

An Evaluation of the Maladaptive Schemas and Personality Traits among Drugs Dependents

Fatemeh Akhlaghi Yazdi Nezhad¹, Rashen Abdollahi^{2*}

¹Allameh Tabatabaie University, Tehran, Iran; ²Faculty of Psychology, Allameh Tabatabaie University, Tehran, Iran

*E-mail: 1357Reza1350@gmail.com

Received for publication: 24 October 2016.

Accepted for publication: 02 February 2017.

Abstract

This study aimed at investigating the relationship between maladaptive schemas and personality characteristics of substance abusers. For this purpose, 120 married substance abusers were purposefully selected. According to the results, extraversion personality characteristic can be anticipated through dependency, suffering, restraint and abandonment. Also, the dependent variable of neuroticism personality characteristic can be predicted by four predictors of emotional deprivation, dependency, suffering, and abandonment. The dependent variable of openness personality trait can also be predicted by two predictors of distrust and obedience. The dependent variable of compatibility personality trait can be traced through three predictors of mistrust, defect and emotional deprivation as well. Finally, the dependent variable of being conscientious can be anticipated by three predictors of emotional deprivation, defect and social isolation. Accordingly, it can be concluded that personality characteristics and early maladaptive schemas appropriately predict the factors increasing or decreasing the tendency to addiction.

Keywords: Personality traits, early maladaptive schemas, drugs dependents

Introduction

Addiction is one of the most important social issues hence, it is important to assess the causes and factors influencing the tendency to drug abuse. Substance abuse cannot solely be known as physical, psychological or social problem because it appears due to the interaction of several problems (National Institute of Drug Abuse, 2007, as cited in Pour Mohammad, 2013). Therefore, the inappropriate use of drugs is one of the health and social problems of today's world (Rush & Wild, 2003). Nations and governments around the world are faced with the problem of drug abuse and addiction, a danger that a generation ago was incredible to increase to such extent (Celedy and Mahdavi, 2003). Addiction is the frequent use of a substance that its deprivation leads to symptoms of discomfort and an intense desire to use it again which causes physical and mental deterioration. Today, this term has been replaced by the term "dependency" that is defined as the frequent use of a drug or chemical substance with or without physical dependence (Sadock, 2007).

Whatever the number of risky factors to be more in a person, there is increase in the likelihood of drug use (Maskani and Jafarzadeh Fakhar, 2008). Despite extensive damages of drug use, investigating the underlying mechanisms of chronic use of drug is an important informing source that can develop appropriate intervention strategies. Regarding the cause of the problematic use of drug point to the factors such as personality traits of individuals, researchers consider the powerful role of personality traits in interaction with other environmental factors in the onset and continuation of the problematic use of drug (Dermody, et al., 2013). Many addicts are people with disorders and immaturity of personality who, by interacting and creating a dependency relationship with other addicts are pushed to this way (Jazayeri, et al., 2004). Studies show that, although the

consumption of opiates causes a feeling of euphoria and relaxation and reduces pain, they lead to high drug abuse (Veillux JC, et al., 2010). Most of the addicted people have distinctive personality traits. These intrinsic traits and specific tendency, gradually expand and intensify the path of drug use. Namely, people with vulnerable personality traits are more prone to drug abuse (Oraki and et al., 2013; Le Bon et al., 2004; Arnau et al., 2008). Diathesis-stress theory (Eysenck 1981, as cited in Spielberger & Reheirser, 2006) showed how differences in personality, motivational and environmental factors are involved in tobacco consumption. Eysenck, in his theory, considers emotional annoyance and boredom as the main internal motivational states that stimulate tobacco use. These states are directly affected by nicotine dipping that changes brain stimulations to achieve an optimal level of arousal. It seems that the nicotine in cigarette reduces the severe anxiety or anger feelings in stressful situations. In this theory, Eysenck states that individuals with high scores in neuroticism response to the environmental stress with severe emotional reaction and higher levels of brain arousal that stimulates them to use tobacco in stressful situations to reduce tension and autonomous motivation. Given the prevalence of drug use and its negative aftermath warning, it is necessary to collect information on factors that could contribute to treatment programs and decrease the likelihood of drug use. One of the factors that can be targeted in the treatment programs for drug users is early maladaptive schemas (Ballsa, 2007). Schemas are formed from the beginning of life and affect the person throughout life (Dozois, et al., 2009). But, early schemas are beliefs that people have about themselves, others and environment and are typically originated from unfulfilled primary needs especially emotional needs during childhood (Yang, et al., 1999). In fact, early maladaptive schemas are constant and persistent throughout life and form the basis of cognitive structures of individuals. These schemes help the person to organize his experiences about the world around and process information received (Diener, 2003; Maltby, 2004). Early maladaptive schemas are auto-convulsive emotional and cognitive patterns that are in mind from beginning of the growth and development and are repeated in the course of life (Young, 1999). Schemas are emerged from parents talking with child which gradually situates in his mind and now systematically, but inefficiently control his life (Hamidpour, 2007). Maladaptive schemas as cognitive infrastructures lead to the formation of irrational beliefs and have cognitive, emotional, and behavioral components. When they are activated, a level of excitement is released and directly or indirectly leads to psychological distress such as depression, anxiety, occupational inability, substance abuse, interpersonal conflicts and suchlike (Young, 1996). Beck described schemas as cognitive structures for selection, encoding and evaluation of stimulants that can affect the organism. Schemas grow during childhood and act as a model for processing overall experiences of life (Yang et al, Trans: Hamidpour & Andouz, 2010). Since schemes are relatively stable, they are constantly searched as confirmed information that can lead to individual's vulnerability to psychological distress (McGinn and Yang, 1996). Maladaptive schemas can arise through primary aversive experiences and later in similar situations provoke a response that had appeared in the past (Schmidt, et al., 1999). Yang and his colleagues have identified 18 maladaptive schemas that can develop and continue in individuals. These schemas are categorized in five distinct areas: too much vigilance and deterrence, cut and rejecting, other orientation, autonomy and disrupt function and constraints (Young, 2003). According to Young, early maladaptive schemas may be the main core of personality disorders, mild cognitive behavior problems and many chronic disorders and there are lot of researches in support of this view (Carr & Francis, 2010; Thimm, 2010; Tremblay & Dozois, 2009). Drug use can be an inefficient defense method against the negative effects of early maladaptive schemas. People with positive schemas are at lower risk of disease because they experience more positive emotions when they encounter with problems and they are stronger in coping styles. Yang and his colleagues

suggest that "the removal of inefficient coping responses without changing the schemas are impossible almost forever" (Yang et al., 2003).

Bloch, et al. (1997) showed that there is a relationship between immature defense mechanisms and smoking. People who abuse substances and cigarettes, use immature defense mechanisms more. The people in stressful situations cannot apply effective and efficient defense mechanisms and turn to evoked and destructive behaviors such as smoking and drug abuse (Nickel and Aigle, 2006). Also Raketic, et al. (2009) conducted a study on defense mechanisms and found that addicts use immature and neurotic defense mechanisms. The researchers in comparison of defense mechanisms found that people addicted to alcohol use more the neurotic mechanisms of "invalidate" and "idealization" and women addicted to opiates use more the immature mechanisms of "daydreaming", "isolation" and "denial". Some other researchers found a significant relationship between immature defense mechanisms and self-harm behaviors (Brody and Carson, 2012).

Spielberger, et al (1998) in a study showed that smokers' scores in scale of anxiety, anger and negative emotions have high positive correlation with subscale of the neuroticism of Eysenck Personality Questionnaire. In general, according to the mentioned studies, it seems that defense mechanisms and personality traits play an important role in tendency to substance use. Also, Shorey et al (2012) in their study showed a significant and positive relationship between early maladaptive schemas and drug use talent. Research results of Maurice (2006) indicate that the personality trait of neuroticism is positively associated with maladaptive schemas. Also, maladaptive schemas are associated with a variety of psychological symptoms including anxiety disorder, depression, problem of substance eating and abuse. Ball et al (2001), in their study, showed that the severity of disorders such as borderline personality disorder, antisocial, avoidance and depression are related to the unique characteristics of existing problems, personality traits and early schemas. Khosravani et al (2016), in their study, showed that early maladaptive schemas positively associated with both neurotic and immature defense styles and negatively associated with mature defense styles. In their study, Shorey et al (2012) demonstrated that women addicted to opiates gained high scores in two of the 18 items of early maladaptive schemas particularly in schemas of dependency and punishment. Overall, these findings suggest that early maladaptive schemas may highly be stable among women with diagnosis of alcohol and opioid dependence. In another study conducted by Shorey et al (2013) on 101 young drug abuse adults and 175 male students, results showed that drug abused group gained high scores compared to non-clinical group in 9 of the 18 items of early maladaptive schemas. Since the importance of defense mechanisms and personality characteristics in distinguishing the individuals that are at risk of drug use is less studied. Thus, examining these variables could play important and effective role in distinguishing at risk individuals. Therefore, the purpose of this study is to assess the maladaptive schemas and personality traits in addicted people. Thus, the question of this study is whether there is a relationship between early maladaptive schemas and personality traits in addicted people.

Methodology

The method used in the present study was a descriptive correlational one and statistical population of the study were drug dependent people in Rafsanjan, who referred to government and non-government camps for treatment in 2016. In this study, 120 married individuals dependent on drugs (opium, heroin, glass) were purposefully selected as sample.

Instruments of the study

Young Maladaptive Schemas Questionnaire: to assess early maladaptive schemas the short form of Young Maladaptive Schemas Questionnaire with 75 items was used. This questionnaire was made by Yang based on the findings of Smith and his colleagues to evaluate 15 early maladaptive schemas. This self-report questionnaire is responded based on a Likert scale of 1 to 6. This 15-

schema was situated within five areas of too much vigilance and deterrence, cut and rejecting, other orientation, autonomy and disrupt function and disrupt constraints in accordance with the early development areas. In the first comprehensive study on its psychometric properties, for every maladaptive schema the alpha coefficient was obtained from 0.83 to 0.96 and retest coefficient in non-clinical population was between 0.50 – 0.83 (Schmidt et al. 1995). Other researches confirmed the factor structure and construct validity of the scale. Iran Cronbach's alpha of the questionnaire is reported 0.97 in female population and 0.98 in the male population (Ahi, 2007). In the present study, Cronbach's alpha was obtained 0.93. ANOVA was used for data analysis.

Personality traits of this questionnaire were made in 1985 by McCrae and Costa (Costa and Mac Lyra, 1985). Garosi and colleagues (2001) have standardized this questionnaire in Iran. The short form of this tool that was used in this study consisted of 60 items answer that measures five main factors of neuroticism, extraversion, openness to experience, and agreements and conscientiousness. In this test, 12 questions were allocated to each factor. Items were answered through 5 options (completely agree, agree, neither agree nor disagree, disagree, completely disagree). Scores of 0 to 4 were considered to these options. The reliability of the instrument by using retest method on 64 people with two weeks interval for five factors was reported 0.87, 0.84, 0.79, 0.80 and 0.82 respectively and Cronbach's alpha coefficient of five factors was 0.76, 0.65, 0.59, 0.48, 0.75 respectively (Attari, et al., 2006). The reported alpha coefficient by Mac Lyra and Costa varied between 0.74 - 0.89 with 0.81 mean (Mac Lyra and Costa, 1991).

Results

Descriptive information on variables including mean and standard deviation is shown in Table 1.

Table 1: Descriptive statistics of variables of early maladaptive schemas and personality traits

Variable	N	Mean	SD	Min	Max	
Early maladaptive schemas	Emotional deprivation	120	20.18	4.70	10	28
	Instability . releasing	120	19.51	4.35	8	29
	Distrust	120	21.05	3.99	11	29
	Social isolation	120	18.82	6.97	7	30
	Defect	120	12.70	4.45	7	25
	Failure	120	21.79	3.71	10	26
	Dependency	120	18.71	4.77	9	29
	Loss. damage in diseases	120	19.38	4.41	10	25
	Caught	120	19.51	5.17	9	26
	Obedience	120	20.23	2.98	12	27
	Self-sacrifice	120	17.43	4.55	10	25
	Emotional inhibition	120	22.25	5.47	10	30
	Unrelenting standards	120	21.13	5.94	10	29
	Merit	120	17.58	3.95	10	28
Continance	120	21.25	6.41	10	29	
Personality traits	Schema (total score)	120	291.50	38.22	212	352
	Extroversion	120	46.88	11.22	30	60
	Neuroticism	120	43.13	6.78	30	58
	Openness	120	31.76	10.02	16	60
	Compatibility	120	37.70	14.32	16	60
	Being conscientious	120	41.08	10.49	20	60

Table 1 represents the descriptive characteristics of the variables of early maladaptive schemas and personality traits.

The results of Pearson correlation test among the study variables are shown in Table 2.

Table 2: The results of correlations among variables of early maladaptive schemas and personality traits

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21
Emotional deprivation	1																				
Instability releasing	43.0 **	1																			
Distrust	437.0 **	30.0 **	1																		
Social isolation	30.0 **	325.0 **	257.0 **	1																	
Defect	075.0	107.0	31.0 **	337.0 **	1																
Failure	403.0 **	006.0	19.0 *	351.0 **	182.0 *	1															
Dependency	40.0 **	392.0 **	366.0 **	58.0 **	203.0 *	239.0 **	1														
loss damage	393.0 **	109.0	358.0 **	222.0 *	13.0	414.0 **	352.0 **	1													
Caught	582.0 **	239.0 **	303.0 **	-184.0 *	-148.0	11.0	096.0	384.0 **	1												
Obedience	098.0	-134.0	009.0	01.0	026.0	159.0	-077.0*	-051.0	132.0	1											
Self-sacrifice	532.0 **	021.0	101.0	-069.0*	-166.0	307.0 **	-035.0	193.0 *	325.0 **	135.0	1										
Emotional inhibition	457.0 **	343.0 **	295.0 **	603.0 **	205.0 *	389.0 **	504.0 **	142.0	-063.0	-013.0	275.0 **	1									
Unrelenting standards	316.0 **	346.0 **	202.0 *	48.0 **	126.0	198.0 *	287.0 **	266.0 **	-024.0	-148.0	055.0	192.0 *	1								
Merit	061.0	-016.0	03.0	074.0	053.0	194.0 *	013.0	099.0	-028.0	031.0	103.0	145.0	039.0	1							
Continece	423.0 **	496.0 **	327.0 **	651.0 **	203.0 *	30.0 **	666.0 **	325.0 **	065.0	-15.0	-086.0	49.0 **	56.0 **	046.0	1						
Schema (total score)	758.0 **	542.0 **	566.0 **	698.0 **	34.0 **	55.0 **	683.0 **	55.0 **	326.0 **	067.0	312.0 **	67.0 **	55.0 **	20.0 *	75.0 **	1					
Extroversion	-534.0 **	-48.0 **	-41.0 **	-34.0 **	-142.0	-28.0 **	-58.0 **	-29.0 **	-39.0 **	-047.0	-106.0	-29.0 **	-33.0 **	038.0	-55.0 **	-63.0 **	1				
Neuroticism	392.0 **	363.0 **	127.0	228.0 *	075.0	019.0	366.0 **	123.0	366.0 **	055.0	134.0	229.0 *	087.0	-09.0	32.0 **	38.0 **	-65.0 **	1			
Openness	-285.0 **	-094.0	-40.0 **	-075.0*	-025.0	-202.0 *	-24.0 **	-25.0 **	-27.0 **	-20.0 **	-204.0 *	-15.0	-067.0	028.0	-07.0	-29.0 **	50.0 **	-45.0 **	1		
Compatibility	-36.0 **	-19.0 *	-38.0 **	-043.0*	154.0	-158.0 *	-198.0 *	-24.0 **	-29.0 **	-086.0	-169.0	-089.0	-16.0	035.0	-24.0 **	-31.0 **	48.0 **	-42.0 **	75.0 **	1	
Being conscientious	-337.0 **	-24.0 **	-162.0	-25.0 **	257.0 **	-224.0 *	-181.0 *	004.0	-174.0	-102.0	-131.0	-23.0 *	-17.0	-04.0	-31.0 **	-31.0 **	32.0 **	-007.0	06.0	17.0	1

* Significant correlation at level of 0.05 ** Significant correlation at level of 0.01

In order to determine the contribution of changes associated with each personality traits based on the maladaptive schemas as predictor variables and personality traits as criterion variables, they were analyzed in the step-by-step regression equation. Before doing multivariate regression analysis, the hypotheses of independence of scores, normality of distribution of variables by using the Kolmogorov - Smirnov - Test (K-S), linearity by using the liner correlation evaluation test at level of (P<0.05) were observed.

The observance of the hypothesis of non-collinearity of independent variables were also examined by using the software SPSS and results showed no collinearity among independent variables, by using Variance Inflation Factor (VIF). In other words, it can be stated that predictions are independent of each other and do not overlap each other and all independent variables can be used in the regression analysis. Results of regression analysis to predict personality traits are presented in Table 3.

According to above table, in extraversion dependent variable, the personality trait of extraversion can be anticipated by four predictors of dependency, caught, continece and releasing. Also, in neuroticism dependent variable, the neuroticism personality trait can be predicted through four predictors of emotional deprivation, dependency, caught and releasing. In dependent variable of openness, the openness personality trait can be predicted by two predictors of distrust and obedience.

Table 3: Summary of stepwise regression analysis of personality traits

Dependent variable	Entry steps	Variable names	R	R ²	SE	F	P
Extroversion	First	Dependency	58.0	33.0	16.9	36.60	0001.0
	Second	Dependency, Caught	67.0	45.0	35.8	76.48	0001.0
	Third	Dependency, Caught, Continece	71.0	50.0	99.7	41.39	0001.0
	Fourth	Dependency, Caught, Continece, Releasing	72.0	52.0	86.7	77.31	0001.0
Neuroticism	First	Emotional deprivation	39.0	15.0	26.6	39.21	0001.0
	Second	Emotional deprivation, Dependency	45.0	20.0	09.6	12.15	0001.0
	Third	Emotional deprivation, Dependency, Caught	50.0	25.0	93.5	004.13	0001.0
	Fourth	Emotional deprivation, Dependency, Caught, Releasing	49.0	24.0	94.5	89.18	0001.0
Openness	First	Distrust	40.0	16.0	21.9	80.22	0001.0
	Second	Distrust , Obedience	44.0	20.0	02.9	79.14	0001.0
Compatibility	First	Distrust	38.0	14.0	29.13	99.19	0001.0
	Second	Distrust, Defect	47.0	22.0	69.12	15.17	0001.0
	Third	Emotional deprivation, Defect	51.0	26.0	43.12	94.13	0001.0
Being conscientious	First	Emotional deprivation	33.0	11.0	91.9	14.15	0001.0
	Second	Emotional deprivation , Defect	44.0	19.0	46.9	07.14	0001.0
	Third	Emotional deprivation, Social isolation, Defect	51.0	26.0	08.9	17.14	0001.0

In dependent variable of compatibility, the compatibility personality trait can also be anticipated through three predictors of mistrust, defect and emotional deprivation. Eventually, in dependent variable of being conscientious, being conscientious personality characteristic can be anticipated by three predictors of emotional deprivation, defect and social isolation. It should also be noted that the significant level of variables is less than 0.01.

Nevertheless, the significance of development of variance was calculated with F which shows that at each step, the effect of predictors is significant at level of ($P < 0.01$).

Table 4: Stepwise regression coefficients of personality characteristics in terms of maladaptive schemas

Fixed Number	Sig.	t	β	SE _b	B	Entry steps	Steps	Dependent Variable
47.72	0.0001	-7.769	-0.582	0.176	-1.368	Dependency	First	Extroversion
52.85	0.0001	-8.002	-0.549	0.161	-1.291	Dependency	Second	
	0.0001	-4.992	-0.342	0.149	-0.743	Caught		
88.87	0.0001	-3.971	-0.349	0.207	-0.82	Dependency	Third	
	0.0001	-5.213	-0.342	0.142	-0.742	Caught		
	0.001	-3.429	-0.3	0.153	-0.526	Continece		
60.91	0.0001	-3.846	-0.333	0.204	-0.784	Dependency	Fourth	
	0.0001	-4.638	-0.308	0.144	-0.668	Caught		
	0.014	-2.487	-0.229	0.161	-0.401	Continece		
	0.029	-2.212	-0.169	0.197	-0.436	Releasing		

Fixed Number	Sig.	t	β	SE _b	B	Entry steps	Steps	Dependent Variable
72.31	0.0001	4.625	0.392	0.122	0.565	Emotional deprivation	First	Neuroticism
01.28	0.002	3.251	0.292	0.13	0.422	Emotional deprivation	Second	
	0.007	2.765	0.249	0.128	0.353	Dependency		
03.25	0.04	2.084	0.25	0.157	0.282	Emotional deprivation	Third	
	0.001	3.28	0.292	0.127	0.415	Dependency		
	0.008	2.678	0.269	0.132	0.353	Caught		
73.25	0.0001	4.129	0.333	0.115	0.474	Emotional deprivation	Fourth	
	0.003	3.053	0.263	0.122	0.373	Dependency		
	0.0001	3.624	0.295	0.107	0.387	Caught		
	0.033	2.154	0.19	0.137	0.296	Releasing		
01.53	0.0001	-4.776	-0.402	0.211	-1.01	Distrust	First	Openness
49.66	0.0001	-4.851	-0.401	0.207	-1.005	Distrust	Second	
	0.017	-2.419	-0.2	0.277	-0.671	Obedience		
43.66	0.0001	-4.472	-0.381	0.305	-1.365	Distrust	First	Compatibility
16.61	0.0001	-5.542	-0.474	0.307	-1.699	Distrust	Second	
	0.001	3.519	0.301	0.275	0.969	Defect		
63.67	0.0001	-4.019	-0.374	0.334	-1.341	Distrust	Third	
	0.001	3.411	0.286	0.27	0.922	Defect		
	0.015	-2.458	-0.218	0.271	-0.665	Emotional deprivation		
28.56	0.0001	-3.892	-0.337	0.194	-0.753	Emotional deprivation	First	Being conscientious
72.48	0.0001	-4.308	-0.359	0.186	-0.801	Emotional deprivation	Second	
	0.001	3.413	0.284	0.196	0.67	Defect		
65.50	0.001	-3.295	-0.275	0.186	-0.613	Emotional deprivation	Third	
	0.0001	4.5	0.38	0.199	0.896	Defect		
	0.001	-3.433	-0.303	0.133	-0.456	Social isolation		

Regression coefficients of predictors for personality traits are reported in Table 4. Regression coefficients table shows that at each step, coefficients analysis of early maladaptive schemas is significant at levels of ($P < 0.01$) and ($P < 0.05$).

Conclusion

This study aimed to assess the maladaptive schemas and personality traits of drug-dependent people. The results showed a significant and negative relationship between extraversion and four predictors of dependency, caught, restraint and releasing and there is a significant and negative relationship between openness and two predictors of distrust and obedience. The compatibility has a significant negative relationship with three predictors of mistrust, defect and emotional deprivation. Finally, dependent variable of being conscientious is significantly associated with three predictors of emotional deprivation, defect, and social isolation and also, a significant positive relationship was observed between maladaptive schemas and neuroticism and four predictors of emotional

deprivation, dependency, caught and releasing. This study results are consistent with findings of Young and his colleagues about schema therapy (Young, 2007).

To explain these findings, it can be said that since the early maladaptive schemas as inefficient cognitive foundations influence the way of perception of phenomena and person's mental forms' formation and can create social and psychological damage, thus, addiction is as one of the injuries that can have significant impact on a person's relationship with himself and others. It can be formed and organized on the basis of these inefficient foundations (Young, 2003).

In line with the role of early maladaptive schemas in creating disorders of one and two axis, as well as the cognitive behavior problems such as depression, divorce, borderline personality disorders and antisocial (Sadoughi et al., 2004; Ahmadian et al., 2008), numerous other studies have also emphasized on the role of schemas in the initiation of drug use and continuation of addiction behaviors (Knon et al., 2008; Ball and Young, 2000; cited in Oveysi, 2012). This study shows that there is a significant relationship between conscientiousness and maladaptive schemas and three predictors of emotional deprivation, defect, and social isolation. In fact, those who gained low score in conscientiousness factor (responsibility), are promiscuous and hedonic and purposeless negligent and these properties are observed more in addicted people. There is a significantly negative relationship among extroversion variable and maladaptive schemas and four predictors of dependency, caught, restraint and releasing. Because, extroverted people are more active, talkative, social, optimism than ordinary people, thus, they can consider substance use as a new experience and this justifies their tendency to drugs use. Amanullahi and Ebrahimi (2011), in their study, showed a negative relationship between extroversion personality trait and tendency to drugs use. There is a significant positive relationship among neuroticism and maladaptive schemas and four predictors of emotional deprivation, dependency, caught and releasing. The result is in line with findings of Amanullahi and Ebrahimi (2011) regarding the existence of positive and significant correlation between neuroticism and attitude toward addiction. This is also consistent with study result of Man (2007) and Fisher and Almas (1998, as cited in Ganji et al., 2014) given that addicts scores in neuroticism and openness to experience are higher than normal group. Possibly because people who gain high score in openness to experience, are those who search novelty, variety and new experiences. Thus, they like to experience new ideas and different value systems (in other words, they are imaginary) and they are high risk taking that probably look at the drug use as a different experience. The study results also showed that drug-dependent individuals in the areas of early maladaptive schemas of mistrust, defect, emotional deprivation, dependency and obedience, caught, restraint and releasing have a significantly negative relationship with personality trait variables. Given that maladaptive intellectual foundations are formed in the first years of life, it seems these thoughts play a major role in people's vulnerability. Therefore, it is suggested that these approaches and intellectual foundations be considered in the planning of preventive methods and treatment programs for substance abusers. Thus, personality characteristics and early maladaptive schemas are appropriate predictor regarding the enhancement or reduction of tendency to addiction.

Recommendations and limitations of the study

Regarding the limitation of this study, since addiction is a complex social problem and disease and numerous factors are involved in its formation, it is necessary to investigate other variables in further study. Another limitations of this study is the lack of cooperation of substance abusers. Also, it is suggested that in order to prevent an increase in the frequency of drug-dependent persons, consulting and psychology services at very little cost to be provided for these people and their families. Finally, conducting this study with other tools (interviews, questionnaires and tests) is another suggestion.

References

- Ahmadian-Gorgi, M., Fata, L., Asgharnejade-Farid, A., & Malakooti, K. (2008). Comparison of early maladaptive schema and attempting to commit suicide in depressed patients with non-depressed patients attempting suicide and non-clinical population, *Journal of new cognitive sciences*, 10(4): 49-59. (Persian).
- Arnau, M. M., Mondon, S., & Santacreu, J. J. (2008). Using the temperament and character inventory (TCI) to predict outcome after inpatient detoxification during 100 days of outpatient treatment, *Alcohol and Alcoholism*, 43(5), 583-588.
- Ball, S. A. (1998). Manualized treatment for substance abusers with personality disorders: Dual focus schema therapy. *Addictive behaviors*, 23 (6), 883 -891.
- Ball, S. A., & Cecero, J. J. (2001). Addicted patients with personality disorders: Traits, schemas, and presenting problems, *Journal of personality disorders*, 15(1), 72-83.
- Ball, S.A. (2007). Comparing individual therapies for personality disordered opioid dependent patients, *J Perso Disor*, 21, 305–21.
- Ball, S.A., & Young, J.E. (2000). Dual focus schema therapy for personality disorders and substance dependence: Case study results, *Cogn Behav Pract*, 7, 270-81.
- Brody, S., & Carson, C.M. (2012). Brief report: Self-harm is associated with immature defense mechanisms but not substance use in a nonclinical Scottish adolescent sample. *Journal of Adolescence*, 35, 765–767.
- Cannon, R., Lubar, J., & Baldwin, D. (2008). Self-perception and experiential schemata in the addicted brain. *Appl Psychophysiol Biofeedback*, 33, 223-38
- Carr, S. N., & Francis, A. J. P. (2010). Do early maladaptive schemas mediate the relationship between childhood experiences and avoidant personality disorder features? A preliminary investigation in a non-clinical sample, *Cognitive Therapy Research*, 34, 343–358.
- Dermody, S.S., Cheong, J., & Munuck, S. (2013). An evaluation of the stress negative affect model in explaining alcohol use. The role of components of negative affect and coping style. *Substance use & Misuse*. 48,297-308.
- Diener, E., Oishi, S., & Lucas, R.E. (2003). Personality, culture, and subjective well-being: Emotional and cognitive evaluations of life. *Annual Review of Psychology*. 54(1), 403-425.
- Dozois, D.J., Martin, R.A., & Bieling, P.J. (2009). Early maladaptive schemas and adaptive/maladaptive styles of humor, *Cognitive Therapy and Research*, 33(6),585-596.
- Ganji, H., Rahnemaye Namin, M., & Pasha Sharifi, H. (2014). Anticipating the tendency of adolescents to addiction based on personality traits and parenting style in order to present a model for prevention, *Journal of Thought and Behavior*, 33, 47-56.
- Hamidpoor, H., & Andooz, Z. (2007). *Schema therapy: A practitioners guide Persian*. 1st ed. Tehran: Ardjomand Press, 13-18.
- Jazayeri, A. R., Hazhir, F., Pour Shahbaz, A., & Rezaei, M. (2004). The relationship between antisocial and borderline personality disorders and drug addiction in 18 to 35 years old men in Kermanshah City. *Hakim Journal*, 7 (1), 49-54.
- Keledi, A. R., & Mahdavi, R. (2003). Investigating the internal and external control in returning to addiction in occupational therapy camp of Zanjan, *Journal of Social Welfare*, 3 (9), 307-334.
- Khosravani, V., Seidisarouei, M., & Alvani, A. (2016). Early maladaptive schemas, behavioral inhibition system, behavioral approach system, and defense styles in natural drug abusers. *Polish Annals of Medicine*, 23(1), 6-14.
- Le Bon, O., Basiaux, P., Streel, E., Tecco, J., Hanak, C., Hansenne, M., & Dupont, S. (2004). Personality profile and drug of choice; a multivariate analysis using Cloninger's TCI on

- heroin addicts, alcoholics, and a random population group. *Drug and alcohol dependence*, 73(2), 175-182.
- Maltby, J., & Day, L. (2004). Forgiveness and defense style. *The Journal of genetic psychology*, 165(1):99-112.
- Maskani, K., & Jafarzadeh Fakhari, M. (2008). Investigating the prevalence of risk factors in addiction and addiction treatment of self-referred addicted people, *Journal of University of Medical Sciences and Health Services of Sabzvar*, 15 (3), 176-181.
- McGinn, L. K., & Young, J. E. (1996). Schema-focused therapy. In P. M. Salkovskis (Ed.), *Frontiers of cognitive therapy* (pp. 182–207). New York: Guilford.
- Muris, P. (2006). Maladaptive schemas in non-clinical adolescents: Relations to perceived parental rearing behaviours, big five personality factors and psychopathological symptoms. *Clinical Psychology & Psychotherapy*, 13(6), 405-413.
- National Institute of Drug Abuse (2007). Science – based prevention programs and principles. Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration Center for Substance Abuse Prevention. www.samhsa.gov.
- Ouraki, M., Makri, A., & Keyayei, S. M. (2013). The relationship between craving for glass (Methamphetamine), and personality traits in patients treated with Methadone. *Journal of Psychiatry and Clinical psychology of Iran*, 13, 177-186.
- Oveysi, A.A., & Bakhshani, N.M. (2012). A comparison of early maladaptive schemas among opioid-dependent and -independent men in Zahedan City, *Journal of Mental Health*, 166-171.
- Pour Mohammad, V., Yaghoobi, H., Yousefi, R., Mohammadzadeh, A., & Najafi, M. (2013). A comparison of early maladaptive schemas and lifestyle in substance dependent patients and normal individuals, *Journal of Addiction Studies of Substance Abuse*, 27, 107- 123.
- Raketic, D., Kovacevic, M., & Djuric, T. (2009). Women addiction (alcohol and opiates) and defense mechanism style. *European Psychiatry*, 24(1),451.
- Rush, B. R., & Wild, T. C. (2003). Substance abuse treatment and pressures from the criminal justice system: data from a provincial client monitoring system. *Addiction*, 98(8), 1119-28
- Sadock, B.J., & Kaplan, H.I. (2006). *Kaplan and Sadocks pocket handbook of clinical psychiatry*. 4th ed. Tehran: Ardjomand Press, 105-6.
- Sadooghi, Z., Aguilar-Vafaie, M., Rasoulzadeh-Tabatabaie, K., & Esfahanian, N. (2008). Factor analysis of the Young schema questionnaire-short form in a nonclinical Iranian sample. *Iranian journal of psychiatry and clinical psychology*, 14: 214-9. (Persian).
- Schmidt, N. B., Schmidt, K. L. & Young, J. E. (1999). Schematic and interpersonal conceptualizations of depression: An integration. In T. E. Joiner & J. C. Coyne (Eds.), *The interactional nature of depression: Advances in interpersonal approaches* (pp. 127–148). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Shorey, R. C., Stuart, G. L., & Anderson, S. (2012). The early maladaptive schemas of an opioid-dependent sample of treatment seeking young adults: A descriptive investigation. *Journal of substance abuse treatment*, 42(3), 271-278.
- Shorey, R. C., Stuart, G. L., & Anderson, S. (2013). Early maladaptive schemas among young adult male substance abusers: A comparison with a non-clinical group. *Journal of substance abuse treatment*, 44(5), 522-527.
- Spielberger, C. D., Foreyt, J. P., Reheiser, E. C., & Poston, W. S. C. (1998). Motivational, emotional, and personality characteristics of smokeless tobacco users compared with cigarette smokers. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 25, 821–832.

- Spielberger, C. D., Reheiser, E. C. (2006). Psychology defense mechanisms, motivation and the use of tobacco. *Personality and individual Differences*, 41, 1033-1043.
- Thimm, J. C. (2010). Personality and early maladaptive schemas: A five-factor model perspective. *Journal of Behavior Therapy and Experimental Psychiatry*, 41, 373-380.
- Tremblay, P. F., & Dozois, D. J. A. (2009). Another personality on trait aggressiveness: overlap with early maladaptive schemas. *Personality and individual differences*, 46, 569 – 574.
- Veillux, J.C., Colvin, P.J., Anderson, J., York, C., & Heinz, A.J. (2010). A review of opioid dependence treatment: Pharmacological psychosocial interventions to treat opioid addiction. *Clin Psychol Rev*, 30.
- Welburn, K., Coristine, M., Dagg, P., Pontefract, A., & Jordan, S. (2002). The Schema Questionnaire—short form: Factor analysis and relationship between schemas and symptoms. *Cognitive Therapy and Research*, 26, 519–530
- Young, J. E., Klosko, J. S., & Weishaar, M. E. (2003). *Schema therapy: A practitioner's guide*. Guilford Press.
- Young, J.E. (1999). *Cognitive therapy for personality disorders (Cognitive Therapy for Personality Disorders): A schema focused approach*; 3th Professional resource press.
- Young, J.E. (1999). *Cognitive therapy for personality disorders: A schema focused approach*. Sarasota FL: Professional Resources Press; 23-37.
- Young, J.E. (2007). The relationship between appearance schemas, self-esteem, and non-direct aggression among college women. Ph.D. Dissertation. Oklahoma State University, 15-35.
- Young, J.E., & Gluhoski, V.L. (1996). Schema focused diagnosis for personality disorders. In Kaslow, F.W. *Handbook of relational diagnosis and dysfunctional family patterns*. New York: Wiley, 300-321.
- Young, J.E., Klosko, J., & Weishaar, M.E. (2003). *Schema therapy: A practitioner's guide*. New York: Guilford Press, 73-5.
- Young, J., Klosko, J., & Vishar, M. (2010). *Schema Therapy (Practical Guide for specialists)* (Trans: H.Hamid Pour and Z. Anduze) Tehran, Arjomand Publication.