



Original Article

Comparing the relationship between early maladaptive schemas, defense mechanisms and type D personality among individuals with secure and insecure attachment style

Shiva Nasirzadeh¹; Adis Keraskian^{2*}

¹ MA. in clinical psychology, Branch of Karaj, Islamic Azad University (IAU), Karaj, Iran

² Assistant professor of Psychology, Branch of Karaj, Islamic Azad University, Karaj, Iran

Abstract

Introduction: Attachment styles determine the emotional, cognitive rules and strategies that guide emotional reactions in people and interpersonal relationships. The primary aim of the current study was to compare the relationship between early maladaptive schemas, defense mechanisms and type D personality among individuals with secure and insecure attachment style.

Materials and Methods: The study population consisted of 240 patients that were selected by convenience sampling method from psychology clinic Delphi in Tehran in 2013. Data collection tools include the (DSQ-40), Adult Attachment Style (AAS), Type D Personality Questionnaire and primary schemas Questionnaire. Data analyzed through Pearson correlation and multiple regressions.

Results: The findings showed that the relationship between primary schemas and defense mechanisms are different in people with secure and insecure attachment. Also, the relationship between primary schemas and type D personality is different in people with secure and insecure attachment styles. In addition, the relationship between defense mechanisms and the type D personality is different in people with secure and insecure attachment styles ($P < 0.01$).

Conclusion: Considering the importance of attachment in development of early maladaptive schemas and effects of early maladaptive schemas and defense mechanism on personality pathology, attention to cognitive functions and attachment can help the healing process.

Keywords: Attachment, Defense mechanisms, Schema, Type D personality

Please cite this paper as:

Nasirzadeh Sh, Keraskian A. Comparing the relationship between early maladaptive schemas, defense mechanisms and type D personality among individuals with secure and insecure attachment style. *Journal of Fundamentals of Mental Health* 2017 Mar-Apr; 19(2): 96-104.

Introduction

Parents' treatment with children, especially mother-child, caused an attachment that has a significant role in future social development (1). Attachment relationship may be secure or insecure (2, 3). Adults who are securely attached tend to have high self-esteem, and trusting long-term relationships as well as the ability to share feelings with other people. Adults who are insecurely attached are more likely to doubt the reliability of others or to expect others to be rejecting (4).

Consequent to a literature review, it is observed that early maladaptive schemas and attachment are related. Simard, Moss and Pascuzzo indicated in

their studies that there were more signs of EMS among young adults with either an insecure ambivalent child attachment, or an insecure preoccupied adult attachment style, compared to their secure peers (5). Schemas of people were significantly related to adult attachment style (6).

Schemas are cognitive shortcuts that prevent a person from having to consciously process the minutiae of every experience (7). Functioning outside of a person's conscious awareness, schemas provide comfort and familiarity, and incoming information is distorted in order to maintain cognitive consistency (8). Similar to the concept of "core beliefs" (9), early maladaptive schemas influence how individuals encode, process, and respond to stimuli in their environment, and are believed to develop during childhood, usually through toxic or traumatic experiences that involve

*Corresponding Author: Department of Clinical Psychology, Karaj Branch, Islamic Azad University, Karaj, Iran

Received: May. 07, 2016

Accepted: Sep. 15, 2016

one's primary caretakers (10).

Ego defense mechanisms are unconscious psychological processes that help an individual cope with anxiety resulting from a stressful internal or external environment (11). Andrews, Singh and Bond categorized three major defense styles based on twenty different defense mechanisms suggested by Villiant. These three defense styles are named "mature", "immature", and "neurotic" according to which kinds of defense mechanisms are used by the individual. The mature defense style represents normal, adaptive and functional method of coping whereas the neurotic and immature styles may be considered a consequence of dysfunctional and maladaptive coping strategies (12).

Type D personality is a distressed personality that includes two stable personality traits: negative affectivity (NA) and social inhibition (SI). Individuals with a type D personality tend to experience increased negative emotions and tend not to share their emotions with others (13). Previous research suggests that type D personality may be associated with major psychosocial stressors (14), impaired physical and mental health (15), morbidity (14, 16,17).

Mols and Denollet, reviewing studies published from 2002 to 2009, concluded that type D personality was associated with symptoms of depression and anxiety, more somatic complaints and reports of poorer health, and more work-related stress (18).

Güngör found that impaired autonomy and unrelenting standards schema domains predicted relational monitoring as positive; impaired limits predicted as negative. The fact that fearful attachment and disconnection schema domain as negative; impaired limits as positive predicted relational assertiveness was found (19). In another study, Calvete et al. concluded that two schemas of self-sacrifice and enmeshment/undeveloped self, had a negative correlation with the psychopathology scale including depression (20).

The aim of present study was comparing the relationship between early maladaptive schemas, defense mechanisms and type D personality among individuals with secure and insecure attachment. Based on this objective, the present study aimed to assess the relationship between early maladaptive schemas, defense mechanisms and type D personality in patients with secure and insecure attachment.

Materials and Methods

This study is correlation and cross-sectional. Considering the fact that Lindeman et al emphasize

that the sample must be at least 10 or 20 times the number of variables in multiple regression analysis (21), 240 patients selected from psychology clinic Delphi in Tehran by convenience sampling method in 2015. The people were assured about the confidentiality of their data. Those who agreed to participate in the study completed Young Schema Questionnaire, Type D Personality, Defense Style Questionnaire-40 and Adult Attachment Scale.

Research instruments

- *Young Schema Questionnaire (YSQ-SF)*: To assess early maladaptive schemas, the Young Schema Questionnaire–Short Form was used. The YSQ-SF is composed of 15 subscales each of which relates to a specific schema. Research has shown that the YSQ-SF has good discriminative validity (with alpha coefficients of 0.96 among a clinical sample and 0.92 among a non-clinical sample), good internal consistency, and a strong factor structure which is stable across clinical samples and across varying degrees of psychopathology (22). Validity and reliability of early maladaptive schemas (75 items Form) by Youssefi and collaborates on a sample of 579 people was conducted in two stages. In the early maladaptive schemas validity using Cronbach's alpha and split-half the total sample, is respectively (0.91 and 0.89), in girls (0.87 and 0.84) and in boys (0.81 and 0.84) (23).

- *Type D Personality Questionnaire*: Type D personality, negative affectivity, and social inhibition were assessed using the Type D Scale (DS-14) (13) at baseline, a 14-item questionnaire that included asking people if they would describe themselves with phrases such as, "I am a closed person" and "I often feel unhappy." The items were answered on a five-point Likert scale from 0 (false) to 4 (true). Seven items refer to NA, and seven items refer to SI. The total scores for NA and SI subscales can range from 0 to 28 to assess personality traits. People who scored 10 points or more on both the NA and SI subscales were classified as type D personality. In Wu and Moser study, Cronbach's alpha was 0.86 and 0.82 for the NA and SI subscales, respectively (24). Ahmadpur et al. examined the reliability of the scale using the Cronbach's alpha, test-retest and split-half methods. Coefficients obtained by these methods respectively 0.85, 0.92 and 0.74, respectively (25).

- *Defense Style Questionnaire-40 (DSQ-40)*: The DSQ-40 is one of the most widely used psychometric instruments for assessing ego defense mechanisms used by respondents. It has demonstrated good construct and content validity by discriminating between different psychiatric

populations in various studies and adequate reliability statistics with test-retest reliability (0.66) and high inter-item correlations (0.78) (12). Ehteshamzadeh, Pasha and Samimi used Cronbach's alpha and composition to determine the reliability of the questionnaire, that for the total scale are respectively 0.84, 0.82, and for immature defense style 0.80, 0.80 and for mature defensive style, 0.55 and 0.63 and for neurotic defense style 0.55 and 0.60 (26).

- *Adult Attachment Scale (AAS)*: The Adult Attachment Scale (AAS) was officially developed in 1990 but built on the earlier work of Hazen & Shaver. The scale was developed by decomposing the original three prototypical descriptions into a series of 18 items (27). The scale consists of 18 items scored on a 5 point likert-type scale. It measures adult attachment styles named "Secure", "Anxious" and "Avoidant".

Collins & Read reported Cronbach's alpha coefficients of .69 for Close, .75 for Depend, and .72 for Anxiety. Test-retest correlations for a 2-month period were .68 for Close, .71 for Depend, and .52 for Anxiety (28). Taheri measured validity of attachment styles 0.55 to 0.74 by internal consistency, and reported the reliability using test-retest in secure attachment ($0.84 = r$), and in ambivalent insecure attachment, and avoidant ($r=0.87$) (29).

Results

They were 17 to 50 years old. 112 were female, 126 were male and 2 persons did not answer. 85.8% were married and 14.2% were single. Around 69.2% held some form of university degree, and 30.8% had completed 12 years of education. Data obtained from mentioned questionnaires were evaluated using

the SPSS software. Skewness/Kurtosis were less than |2| and p was more than 0.05 in Kolmogorov-Smirnov test, so assumption of normality of the data is set (Table 1). Then Multiple regression was calculated.

Table 1. Tests of Normality: Skewness, Kurtosis and Kolmogorov-Smirnov test

Dependent Variable	Skewness	Std. Error	Kurtosis	Std. Error
Emotional Deprivation	2.359	0.157	7.198	0.313
Abandonment	1.467	0.157	2.988	0.313
Mistrust/Abuse	1.036	0.157	1.712	0.313
Social Isolation	0.044	0.157	-0.231	0.313
Defectiveness	1.348	0.157	2.182	0.313
Dependence	1.151	0.157	1.288	0.313
Vulnerability	2.735	0.157	10.303	0.313
Enmeshment	1.423	0.157	1.784	0.313
Failure	-0.012	0.157	0.341	0.313
Entitlement	0.781	0.157	0.357	0.313
Insufficient Self-Control	0.482	0.157	0.795	0.313
Subjugation	1.978	0.157	5.874	0.313
Self-Sacrifice	1.702	0.157	3.778	0.313
Emotion Inhibition	1.369	0.157	3.876	0.313
Unrelenting Standards	-0.471	0.157	0.095	0.313

Pearson correlation showed significant relationship between defense mechanisms and early maladaptive schemas ($P<0.01$). In people with secure attachment, early maladaptive schemas explained 61% of mature defense mechanisms variance, 34% of neurotic defense mechanisms and 43% of immature defense mechanisms. In people with insecure attachment, early maladaptive schemas explained 55% of mature defense mechanisms variance, 63% of neurotic defense mechanisms and 27% of immature defense mechanisms.

Table 2. Multiple regression analysis for mature defense mechanisms and early maladaptive schemas

Dependent Variable	Secure attachment					Insecure attachment				
	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	β	Std. Errors	Beta			β	Std. Errors	Beta		
(Constant)	123.259	7.879		15.64	0.000	91.670	7.025		13.049	0.000
Emotional Deprivation	-0.805	0.324	-0.198	-2.48	0.014	-0.256	0.223	-0.129	-1.148	0.254
Abandonment	-1.461	0.293	-0.536	-4.98	0.000	-0.755	0.296	-0.433	-2.552	0.012
Mistrust/Abuse	-2.378	0.295	-0.838	-8.05	0.000	0.172	0.232	0.098	0.744	0.459
Social Isolation	-0.507	0.195	-0.218	-2.59	0.011	-0.958	0.182	-0.579	-5.256	0.000
Defectiveness	-0.014	0.261	-0.006	-0.05	0.956	1.130	0.368	0.667	3.067	0.003
Dependence	-1.168	0.397	-0.337	-2.94	0.004	0.337	0.502	0.122	0.671	0.504
Vulnerability	-2.316	0.354	-0.520	-6.54	0.000	-0.218	0.313	-0.094	-0.699	0.486
Enmeshment	1.074	0.382	0.251	2.81	0.006	-1.994	0.438	-0.709	-4.556	0.000
Failure	-0.406	0.268	-0.151	-1.51	0.132	-1.385	0.265	-0.610	-5.227	0.000
Entitlement	-1.168	0.275	-0.454	-4.24	0.000	0.206	0.240	0.118	0.855	0.395
Insufficient Self-Control	-0.144	0.370	-0.045	-0.38	0.699	0.800	0.360	0.330	2.224	0.029

Subjugation	1.890	0.266	0.600	7.10	0.000	0.563	0.310	0.308	1.817	0.073
Self-Sacrifice	-1.979	0.318	-0.447	-6.22	0.000	-0.321	0.263	-0.155	-1.221	0.225
Emotion Inhibition	1.144	0.366	0.353	3.12	0.002	0.468	0.255	0.237	1.837	0.069
Unrelenting Standards	-0.471	0.253	-0.527	-4.65	0.000	-0.167	0.258	-0.084	-0.648	0.519

Based on the Table 2, in people with secure attachment, emotional deprivation, abandonment, mistrust/abuse, social isolation, dependence, vulnerability, enmeshment, entitlement, subjugation, self-sacrifice, emotion inhibition, unrelenting standards and in people with insecure attachment, abandonment, social isolation, defectiveness, enmeshment, failure and insufficient self-control predict mature defense mechanisms.

Table 3. Multiple regression analysis for neurotic defense mechanisms and early maladaptive schemas

Dependent Variable	Secure attachment				Insecure attachment					
	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	β	Std. Errors	Beta			β	Std. Errors	Beta		
(Constant)	10.36	8.462		1.225	0.223	-11.438	8.257		-1.385	0.169
Emotional Deprivation	-1.313	0.348	-0.395	-3.77	0.000	-0.255	0.262	-0.099	-0.972	0.333
Abandonment	0.794	0.315	0.355	2.52	0.013	-1.278	0.348	-0.563	-3.674	0.000
Mistrust/Abuse	-0.755	0.317	-0.324	-2.37	0.019	-0.557	0.272	-0.244	-2.046	0.044
Social Isolation	0.141	0.210	0.074	0.672	0.503	-0.068	0.214	-0.032	-0.319	0.751
Defectiveness	0.188	0.280	0.092	0.672	0.503	0.938	0.433	0.425	2.166	0.033
Dependence	0.441	0.427	0.155	1.033	0.304	0.887	0.590	0.247	1.504	0.136
Vulnerability	0.615	0.380	0.168	1.618	0.108	0.757	0.367	0.251	2.062	0.042
Enmeshment	0.711	0.410	0.203	1.73	0.085	2.321	0.514	0.634	4.511	0.000
Failure	-0.104	0.287	-0.047	-0.36	0.717	-0.095	0.311	-0.032	-0.306	0.760
Entitlement	-0.481	0.295	-0.228	-1.62	0.106	-0.557	0.283	-0.245	-1.972	0.052
Insufficient Self-Control	0.198	0.397	0.076	0.499	0.619	0.412	0.423	0.131	0.975	0.332
Subjugation	0.152	0.286	0.059	0.533	0.595	-0.693	0.364	-0.292	-1.905	0.060
Self-Sacrifice	0.802	0.341	0.221	2.35	0.020	0.416	0.309	0.154	1.348	0.181
Emotion Inhibition	-0.594	0.394	-0.223	-1.50	0.134	0.578	0.299	0.226	1.934	0.056
Unrelenting Standards	0.852	0.271	0.466	3.141	0.002	0.514	0.304	0.197	1.691	0.094

Based on the table 3, in people with secure attachment, emotional deprivation, abandonment, mistrust/abuse, self-sacrifice, unrelenting standards and in people with insecure attachment, abandonment, mistrust/abuse, defectiveness, vulnerability and enmeshment predict neurotic defense mechanisms.

Table 4. Multiple regression analysis for immature defense mechanisms and early maladaptive schemas

Dependent Variable	Secure attachment				Insecure attachment					
	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	β	Std. Errors	Beta			β	Std. Errors	Beta		
(Constant)	49.242	20.867		2.360	0.020	30.509	28.981		1.053	0.295
Emotional Deprivation	0.296	0.858	0.034	0.345	0.731	2.865	.920	0.135	3.940	0.000
Abandonment	-1.063	0.776	-0.179	-1.37	0.173	3.725	1.221	0.129	4.594	0.000
Mistrust/Abuse	4.357	0.782	0.706	5.569	0.000	-2.436	.956	-0.255	-4.502	0.000
Social Isolation	2.108	0.518	0.417	4.072	0.000	-3.050	.752	-0.009	-4.066	0.000
Defectiveness	-0.909	0.690	-0.168	-1.31	0.190	1.998	1.520	0.366	1.314	0.192
Dependence	-1.145	1.052	-0.152	-1.08	0.279	-2.009	2.070	-0.226	-0.971	0.334
Vulnerability	-0.689	0.937	-0.071	-0.73	0.464	-2.100	1.290	-0.281	-3.628	0.000
Enmeshment	1.870	1.011	0.201	1.849	0.067	2.004	1.806	0.221	4.110	0.000
Failure	-2.478	0.709	-0.424	-3.49	0.001	2.392	1.093	0.054	3.358	0.000
Entitlement	-1.368	0.728	-0.245	-1.87	0.063	-1.763	.992	-0.314	-1.778	0.079
Insufficient Self-Control	1.818	0.979	0.263	1.857	0.066	-0.204	1.484	-0.026	-0.138	0.891

Subjugation	0.331	0.705	0.048	0.470	0.640	2.194	1.278	0.373	2.717	0.029
Self-Sacrifice	-0.486	0.842	-0.050	-0.57	0.565	-0.081	1.084	-0.012	-0.075	0.941
Emotion Inhibition	-0.284	0.971	-0.040	-0.29	0.771	1.872	1.050	0.295	2.783	0.028
Unrelenting Standards	0.845	0.669	0.174	1.264	0.209	1.323	1.066	0.205	1.240	0.218

Based on the Table 4, in people with secure attachment, mistrust/abuse, social isolation, failure and in people with insecure attachment, emotional deprivation, abandonment, mistrust/abuse, social isolation, vulnerability and enmeshment, failure, subjugation and self-sacrifice predict immature defense mechanisms.

Table 5. Multiple regression analysis for negative affectivity (NA) and early maladaptive schemas

Dependent Variable	Secure attachment				Insecure attachment					
	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	β	Std. Errors	Beta			β	Std. Errors	Beta		
(Constant)	-0.152	3.918		-0.03	0.969	16.019	3.714		4.313	0.000
Emotional Deprivation	0.182	0.161	0.110	1.127	0.262	0.133	0.118	0.164	1.128	0.262
Abandonment	0.618	0.146	0.555	4.242	0.000	-0.350	0.157	-0.490	-2.235	0.028
Mistrust/Abuse	-0.369	0.147	-0.319	-2.51	0.013	0.212	0.122	0.297	3.735	0.000
Social Isolation	0.158	0.097	0.167	1.628	0.106	0.149	0.096	0.220	3.547	0.000
Defectiveness	-0.057	0.130	-0.057	-0.44	0.659	0.282	0.195	0.407	3.447	0.000
Dependence	0.024	0.198	0.017	0.121	0.904	-0.361	0.265	-0.321	-3.362	0.000
Vulnerability	1.013	0.176	0.556	5.754	0.000	-0.035	0.165	-0.037	-0.213	0.832
Enmeshment	-0.902	0.190	-0.517	-4.75	0.000	0.403	0.231	0.351	2.743	0.025
Failure	0.159	0.133	0.145	1.198	0.233	0.214	0.140	0.231	1.530	0.129
Entitlement	-0.164	0.137	-0.156	-1.19	0.233	0.166	0.127	0.233	1.306	0.195
Insufficient Self-Control	-0.130	0.184	-0.100	-0.70	0.481	-0.321	0.190	-0.324	-1.687	0.095
Subjugation	-0.495	0.132	-0.385	-3.73	0.000	-0.141	0.164	-0.188	-0.860	0.392
Self-Sacrifice	0.471	0.158	0.260	2.977	0.004	0.025	0.139	0.030	0.182	0.856
Emotion Inhibition	0.085	0.182	0.064	0.464	0.643	-0.013	0.135	-0.017	-0.100	0.920
Unrelenting Standards	0.256	0.126	0.281	2.037	0.044	-0.024	0.137	-0.029	-0.177	0.860

Pearson correlation showed significant relationship between type D personality and most of early maladaptive schemas ($P < 0.01$). Based on the table 5, in people with secure attachment, abandonment, mistrust/abuse, vulnerability, enmeshment, subjugation, self-sacrifice, unrelenting standards and in people with insecure attachment, abandonment, mistrust/abuse, social isolation, defectiveness, dependence, enmeshment predict negative affectivity.

Table 6. Multiple regression analysis for social inhibition (SI) and early maladaptive schemas

Dependent Variable	Secure attachment				Insecure attachment					
	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	β	Std. Errors	Beta			β	Std. Errors	Beta		
(Constant)	-3.205	2.793		-1.14	0.253	1.397	3.429		0.407	0.685
Emotional Deprivation	-0.081	0.115	-0.061	-0.70	0.483	0.233	0.109	0.260	2.140	0.035
Abandonment	0.001	0.104	0.001	0.012	0.990	-0.225	0.145	-0.286	-1.556	0.123
Mistrust/Abuse	-0.285	0.105	-0.309	-2.72	0.007	0.110	0.113	0.139	0.974	0.333
Social Isolation	-0.195	0.069	-0.257	-2.80	0.006	0.333	0.089	0.447	3.749	0.000
Defectiveness	0.017	0.092	0.022	0.188	0.851	0.293	0.180	0.383	1.628	0.107
Dependence	0.052	0.141	0.046	0.368	0.714	-0.328	0.245	-0.264	-1.339	0.184
Vulnerability	0.206	0.125	0.142	1.639	0.104	0.242	0.153	0.231	1.585	0.116
Enmeshment	0.759	0.135	0.547	5.611	0.000	0.689	0.214	0.544	3.227	0.002
Failure	0.124	0.095	0.142	1.306	0.194	0.505	0.129	0.493	3.902	0.000
Entitlement	0.134	0.097	0.160	1.373	0.172	-0.171	0.117	-0.218	-1.461	0.148
Insufficient Self-Control	-0.325	0.131	-0.315	-2.47	0.015	-0.550	0.176	-0.504	-3.134	0.002

Subjugation	0.221	0.094	0.216	2.341	0.021	-0.252	0.151	-0.305	-1.665	0.099
Self-Sacrifice	0.217	0.113	0.151	1.924	0.057	0.208	0.128	0.222	1.619	0.109
Emotion Inhibition	-0.236	0.130	-0.224	-1.81	0.072	-0.284	0.124	-0.319	-2.283	0.025
Unrelenting Standards	0.465	0.089	0.642	5.196	0.000	0.143	0.126	0.158	1.131	0.261

Based on the Table 6, in people with secure attachment, mistrust/abuse, social isolation, enmeshment, insufficient self-control, subjugation, and in people with insecure attachment, emotional

deprivation, social isolation, enmeshment, failure, insufficient self-control and emotion inhibition predict social inhibition.

Table 7. Multiple regression analysis for negative affectivity (NA) and defense mechanisms

Dependent Variable	Secure attachment				Insecure attachment					
	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	β	Std. Errors	Beta			β	Std. Errors	Beta		
(Constant)	18.603	3.149		5.907	0.000	21.939	2.729		8.039	0.000
mature	-0.139	0.035	-0.341	-3.97	0.000	-0.116	0.039	-0.285	-3.023	0.003
neurotic	0.087	0.043	0.174	2.025	0.045	0.066	0.031	0.209	2.109	0.037
immature	0.018	0.015	0.094	1.173	0.243	0.020	0.012	0.161	1.744	0.084

Defense mechanisms and type D personality

Pearson correlation showed significant relationship between type D personality and defense mechanisms ($P < 0.01$). Based on the Table 7, in

people with secure and insecure attachment, neurotic and mature defense mechanisms predict negative affectivity.

Table 8. Multiple regression analysis for social inhibition (SI) and Early defense mechanisms

Dependent Variable	Secure attachment				Insecure attachment					
	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	β	Std. Errors	Beta			β	Std. Errors	Beta		
(Constant)	16.440	2.432		6.761	0.000	22.968	2.328		9.864	0.000
mature	-0.099	0.027	-0.304	-3.65	0.000	-0.239	0.033	-0.530	-7.272	0.000
neurotic	0.110	0.033	0.279	3.339	0.001	0.054	0.027	0.155	2.019	0.046
immature	0.015	0.012	0.100	1.288	0.200	0.042	0.010	0.299	4.184	0.000

Based on the Table 8, in people with secure attachment, neurotic and mature defense mechanisms and in people with insecure attachment, neurotic, mature and immature defense mechanisms predict social inhibition.

Discussion

Based on the results, all three hypotheses were confirmed. Core to Schema Therapy (ST) is the concept of Early Maladaptive Schemas (EMS). EMSs are thought to result from adverse experiences and unmet core emotional needs in childhood. However, it is stated by major contributors to the ST model that the theory of EMS development remains largely conceptual (8,10).

The results showed that the relationship between early maladaptive schemas and defense mechanisms

in patients with secure and insecure attachment has significant difference. This finding is consistent with the researches of Platts, Mason and Tyson, Pinto-Gouveia, Castilho, Galhardo, and Cunha and Stiles (6,30,31). Stiles showed that the increase of early maladaptive schemas decreased the marital satisfaction and intimacy. Psychological problems such as depression and anxiety disorders are associated with schemas. Researchers have confirmed negative correlation between emotional deprivation schema and problems in relationships, isolation and mental disorders (31). These all suggest that maladaptive schemas as a preliminary recognition and interpretations of the world can cause disorders. In this case, affect of maladaptive schemas on defense mechanisms is clear and expected because, the immature mechanisms in

most disorders such as depression and anxiety are active and it seems defense mechanisms take their power through schemes.

In addition, the results showed that the relationship between early maladaptive schemas and type D personality in patients with secure and insecure attachment has significant difference. This finding is consistent with the researches of Calvete, Estévez, López de Arroyabe, Ruiz, Pinto-Gouveia et al., Castile, Proof, Marciz, Smizr, Yoder, Howlet (20,30, 32). Schemas are considered one of the cognitive structures that in the selection, encoding and evaluation of stimulus are effective and cause biases at our interpretations of the events of life. These biases in psychopathology manifested as a misunderstanding, and distorted attitudes, false assumptions, unrealistic goals and expectations (33). It can be expected that abnormalities occur in people due to the specific type schemes, assumptions, attitudes, goals and expectations that specific symptoms reflect a type of personality.

Moreover, the results showed that the relationship between type D personality and defense mechanisms in patients with secure and insecure attachment has significant difference. Finding is consistent with the researches of Costa, Zonderman, McCrae and Cramer (34, 35). Defenses that used very much or too little may indicate psychological disorders. In other words, while the normal level of defenses, protect the individual against high and unnecessary anxiety and stress, lack of access to defenses leave open the individual against emotional distress, and excessive use of defenses skew the individual's perception of reality (35). Costa et al

conducted that adaptive and mature defenses have a positive relationship with extroversion and openness, while neurotic defenses and maladaptive coping styles are associated with neuroticism. Therefore, there is evidence that shows big five personality traits are associated with the defense mechanisms (34).

Several limitations of this study should be noted. Non-matched subjects based on intervention variables such as age, education and other demographic variables can be considered as one of the major limitations of the study. The study focused on patients referred to Tehran counseling centers that the results generalization to other people and similar examples in other cities would be difficult.

Conclusion

The results showed a significant difference between the relationship between early maladaptive schemas and defense mechanisms, early maladaptive schema and type D personality and type D personality and defense mechanisms in patients with secure and insecure attachment. Considering the importance of attachment in the development of early maladaptive schemas and early maladaptive schema and defense mechanism effects on the pathology of personality, attention to cognitive functions and attachment can help the healing process.

Acknowledgment

This article is the result of the thesis and thereby we appreciate all participants who helped us.

References

1. Bowlby J. Attachment and loss. New York: Basic Books; 1969: 20-75.
2. Bowlby J. Attachment and loss. New York: Basic Books; 1980: 50-83.
3. Zeifman D, Hazan C. Pair bonds as attachments: Reevaluating the evidence. In: Cassidy J, Shaver PR. (editors). Handbook of attachment: Theory, research, and clinical applications. 2nd ed. New York: Guilford; 2008: 436-55.
4. Main M, Goldwyn R. Adult attachment rating and classification system. In: A topology of human attachment organization assessed in discourse, drawings and interviews. Main M. (editor). New York: Cambridge University; 1990: 45-55.
5. Simard V, Moss E, Pascuzzo K. Early maladaptive schemas and child and adult attachment: A 15-year longitudinal study. *Psychol Psychother* 2011; 84(4): 349-66.
6. Mason O, Platts H, Tyson M. Early maladaptive schemas and adult attachment in a UK clinical population. *Psychol Psychother* 2005; 78(Pt 4): 549-64.
7. Young J. The Young Schema Questionnaire-Shortened Inventory. [cited 1998]. Available from: URL; <http://www.schematherapy.com>.
8. Rafaeli E, Bernstein DP, Young J. Schema therapy: Distinctive features. London: Routledge; 2010: 62-83.
9. Riso LP, Froman SE, Raouf M, Gable P, Maddux RE, Turini-Santorelli N, et al. The long-term stability of early maladaptive schemas. *Cogn Ther Res* 2006; 30(4): 515-29.

10. Young JE, Klosko JS, Weishaar ME. Schema therapy: A practitioner's guide. New York: Guilford; 2003: 25-69.
11. Freud A. The ego and the mechanisms of defence. London: Hogarth Press and Institute of Psycho-Analysis; 1937: 5-23.
12. Andrews G, Singh M, Bond M. The defense style questionnaire. *J Nerv Ment Dis* 1993; 181(4): 246-56.
13. Denollet J. Type D personality. A potential risk factor refined. *J Psychosom Res* 2000; 49(4): 255-66.
14. Michal M, Wiltink J, Grande G, Beutel ME, Brähler E. Type D personality is independently associated with major psychosocial stressors and increased health care utilization in the general population. *J Affect Disord* 2011; 134(1-3): 396-403.
15. Schiffer AA, Pedersen SS, Widdershoven JW, Denollet J. Type D personality and depressive symptoms are independent predictors of impaired health status in chronic heart failure. *Eur J Heart Fail* 2008; 10(9): 922-30.
16. Martens EJ, Mols F, Burg MM, Denollet J. Type D personality predicts clinical events after myocardial infarction, above and beyond disease severity and depression. *J Clin Psychiatry* 2010; 71(6): 778-83.
17. Denollet J, Vaes J, Brutsaert DL. Inadequate response to treatment in coronary heart disease: adverse effects of type D personality and younger age on 5-year prognosis and quality of life. *Circulation* 2000; 102(6): 630-5.
18. Mols F, Denollet J. Type D personality in the general population: a systematic review of health status, mechanisms of disease, and work-related problems. *Health Qual Life Outcomes* 2010; 8: 1-9.
19. Cihan Güngör H. The predictive role of early maladaptive schemas and attachment styles on romantic relationships. *Int J Soc Sci Educ* 2015; 5(2): 417-30.
20. Calvete E, Estévez A, López de Arroyabe E, Ruiz P. The schema questionnaire-short form. *Eur J Psychol Assess* 2005; 21(2): 90-9.
21. Hooman HA. [Knowledge of scientific methods in the behavioral sciences (basic research)]. 4th ed. Tehran: Parsa; 2002: 195-220. (Persian)
22. Welburn K, Coristine M, Dagg P, Pontefract A, Jordan S. The schema questionnaire-short form: Factor analysis and relationship between schemas and symptoms. *Cogn Ther Res* 2002; 26: 519-30.
23. Youssefi N, Etemadi O, Bahrami F. [Psychometric properties of the early maladaptive schema questionnaire]. Ph.D. Dissertation. Faculty of Education and Psychology, University of Isfahan, 2009. (Persian)
24. Wu JR, Moser DK. Type D personality predicts poor medication adherence in patients with heart failure in the USA. *Int J Behav Med* 2014; 21(5): 833-42.
25. Ahmadpur Mobarakeh AR, Ahadi H, Mazahery MM, Nafisi G. [Construction and validation of a scale to measure type D personality and its relationship with coronary heart disease]. *Knowledge and research in psychology* 2008; 32: 37-60. (Persian)
26. Ehteshamzadeh P, Pasha R, Samimi Z. [Compare defense mechanisms between staff of production, maintenance department (direct reduction) and administrative staff of Khuzestan Steel Company]. *New findings in psychology* 2013; 7: 21-33. (Persian)
27. Hazan C, Shaver P. Romantic love conceptualized as an attachment process. *J Pers Soc Psychol* 1987; 52: 511-24.
28. Collins NL, Read SJ. Adult attachment, working models, and relationship quality in dating couples. *J Pers Soc Psychol* 1990; 54: 644-63.
29. Khanjani Z. [Role of sensory deficits in attachment styles and behavior problems in children]. *Journal of psychology*, University of Tabriz 2008; 3(9): 21-46. (Persian)
30. Pinto-Gouveia J, Castilho P, Galhardo A, Cunha M. Early maladaptive schemas and social phobia. *Cogn Ther Res* 2006; 30: 571-84.
31. Stiles OE. Early maladaptive schema and intimacy in young adults' romantic relationships. Ph.D. Dissertation. Alliant International University, 2004.
32. Castile KP, Howlet B. The early maladaptive schemas of self-mutilators. *J Cogn Psychother* 2007; 20: 271-91.
33. Pascal A, Christine A, Jean L. Development and validation of the cognitive inventory of subjective distress. *Int J Geriatr Psychiatry* 2008; 23: 1175-82.

34. Costa PT, Zonderman AB, McCrae RR. Personality, defense, coping, and adaptation in older adulthood. In: Cummings EM, Greene AL, Karraker KH. (editors). Life-span developmental psychology: Perspectives on stress and coping. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum; 1991: 277-93.
35. Cramer P. Personality change in later adulthood is predicted by defense mechanism use in early adulthood. *J Res Pers* 2003; 37(1): 76-104.