Brown et. al., 2007).

A great deal of suffer is the result of people's need for what they wish but does not exist in addition to omitting what they do not like (Ekman, Davidson, Richard & Wallace, 2005). However, mindfulness can facilitate the emergence of positive emotional states which do not depend on the conditions (Tart, 1994; Mc Intosh, 1997; cited by Brown et. al., 2007). It can also assist the growth process of new goals in life and meaning in life based on the present life realities (Becker & Zyafer, 2001). Studies of Eifert and Heffner (2003), also, emphasize that mindful people are more willing to tolerate and stay with the unpleasant stimulus because their optimism and self-esteem increases (Brown & Ryan, 2003). The positive and indirect relationship between mindfulness through nonexistential resistance to life and search for meaning in life shows that the ability of divorce women to take a different approach towards a problem and facilitate their openness towards the experience they confront. According to the study of Brown & Ryan, 2003; Baere, Smith & Alen; cited by Brown et al, a mindful person can improve unpleasant moods.

Therefore, there is a possibility that by preserving mindfulness as an ability, a divorced woman can learn that her approach towards a problem can change, though the conditions may not favorably differ; this can lead to the meaningful reduction of signs (Kabat-Zinn, 1991; cited by Chaskalson, 2005). Hence, it seems that the issue raised in transferring meaning (the compatibility between experience and personal meaningful concepts) (Denne & Thompson, 1991) can come off for a divorced woman due to mindfulness and nonexistential resistance to life. The reason is that such women do not need to use the mechanisms of non-existential resistance to life (control, avoidance and ambivalence) which disturb full, pure lives. Instead, they expose the problem and find a situational meaning as well as its compatibility with the global meaning; this reduces the level of distress (Park & Folkman, 1997). The direct and positive relationship between nonexistential resistance to life and search for meaning in life displays the ability of divorced women in decreasing their suffer and facing the reality with the help of minute-by-minute living in the present time. According to Ekman, Davidson, Richard, et al (2005), people would undergo a great suffer when they do not accomplish what they wish and want to ruin what they do not like. It seems that being released from the past conditions can reduce divorced women's suffer by re-providing a motivation for search for meaning in life. The positive, direct relationship between mindfulness and sociability can show the increase in the sociability of divorced women through the raise of awareness in their thought, feelings and surrounding environment.

So, when a divorced woman can fulfill what George Kelly considers sociability through mindfulness, it may mean that she could manage to preserve her organization (identity) along with her major role, avoid being involved in her peripheral role as a divorced woman excessively and also possess her social status. Mindfulness can create a deeper understanding of the concept of "self" which is rooted in awareness. Therefore, events like rejection imposed on the "self" are not considered too threatening (Brown et. al., 2007) because mindfulness has a positive and meaningful relationship with self-expression in social contexts (Leary, 2004) as well as self-strengthening processes (Taylore, et. al., 2003; cited by Brown et. al., 2007). According to the study of Barnes et. al. (2007), mindful people are more satisfied with their relationships and have a greater capacity for providing constructive responses to distress in relationships.

The positive and direct relationship between search for meaning in life and sociability is an indicator of the increase in the sociability of divorced women by enhancing the motivation for search for meaning in their present lives.

When people use external sources as the basis for their psychological strong points, they would experience a more rapid and intensive deficiency in meaning in case of losing them (Steger et. al., 2008). If a social relationship is considered as the main source of meaning, only the empirical values (of Frankl) would be obtained and by losing the relationship, meaning in life would disappear, as well (Parrot, 2003). Therefore, it seems that when a divorced woman can look for search for meaning in life, i.e. attitude values, in order to adapt with issues beyond control and have a non-passive role in response to life conditions (Parrot, 2003). Therefore, her sociability is maintained based on not only a social self that is slightly damaged but also a real, true self. According to Kelly, central system constructs are the self preserving processes. When the preservation level, i.e. proper relationship disturbance or disturbance in relationships based on forming the "self" is threatened, disorders come up (Kenny, 1989). As a result, the motivation of search for meaning in life in divorced women was so strong that they could enter the context of social relationships according to their central role (what they are and not what they have to be) regardless of the pressures resulting from the expectations of the society from a divorced woman. Zika & Chamberlain (1992) also state that meaning of life has a positive and meaningful relationship with sociability.

The direct, negative relationship between nonexistential resistance to life and sociability may mean that even in case of not having nonexistential resistance to life, Kelly's sociability is not fulfilled and the individual would be away from healthy role relationships. According to George Kelly, healthy role relationships should lead to changes in structure and also organization (identity) preservation (Kenny, 1989). Hence, an individual should not choose to be completely involved in role relationships (Leitner, Faidley, Celentana, 2000; cited by Humphreys, 2005); however, when search for meaning in life is considered as the intermediation variable along with nonexistential resistance to life and sociability, the conditions change. It means that nonexistential resistance to life, due to search for meaning in life, can have a positive and meaningful relationship with sociability. A divorced woman without existential resistance to life can avoid taking the signs into major roles through search for meaning in life. From the structural point of view, these signs (which can be the harms of divorce and its social consequences as a divorced woman) can be used for compensating environmental disorder (Kenny, 1989) and attracting them into the major role (organization, identity) means practicing them. Therefore, the goal of psychotherapy is to engage its own references in the growth process, i.e. the abilities for preserving the organization of "self" and adaptation of structures can be increased (Kenny, 1989). Accordingly, the most important applied proposal of the research can be designing therapeutic and educational interventions in form of psychotherapy or educational groups based on the variables of the researcher's theoretical model for divorced women. Limitation of research is, not attending to variables that are relevant with severity of consequences of divorce.

4. Conclusion

Also, apart from all emotional, psychological, legal and financial problems that she would experience, she as a divorced woman would have to respond to the looks and judgments of others. This new role would become a part of her identity. This is the concept called social divorce which, along with psychological divorce, refers to the adaptability of an individual with the society considering her new role. Besides all results of the present research which indicate a change in the trend of dealing with divorce in Iranian women, the social aspect of divorce in this group of women in this research could be an evidence for the post-divorce social growth. The reason is that these women could maintain their sociability based on the major role regardless of the peripheral role of a divorced

woman. Mindfulness, nonexistential resistance to life and search for meaning in life played a major role in this regard.

References

- Barnes, Sean. & Brown, Kirk. & Krusemark, Elizabeth. & Campbell, W. Keith. & Rogge, Ronald D. (2007). The Role Of Mindfulness In Romantic Relationship Satisfaction And Responses To Relationship Stress. *Journal Of Marital & Family Therapy*: 33, (4), 409-427.
- Battista J. Almond R. (1973). The Development Of Meaning In Life. *Psychiatry*, 36, 409-427.
- Baum, Nehami. (2006). Separation Guilt In Women Who Initiate Divorce. *Clinical Social Work. Journal Springer Science*.
- Baumeister, R. (1991). *Meaning Of Life*. New York: The Guilford Press.
- Becker. C. B. & Zyafer, C. (2001). Integrating DBT-Based Techniques And Concepts To Facilitate Exposure Treatment For PTSD. *Cognitive And Behavioral Practice*, 8, 107-122.
- Bishop, S. R. & Lau, M. & Shapiro, S. & Carlson, L. & Anderson, N. D. & Carmody. J. et al. (2004). Mindfulness: A Proposed Operational Definition. *Clinical Psychology: Science & Practice*, 11, 230-241.
- Blekesaune, Morten. & Barrett, Anne. E. (2005). Marital Dissolution And Work Disability *European Sociological Review*, 21,(3), 259-271.
- Borkovec, T. D. (2002). Life In The Future Versus Life In The Present. *Clinical Psychology: Science And Practice*, 9, 76-80.
- Brown, Kirk Warren. & Ryan, Richard M. & Creswell, J. David. (2007). Target Article. Mindfulness: Theoretical Foundations And Evidence For It's Salutary Effects. *Psychological Inquiry*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 18, (4), 211-237.
- Brown, Kirk Warren. & Ryan, Richard. (2003). The Benefits Of Being Present Mindfulness And It's Role In Psychological Well-Being. *Journal Of Personality And Social Psychology*, 84, (4), 822-848.
- Butt, Trever. (2004). Core Role Structure. *The Internet Encyclopedia Of Personal Construct Psychology*. www.pcp.net.org.
- Carlson, L. E. & Brown, K. W. (2005). Validation Of The Mindful Attention Awareness Scale In A Cancer Population. *Journal Of Psychosomatic Research*, 58, 29-33.
- Chaskalson, Michael Wayne. (2005). *Mindfulness As Cognitive Training*. School Of Education, University Of Wales Bangor. Dissertation.
- Chasteen, A. (1994). "The World Around me": The Environment And Single Women. *Sex Roles*. 31, 309-328.
- Chang, Cheung. & Farmer, Steven. & Grant, Karen. & Newton, Rebecca. & Payne, Sally. & Perry Melissa. & Saunders, Jenny. & Smith, Charlotte. & Stone, Nina. (2003). Coping With Post-Traumatic Stress Symptoms Following Relationship Dissolution. *Stress And Health*, 19, 27-36.
- Crumbaugh, JC. & Maholic LT (1964). An Experimental Study In Existentialism: The Psychometric Approach To Frankle's Concept Of Noogenic Neurosis. *J Clin Psychol*, 20, 200-207.
- Denborough, David. (2005). Trauma, meaning. Witnessing Action. An Interview With Keath Weingarten. *The International Of Narrative Therapy Community Work*. www.dulwichcentre.com.
- Denne, J. M. & Thompson, N. L. (1991). The Experience Of Transition To Meaning And Purpose In Life. *Journal Of Phenomenological Psychology*, 22, (2), 109-133.
- Duffey, Thelma. (2005). *Creative Interventions In Grief And Loss Therapy*. Howorth Press.
- Ekman, P. & Davidson, R. J. & Richard, M. & Wallace, B. A. (2005). Buddhist And Psychological Perspectives On Emotions And Well-Being. *Current Directions In Psychological Science*, 14,59-63.
- Ericsson, Natalies Sachs. & Ciarlo, James A. (2000). Gender, Social Roles And Mental Health: An Epidemiological Perspective. *Journal Of Research: Sex Roles*.
- Everett, Craig A. (1992). *The Consequences Of Divorce Economic And Custodial Impact On Children And Adults*. Haworth Press.
- Feist, less., & Gregori J, Feist. (2002). *Theories Of Personality*, Translated by Sayed Mohammadi, Yahya. (2007). Tehran, Ravan Publications.
- Feldman Barrett, L. & Gross, J. & Chistensen, T.C. & Benvenuto, M. (2001). Knowing What You're Feeling And Knowing What To Do About It: Mapping And The Relation Between Emotion Differentiation And Motion Regulation. *Cognition & Emotion*, 15, 713-724.
- Frankl, Victor Emil. (1965); *Man's search for meaning: An Introduction to logotherapy*, Translated by Salehian, Nehzat; Milani, Mahin (1387), Tehran, Dorsa publications.
- G. J. Park. & KH Lee. (2002). A Structural Model For Depression In Middle-Aged Women. *Korean Journal Women Health Nurse*. 8, (1), 69-84.
- Garner, Christopher. N. (2008). *The Reality Of Divorce: A Study Of The Effects Of Divorce On Parents And Their Children*. Liberty University. Fortified Marriage Ministry. www.fortifiedmarriages.com.
- Hartman, David & Zimberoff, Diane, (2004). Existential Resistance To Life: Ambivalence, Avoidance & Control, *Journal Of Heart-Centered Therapies*, 7, (1), 3-63.
- Heather S. ,Jim. & Purnell Jason. & Richardson Susan A. & Golden-Kreutz, Deanna. & Anderson, Barbara L. (2005). *Measuring Meaning In Life Following Cancer*. The Ohio State University Columbus.
- Hompheys, Carol, Lee. (2005). *An Alternative Lens For A Case Of Dissociative Identity: Experiencial Personal Construct Psychology Thesis*. Miami University.
- Kazak Anne E. (1980). *Life Satisfaction And Perceived Role Competence In Single Parent Divorced Women*. Education Resources Information Center.
- Kenny, Vincent. (1989). *Anticipating Autopeiosis. Personal Construct Psychology And Self Organising Systems*. www.oikos.org.
- Kenyon, G. M. (2000). *Philosophical Foundation Of Existential Meaning In G. T. Reker & K. Chamberlain (Eds.) Exploring Existential Meaning: Oprimizing Human Development Across The Life Span*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Kline, Rex B. (1998). *Principles And Practice Of Structural Equation Modeling*. NY. Guilford Press. A Very Readable Introduction To The Subject With Good Coverage Of Assumptions And SEM's Relation To Underlying Regression, Factor And Other Techniques.

- Klinger, E. (1998). The Search For Meaning In Evolutionary Perspective And It's Clinical Implications. In P. T. P. Wong & P. S. Fry (Eds.) *The Human Quest For Meaning: A Handbook Of Psychological Research And Clinical Application* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Leary, M. R. (2004). *The Curse Of The Self-Awareness, Egotism, And The Quality Of Human Life*. NY: Oxford University Press.
- Leath, Colin. (1999). The Experience Of Meaning In Life From A Psychological Perspective. Junior Paper, Psychology Honors Program, URL <http://purl.oclc.org/net!cleath/writings/meaning.htm>.
- Mascaro, Nathan. & Rosen, David H. (2008). Assessment Of Existential Meaning And It's Longitudinal Relations With Depressive Symptoms. *Journal Of Social And Clinical Psychology*, New York. 27, (6).
- Mascaro, Nathan. (2006). Longitudinal Analysis Of The Relationship Of Existential Meaning With Depression And Hope Dissertation Of Graduate Studies Of Texas, A & M University.
- Park, CL. & Folkman S. (1997). Meaning In The Context Of Stress And Coping. *Rev Gen Psychol*, 1, 115-144.
- Parrott, Less. (2003). *Psychotherapy And Counseling*. Second Edition.
- Raskin, Gonathan, D. (2002). Constructivism In Psychology: Personal Construct Psychology Radical Constructivism & Social Constructionism *American Communication Journal*. 5, (3).
- Reker, G. T. (2000). Theoretical Perspective, Dimensions, And Measurement Of Existential Meaning. In G. T. Reker & K. Chamberlain (Eds), *Exploring Existential Meaning: Optimizing Human Development Across The Life Span* (PP 39-58). Thousand Oaks. CA: Sage Publication.
- Reker, G.T. (1977). The Purpose - In - Life Test In An Inmate Population: An Empirical Investigation. *Journal Of Clinical Psychology*, 33, (3), 688-693.
- Ryff, C. D. & Singer, B (1988). The Contours Of Positive Human Health. *Psychological Inquiry*, 9, 1-28.
- Sharf, Richards, *Theories of Psychotherapy & Counseling*, Translated by Firoozbakht, Mehrdad. (2002), Tehran, Resa Institute of Cultural Services.
- Shek, D. T. L., Ma, H. K & Cheung, P. C. (1994). Meaning In Life And Adolescent Antisocial And Prosocial Behavior In A Chinese Context. *Psychologia*, 37,211-218.
- Spencer, A MC Williams. (2000). Construing Contemplation Challenges To A Constructivist Theory. *Psychosocial- Verlag*, 267-271.
- Steger, Michael, F. & Kashdan, Todd, B. & Sullivan, Brandon, A. & Lorente, Danielle. (2008). Understanding The Search For Meaning In Life: Personality, Cognitive Style And The Dynamic Between Seeking And Experiencing Meaning. *Journal Of Personality*, Blackwell Publishing, 76, (2).
- Steger, Michael. F. & Fraizier, Patricia. (2006). The Meaning In Life Questionnaire: Assessing The Presence Of And Search For Meaning In Life. *Journal Of Counseling Psychology*, American Psychological Association, 53 (1), 80-93.
- Tafti, Akhavan. (1382). Consequences of divorce, *women studies*, 1, (3), 125-152.
- Thompson, SC. & Sobolew-Shubin, A. & Graham, MA. & Janigian, AS. (1989). Psychosocial Adjustment Following A Stroke. *SOC SCI med*, 28, 239-247.
- Wahlund, R. (1992). Tax Changes And Economic Behavior: The Case Of Tax Evasion. *Journal Of Economic Psychology*. 73. 657-677.
- Wong & Fry P.S. (in press) *Meaning In Life: Theory And Research Handbook Of Personal Meaning: Theory Research And Application*.
- Yalom, I. D. (1980). *Existential Psychotherapy* New York: Basic Books.
- Zika, S. & Chamberlain, K. (1992). On The Relationship Between Meaning In Life And Psychological Well-Being. *British Journal Of Psychology*, 83, 133-145.

Appendix 1

	Stage 1 of Factor analysis			Stage 2 of Factor analysis	
	sociability 1	Search for meaning in life 2	Nonexistential resistance to life 3	Simulative role taking 1	Mindfulness 2
1. When I am doing what I like, I am so interested that I do not feel the time passing by.	0.796			0.928	
2. I easily drown in my thoughts.				0.930	
3. I avoid the situations that make me anxious		0.690			
4. I feel bad if I cannot behave according to what others expect				0.932	
5. I have goal in my life		0.831			
6. I face any experience even if it is unpleasant.	0.788			0.936	
7. I accept myself as I am.	0.760				0.930
8. I play different roles (employee, child mother, ...) well and can distinguish them from each other.				0.942	
9. I have dealt with my past.			0.739		
10. When I face a chaotic situation, I lose my concentration.	0.774			0.923	
11. If a problem occurs on my way, I do not abandon my goals.		0.795			
12. I think that I behave according to the expectations of others so much that I ignore my needs and expectations.				0.935	
13. In chaotic and stressful situations, I still experience some peaceful moments.	0.768				0.939
14. I know my needs well.	0.722				0.918
15. I think of the past or the future.	0.799				0.723
16. I try hard to prevent people from knowing what I really am.				0.930	
17. I accept things that cannot be changed in my life.			0.731		
18. I am not afraid of taking risks and can tolerate failure.		0.631			
19. I do most of my jobs habitually and not enthusiastically and attentively.	0.840			0.910	
20. I can delay my needs.	0.677				0.914
21. Before contacting people, I continuously think of the conversation between us and the behavior I should have.	0.741				0.951
22. I think of what I wanted from life and what has happened.			0.775		
23. I am aware of whatever happens around me (sounds or events).	0.761				
24. I am ready to face unpredictable	0.787			0.931	

matters.					
25. I behave with people as they like or expect me.				0.947	
26. Unpleasant happenings of life made me learn many things about me and my goals.			0.733		
27. I am not afraid of facing unfamiliar situations.		0.798			
28. I think of many solutions when I came across a problem.	0.774			0.916	
29. I easily accept the critics of others.	0.847			0.929	
30. My spiritual beliefs and faith make me calm.		0.817			
31. I know my future goals but I do not drown in them.	0.784				0.947
32. Pleasing others is important for me.	0.827			0.921	
33. I am not afraid of facing negative feelings like fear or anger.		0.780			
34. Doing daily chores can be pleasing and joyful.			0.713		
35. I feel that life has been unfair to me.		0.790			
36. I like others to think that I can cope with the issues well.	0.764				0.929
37. I do not become anxious in facing positive feeling like happiness and fully enjoy the situation.		0.821			
38. I am pleased with my relationships.		0.827			
39. I am aware of the movement in my parts of body (shaking my foot, playing with fingers)	0.758				0.949
40. I can find solutions for painful issues of life.			0.752		
41. I feel calm inside.			0.754		
42. I can have a close relationship with God in any situation (either good or bad).		0.780			
43. I can explain the details of TV programs after watching them.	0.832			0.924	
44. I can easily trust others.		0.661			
45. When I feel good, I do not think that something can spoil the feeling.		0.772			
46. I am after something to give meaning to my life.		0.838			
47. Only when I feel powerful, I can be calm and enjoy the life.			0.685		
48. I experience confusion and wonder in different situations.		0.798			
49. When a person experiences a failure in life, she should behave like a defeated person.	0.844			0.920	
50. When something happens, I do not care about it more or less than what I should.			0.743		
51. My life is targeted and full of love for people.		0.787			
52. I am fully satisfied with what I am.			0.719		
53. I blame myself if things do not go as I wish.			0.642		

54. I become anxious in new, unfamiliar situations.		0.701			
55. Life is possible without the support and approval of others.	0.777			0.933	
56. I am a decisive person and can express myself.	0.793			0.944	
57. Occupational, educational or family achievements are not my final goals in life.		0.796			
58. I view the problems as an opportunity for learning.	0.704				0.909
59. Attending to feelings leads to harm and failure.		0.612			