

Vol. 10, Issue 1, 35-46, 2021

Academic Journal of Psychological Studies

Print ISSN: 2375-7450 Online ISSN: 2333-0821 ajps.worldofresearches.com

Predicting Consciousness Based On Initial Maladaptive Schemas and Schematic Mindsets in Psychology Students

Iman Bonakdar Sakhi*1, Anis Khoshlahjeh sedgh², Maryam Bahrami HydeJi²

- 1. Master of Clinical Psychology, Islamic Azad University, Karaj Branch, Iran.
- 2. Assistant Professor Islamic Azad University, Karaj Branch, Iran.

A B S T R A C T

Context and Purpose: this research was to predict mindfulness through early maladaptive schemas and schema mentalities among psychology students of Karaj Azad University. Method: the present research plan was the design of the present study was quantitative, correlational and predictive. The statistical population included all psychology students of Karaj Azad University. The studied sample included 250 people were selected by available sampling method from the study population The questionnaires used in this study included MAAS Consciousness Questionnaire, Yang Schema and SMI Yang Schema Mentalities. Results: The test results show that early maladaptive schemas and schematic mindsets predict consciousness (P≤0.05). Overall conclusion: Finally, it can be stated that disability and shame, vulnerable child and indifferent self-comfort can predict the level of consciousness, so that increasing the score of the person in this scheme will reduce consciousness. And the relationship between mindfulness and the mindset of a healthy adult is positive, so that increasing a person's score in this mindset will increase the likelihood of mindfulness.

Keywords: Consciousness, Early Maladaptive Schemas, Schematic Mindsets.

INTRODUCTION

According to what is presented in the title of this study, we have sought to predict the extent of early maladaptive schemas and schematic mentalities of optimism. Therefore, we must first know what the nature of consciousness is and which of the psychological variables can be directly related to it. The definition of mindfulness has been modified for use in psychotherapy and now includes a wide range of concepts and exercises. Consciousness is inherently powerful, and attention, which is the concentration of consciousness, is stronger than consciousness. Only by being aware of what is happening inside and outside of us can we separate ourselves from mental occupations and hard emotions(Singh, Wahler, Adkins, Myers, & Group, 2003).

By shifting attention instead of trying to control or suppress intense emotions, we can regulate how we feel. Another aspect of mindfulness is "reminder." Remembrance does not mean memory of past events, but remembrance, awareness and attention, and is more than passive awareness or awareness for awareness(Addis, Wong, & Schacter, 2007). In addition to the definitions provided, consciousness contains many mental qualities. For this reason, we use

DOI: In prossing

To cite this article: Bonakdar Sakhi, I., Khoshlahjeh sedgh, A., Bahrami Hydeji, M. (2021). Predicting Consciousness Based On Initial Maladaptive Schemas and Schematic Mindsets in Psychology Students. *Academic Journal of Psychological Studies*, 10 (1), 35-46.

January, 2021

*

^{* .} Corresponding Author: Bonakdar Sakhi, I.

it to calm the clinical situation. These qualities include: lack of judgment, acceptance and compassion(Kabat-Zinn, 2006; Waelde, Thompson, Robinson, & Iwanicki, 2016). Continuity of self-control and attention to the present experience makes possible the increasing recognition of mental events in the present moment and provides a choice of a particular orientation towards the individual experience characterized by curiosity, openness and acceptance(Bishop et al., 2004).

As can be seen, mental processes and their mechanism of action are very important in consciousness, so in the following we will examine two variables in this regard. Primary maladaptive schema variables and schema mindsets. In recent years, in addition to using behavioral techniques, therapists have paid special attention to the need to make cognitive changes in people who suffer from cognitive errors, for example, Beck, Riggs, and Gorniak (2009), introduced the role of logical errors. Jeffrey E Young, Klosko, and Weishaar (2003), which combines the principles and foundations of cognitive-behavioral approaches, attachment, gestalt, thematic relationships, and psychoanalysis, addresses the role of early maladaptive schemas in the development of mental disorders. Early maladaptive schemas that form as a result of childhood experiences and in connection with important people in life put people on a downward spiral of unconsciousness. Depending on the problem of the client, short-term, medium-term and long-term treatment scheme, using motivational techniques and presenting the concept of maladaptive coping styles, open new horizons beyond the boundaries of cognitive-therapeutic behavior(Bach, Lockwood, & Young, 2018; Flink et al., 2018; Soygüt, Karaosmanoğlu, & Cakir, 2009).

However, in some cases, schema-based therapy has also been criticized for ignoring the emotions involved in people with mental disorders(Ball, 2007). Due to the great effect of emotions on the occurrence and continuity of consciousness, schema mentalities are also considered as underlying factors in this field. Schematic mindsets are emotional states and confrontational behaviors that we experience in every moment(Kaluzniacky, 2004). Often our schematic mindsets are aroused and activated through those life situations to which we are most sensitive. These situations act as keys to illuminating our emotions, and our inability to be conscious can cause these illuminated emotions to lead us into cognitive errors. Schematic mindsets are triggered when schemas are activated. They include severe and inflexible behaviors that occur and take control of a person's performance. The mindsets that govern us can change rapidly or overlap. This is referred to as oscillation or change of mindset. Mentality change is very common in people with psychiatric disorders. This leads to fear and anxiety in the person and is very exhausting and frustrating for him(Coombs, 2004; Leahy, 2016).

In fact, it can be said that schematic mentalities are an organized pattern of thinking, feeling and behavior that originates from a set of schemas. In this regard, the present study seeks to examine the prediction of early maladaptive schemas and mentalities. We have been a schema of consciousness. Today, the advancement of industry and technology among human societies has increased power and wealth, but has deprived people of the possibility of living in peace, tranquility and confidence, and in fact quality has been sacrificed for quantity, moderation and proportion aside, and neurological problems. The physical and psychological consequences of such problems impair the ability to function in the family, community, and workplace, and in many cases lead to family breakdown, substance abuse, suicide, unemployment, and poverty. And social isolation. While many of these critical consequences can be prevented by mental health issues and timely support. One of the concepts that is directly related to human mental health is the skill of consciousness or mindfulness. Methods of increasing mental health based on awareness, which is known as a new cognitive approach, should be taught to people as a skill and then as one of their abilities when facing problems and obstacles along the way. Life to use

it. But there is a question that states which factors stand in the way of learning and applying mindfulness skills or what variables are related to the lack of this skill. In this regard, the two variables are early maladaptive schemas and schema mindsets. Were considered in the present study. The concepts of early maladaptive schemas and schematic mindsets that attempt to describe the cognitive and emotional vulnerability of individuals form the basis of psychological pathology in schema-based approaches. The cognitive schema therapy approach to mindfulness refers to the ear-ring schema as a major factor in over-threatening assessments in response to stimuli that are objectively neutral(Leahy, 2016; Rafaeli, Bernstein, & Young, 2010).

Also, in a study entitled Comparison of initial maladaptive schemas of successful and unsuccessful addicts to quitting and non-clinical population(Khorshid Zadeh & Borjali, 2011; Khorshidzadeh, Borjali, Sohrabi, & Delavar, 2012; Morvaridi, Mashhadi, & Sepehri Shamloo, 2019), it was shown that the mean scores of 14 primary maladaptive schemas were simultaneously between successful and Failure to do so is a significant difference compared to opioid withdrawal and the non-clinical population. In this regard, in relation to schematic mentalities, it should be stated that there are four central schematic mentalities, which are: Types of schematic mental model models are: 1- Childish schematic mental model: which itself includes four vulnerable child mentalities, Angry child, impulsive child and happy child.2-Schematic mentality model of dysfunctional parent: which includes two blameful parent mentality and perfectionist parent.3- Schematic mindset model of coping styles: which includes 3 mindsets The submissive is the protector of avoidance and the compensator of the extreme. 4-Healthy adult schema mentality model(Farrell, Shaw, & Webber, 2009; Renner, Arntz, Leeuw, & Huibers, 2014). In the cognitive schema therapy approach, it is believed that thinking, or in a broader sense cognition, plays an essential role in how human behavior occurs. Schema therapists consider behavior as a clue to infer cognitive phenomena or what is going on in the mind(Fassbinder, Schweiger, Martius, Brand-de Wilde, & Arntz, 2016; Hayes, 2004). Ellis (1969), presented his intellectual-emotional-behavioral behavior in such a way that it is not events that cause confusion, distress or anxiety, but the individual's own perception and belief in events and phenomena. Which cause confusion, distress, anxiety and also cause many problems in his life, so it can be said that in the study of the process of consciousness, the main purpose of managing disturbing and unwanted disturbing thoughts that these thoughts have internal roots and as Repetitive thoughts, images, or impulses show themselves as unacceptable(Winston & Seif, 2017). Therefore, it would not be unreasonable to accept that those who receive mindfulness skills can guide themselves more and more, and this guidance will not be ineffective in increasing a person's mental health and reducing his stress, so the present study seeks to answer this The question was: Do early maladaptive schemas and schematic mindsets predict consciousness?

METHODOLOGY

The present study is correlation (structural equations). The statistical population of this study consisted of graduate psychology students of Karaj Azad University, which was a total of 650 people in the second semester of 2019. 250 people from the mentioned statistical population (250 people were selected by available non-random sampling method). In this study, three questionnaires: 1- MAAS Consciousness Questionnaire 2- Yang Schema Questionnaire 90 Questions 3- SMI Yang Schema Mental Questionnaire have been used.

Kessler Psychological Distress Questionnaire (K-10): This questionnaire was developed by Kessler et al. (2002). This questionnaire consists of 10 questions. The scoring of the questionnaire in the Likert scale is 5 points in such a way that no time is given 1 point, limited time 2 points, sometimes 3 points, most of the time 4 points and all the time 5 points(Naito et al.,

2021). The Kessler Psychological Distress Scale for the identification of mental disorders in the general population was developed by Kessler et al. In 2002 in the form of 10 questions (K) and 10 and 6 questions (K-6) and has been used in various studies. The questions on the two forms of the Kessler Psychological Distress Scale are like "never" to "always" and are scored between zero and four; Therefore, the maximum score of K-10 is equal to 40 and in K-6 is equal to 24. Also, the internal consistency of the questionnaire based on Cronbach's alpha in the present study (0.87) was obtained. In this study, three questionnaires; MAAS Consciousness, Yang Schema Questionnaire 90 Question Questionnaire and SMI Yang Schema Mental Questionnaire were used.

Yang Schema Questionnaire 90 questions: This questionnaire was developed by Jeffrey E. Young (1999). The self-report of initial maladaptive schemas has 90 items, including 18 areas of primary maladaptive schemas, such as: emotional deprivation, abandonment / instability, mistrust / abuse, social isolation / alienation, disability / unkindness Love) Failure to progress, dependence / practical inadequacy, vulnerability to harm and disease, adversity, obedience, self-sacrifice, emotional inhibition, strict criteria, entitlement / superiority, self-control / inadequate self-discipline, coercion Measures attention, worry / pessimism, self-punishment. Each item is scored on a 6-point scale. Therefore, the scores of this questionnaire are obtained by adding the scores of the items of each scale. In other words, each scale has 5 items that measure the type of first incompatible schema. The minimum and maximum scores for measuring the initial maladaptive schemas are between 1 and 6, with a high score indicating a high rate of early maladaptive schemas in the subjects.

SMI Young Schematic Mindset Questionnaire: This questionnaire has 124 questions and its purpose is to measure 14 schematic mindsets. Vulnerable child mentality, Angry child mentality, Impulsive child mentality, Undisciplined child mentality, Happy child mentality, Obedient submissive mentality, Indifferent protective mentality, Indifferent calming mentality, Self-aggrandizement mentality, Bullying mentality And aggressive, punitive parent mentality, expectant parent mentality, healthy adult mentality).

To conduct the research, first the necessary permits were obtained, then information was provided for research and sampling, and a number of graduate psychology students of Karaj Azad University volunteered, from which the sample was selected by available sampling. The questionnaires were distributed among them and the questionnaires were arranged in a set and after collecting the questionnaires, information was extracted and analyzed with 21spss program. The statistical method used in this study is descriptive statistics including Frequency; Percent; Mean; Standard deviation and to test the hypotheses, considering that the purpose of the study was to predict consciousness based on early maladaptive schemas and schematic mindsets, the statistical model of Pearson correlation coefficient and multivariate regression was used by regression method.

RESULTS

Table 1. Frequency and percentage distribution related to gender in the study group

Gender	Frequency	Percent
Female	162	64.8
Male	88	35.2
Total	250	100

Out of 250 subjects who participated in this study, 64.8% were female and 35.2% were male.

Predicting Consciousness Based On Initial Maladaptive Schemas ...

Table 2. Central statistical indices, dispersion and relative dispersion of early maladaptive schemas and schematic mindsets

Emotional deprivation	Variable	Extension	ckaymass	Std. Deviation	View	Middle	Mean
Punishment -0.975 0.055 4.071 8 15 16.07 Abandonment -0.073 0.857 7.320 5 11.50 13.08 Distrust 0.179 0.787 6.535 5 12.50 12.88 Social isolation -0.679 0.530 7.582 5 14 14.63 Defects and shame -0.967 0.087 7.071 10 17 17.06 Break -0.345 0.578 6.511 2 9.50 10.74 Dependence / Inadequacy -0.967 0.087 7.071 10 17 17.06 Sensitivity to injury 0.106 0.929 7.096 2 7.50 9.62 Caught -0.147 0.593 2.616 7 4 5.06 information 0.639 0.324 7.871 18 15 15.45 Negativity / Pessimism 0.142 0.543 8.353 7 14 14.25 Sacrific			skewness				
Abandonment	*						
Distrust							
Social isolation							
Defects and shame							
Break -0.345 0.578 6.511 2 9.50 10.74 Dependence / Inadequacy -0.967 0.087 7.071 10 17 17.06 Sensitivity to injury 0.106 0.929 7.096 2 7.50 9.62 Caught -0.147 0.593 2.616 7 4 5.06 information 0.639 0.324 7.871 18 15 15.45 Negativity / Pessimism 0.142 0.543 8.353 7 14 14.25 Sacrifice -1.027 0.214 7.081 9 12 13.16 Emotional deterrence 0.644 -0.672 3.492 13 12 11.47 Stubborn criteria -0.161 -0.226 3.890 18 12 12.09 Entitlement -0.147 0.593 2.616 7 4 5.06 You have self-control 0.639 0.324 7.871 18 15 15.45 <							
Dependence / Inadequacy							
Sensitivity to injury 0.106 0.929 7.096 2 7.50 9.62 Caught -0.147 0.593 2.616 7 4 5.06 information 0.639 0.324 7.871 18 15 15.45 Negativity / Pessimism 0.142 0.543 8.353 7 14 14.25 Sacrifice -1.027 0.214 7.081 9 12 13.16 Emotional deterrence 0.644 -0.672 3.492 13 12 11.47 Stubborn criteria -0.161 -0.226 3.890 18 12 12.09 Entitlement -0.147 0.593 2.616 7 4 5.06 You have self-control 0.639 0.324 7.871 18 15 15.45 Acceptance / Attention -1.015 0.812 6.031 17 13 13.54 Vulnerable child mentality 0.446 -0.388 4.319 14 14 14.21							
Caught -0.147 0.593 2.616 7 4 5.06 information 0.639 0.324 7.871 18 15 15.45 Negativity / Pessimism 0.142 0.543 8.353 7 14 14.25 Sacrifice -1.027 0.214 7.081 9 12 13.16 Emotional deterrence 0.644 -0.672 3.492 13 12 11.47 Stubborn criteria -0.161 -0.226 3.890 18 12 12.09 Entitlement -0.147 0.593 2.616 7 4 5.06 You have self-control 0.639 0.324 7.871 18 15 15.45 Acceptance / Attention -1.015 0.812 6.031 17 13 13.54 Vulnerable child mentality 0.446 -0.388 4.319 14 14 14.21 Angry child mentality 0.446 -0.388 4.319 14 14 14.21 <td>1 1</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>	1 1						
information 0.639 0.324 7.871 18 15 15.45 Negativity / Pessimism 0.142 0.543 8.353 7 14 14.25 Sacrifice -1.027 0.214 7.081 9 12 13.16 Emotional deterrence 0.644 -0.672 3.492 13 12 11.47 Stubborn criteria -0.161 -0.226 3.890 18 12 12.09 Entitlement -0.147 0.593 2.616 7 4 5.06 You have self-control 0.639 0.324 7.871 18 15 15.45 Acceptance / Attention -1.015 0.812 6.031 17 13 13.54 Vulnerable child mentality 0.446 -0.388 4.319 14 14 14.21 Angry child mentality 2.797 -0.777 4.850 21 21 21.82 Angry child mentality 0.623 3.244 7.956 19 20 20	Sensitivity to injury	0.106	0.929	7.096		7.50	
Negativity / Pessimism	Caught	-0.147	0.593	2.616	7	4	5.06
Sacrifice -1.027 0.214 7.081 9 12 13.16 Emotional deterrence 0.644 -0.672 3.492 13 12 11.47 Stubborn criteria -0.161 -0.226 3.890 18 12 12.09 Entitlement -0.147 0.593 2.616 7 4 5.06 You have self-control 0.639 0.324 7.871 18 15 15.45 Acceptance / Attention -1.015 0.812 6.031 17 13 13.54 Vulnerable child mentality 0.446 -0.388 4.319 14 14 14.21 Angry child mentality 0.623 3.244 7.956 19 20 20.58 Happy child mentality 1.445 2.524 4.221 7 5 5.98 Impulsive child mentality 1.820 930 6.044 18 15 15.02 Undisciplined child mentality -0.755 0.160 3.787 15 10 <td>information</td> <td>0.639</td> <td>0.324</td> <td>7.871</td> <td></td> <td>15</td> <td>15.45</td>	information	0.639	0.324	7.871		15	15.45
Emotional deterrence 0.644 -0.672 3.492 13 12 11.47 Stubborn criteria -0.161 -0.226 3.890 18 12 12.09 Entitlement -0.147 0.593 2.616 7 4 5.06 You have self-control 0.639 0.324 7.871 18 15 15.45 Acceptance / Attention -1.015 0.812 6.031 17 13 13.54 Vulnerable child mentality 0.446 -0.388 4.319 14 14 14.21 Angry child mentality 2.797 -0.777 4.850 21 21 21.82 Angry child mentality 0.623 3.244 7.956 19 20 20.58 Happy child mentality 1.445 2.524 4.221 7 5 5.98 Impulsive child mentality 1.820 930 6.044 18 15 15.02 Undisciplined child mentality -0.755 0.160 3.787 15	Negativity / Pessimism	0.142	0.543	8.353	7	14	14.25
Stubborn criteria -0.161 -0.226 3.890 18 12 12.09 Entitlement -0.147 0.593 2.616 7 4 5.06 You have self-control 0.639 0.324 7.871 18 15 15.45 Acceptance / Attention -1.015 0.812 6.031 17 13 13.54 Vulnerable child mentality 0.446 -0.388 4.319 14 14 14.21 Angry child mentality 2.797 -0.777 4.850 21 21 21.82 Angry child mentality 0.623 3.244 7.956 19 20 20.58 Happy child mentality 1.445 2.524 4.221 7 5 5.98 Impulsive child mentality 1.820 930 6.044 18 15 15.02 Undisciplined child mentality -0.755 0.160 3.787 15 10 9.89 Submissive mentality -1.033 0.296 8.406 5	Sacrifice	-1.027	0.214	7.081	9	12	13.16
Entitlement -0.147 0.593 2.616 7 4 5.06 You have self-control 0.639 0.324 7.871 18 15 15.45 Acceptance / Attention -1.015 0.812 6.031 17 13 13.54 Vulnerable child mentality 0.446 -0.388 4.319 14 14 14.21 Angry child mentality 2.797 -0.777 4.850 21 21 21.82 Angry child mentality 0.623 3.244 7.956 19 20 20.58 Happy child mentality 1.445 2.524 4.221 7 5 5.98 Impulsive child mentality 1.820 930 6.044 18 15 15.02 Undisciplined child mentality -0.755 0.160 3.787 15 10 9.89 Submissive mentality -1.033 0.296 8.406 5 16 15.90 Indifferent protective mindset -0.193 0.734 7.048 10	Emotional deterrence	0.644	-0.672	3.492	13	12	11.47
You have self-control 0.639 0.324 7.871 18 15 15.45 Acceptance / Attention -1.015 0.812 6.031 17 13 13.54 Vulnerable child mentality 0.446 -0.388 4.319 14 14 14.21 Angry child mentality 2.797 -0.777 4.850 21 21 21.82 Angry child mentality 0.623 3.244 7.956 19 20 20.58 Happy child mentality 1.445 2.524 4.221 7 5 5.98 Impulsive child mentality 1.820 930 6.044 18 15 15.02 Undisciplined child mentality -0.755 0.160 3.787 15 10 9.89 Submissive mentality -1.033 0.296 8.406 5 16 15.90 Indifferent protective mindset -0.193 0.734 7.048 10 14 14.61 Indifferent self-calming mentality -1.084 0.023 <td< td=""><td>Stubborn criteria</td><td>-0.161</td><td>-0.226</td><td>3.890</td><td>18</td><td>12</td><td>12.09</td></td<>	Stubborn criteria	-0.161	-0.226	3.890	18	12	12.09
Acceptance / Attention -1.015 0.812 6.031 17 13 13.54 Vulnerable child mentality 0.446 -0.388 4.319 14 14 14.21 Angry child mentality 2.797 -0.777 4.850 21 21 21.82 Angry child mentality 0.623 3.244 7.956 19 20 20.58 Happy child mentality 1.445 2.524 4.221 7 5 5.98 Impulsive child mentality 1.820 930 6.044 18 15 15.02 Undisciplined child mentality -0.755 0.160 3.787 15 10 9.89 Submissive mentality -1.033 0.296 8.406 5 16 15.90 Indifferent protective mindset -0.193 0.734 7.048 10 14 14.61 Indifferent self-calming mentality -1.084 0.023 7.873 30 17.50 17.71 Self-consciousness of great character -1.097 -0	Entitlement	-0.147	0.593	2.616	7	4	5.06
Vulnerable child mentality 0.446 -0.388 4.319 14 14 14.21 Angry child mentality 2.797 -0.777 4.850 21 21 21.82 Angry child mentality 0.623 3.244 7.956 19 20 20.58 Happy child mentality 1.445 2.524 4.221 7 5 5.98 Impulsive child mentality 1.820 930 6.044 18 15 15.02 Undisciplined child mentality -0.755 0.160 3.787 15 10 9.89 Submissive mentality -1.033 0.296 8.406 5 16 15.90 Indifferent protective mindset -0.193 0.734 7.048 10 14 14.61 Indifferent self-calming mentality -1.084 0.023 7.873 30 17.50 17.71 Self-consciousness of great character -1.097 -0.178 7.810 5 19 18.10 The mentality of the punishing parent -0.631	You have self-control	0.639	0.324	7.871	18	15	15.45
Vulnerable child mentality 0.446 -0.388 4.319 14 14 14.21 Angry child mentality 2.797 -0.777 4.850 21 21 21.82 Angry child mentality 0.623 3.244 7.956 19 20 20.58 Happy child mentality 1.445 2.524 4.221 7 5 5.98 Impulsive child mentality 1.820 930 6.044 18 15 15.02 Undisciplined child mentality -0.755 0.160 3.787 15 10 9.89 Submissive mentality -1.033 0.296 8.406 5 16 15.90 Indifferent protective mindset -0.193 0.734 7.048 10 14 14.61 Indifferent self-calming mentality -1.084 0.023 7.873 30 17.50 17.71 Self-consciousness of great character -1.097 -0.178 7.810 5 19 18.10 The mentality of the punishing parent -0.631	Acceptance / Attention	-1.015	0.812	6.031	17	13	13.54
Angry child mentality 0.623 3.244 7.956 19 20 20.58 Happy child mentality 1.445 2.524 4.221 7 5 5.98 Impulsive child mentality 1.820 930 6.044 18 15 15.02 Undisciplined child mentality -0.755 0.160 3.787 15 10 9.89 Submissive mentality -1.033 0.296 8.406 5 16 15.90 Indifferent protective mindset -0.193 0.734 7.048 10 14 14.61 Indifferent self-calming mentality -1.084 0.023 7.873 30 17.50 17.71 Self-consciousness of great character -1.097 -0.178 7.810 5 19 18.10 The mentality of the punishing parent -0.631 -0.318 6.550 16 17 16.63 Healthy adult mentality 15.540 2.436 7.576 19 17 16.77					14	14	14.21
Angry child mentality 0.623 3.244 7.956 19 20 20.58 Happy child mentality 1.445 2.524 4.221 7 5 5.98 Impulsive child mentality 1.820 930 6.044 18 15 15.02 Undisciplined child mentality -0.755 0.160 3.787 15 10 9.89 Submissive mentality -1.033 0.296 8.406 5 16 15.90 Indifferent protective mindset -0.193 0.734 7.048 10 14 14.61 Indifferent self-calming mentality -1.084 0.023 7.873 30 17.50 17.71 Self-consciousness of great character -1.097 -0.178 7.810 5 19 18.10 The mentality of the punishing parent -0.631 -0.318 6.550 16 17 16.63 Healthy adult mentality 15.540 2.436 7.576 19 17 16.77	Angry child mentality	2.797	-0.777	4.850	21	21	21.82
Happy child mentality 1.445 2.524 4.221 7 5 5.98 Impulsive child mentality 1.820 930 6.044 18 15 15.02 Undisciplined child mentality -0.755 0.160 3.787 15 10 9.89 Submissive mentality -1.033 0.296 8.406 5 16 15.90 Indifferent protective mindset -0.193 0.734 7.048 10 14 14.61 Indifferent self-calming mentality -1.084 0.023 7.873 30 17.50 17.71 Self-consciousness of great character -1.097 -0.178 7.810 5 19 18.10 The mentality of the punishing parent -0.631 -0.318 6.550 16 17 16.63 Healthy adult mentality 15.540 2.436 7.576 19 17 16.77		0.623	3.244	7.956	19	20	20.58
Impulsive child mentality 1.820 930 6.044 18 15 15.02 Undisciplined child mentality -0.755 0.160 3.787 15 10 9.89 Submissive mentality -1.033 0.296 8.406 5 16 15.90 Indifferent protective mindset -0.193 0.734 7.048 10 14 14.61 Indifferent self-calming mentality -1.084 0.023 7.873 30 17.50 17.71 Self-consciousness of great character -1.097 -0.178 7.810 5 19 18.10 The mentality of the punishing parent -0.631 -0.318 6.550 16 17 16.63 Healthy adult mentality 15.540 2.436 7.576 19 17 16.77		1.445	2.524	4.221	7	5	5.98
Undisciplined child mentality -0.755 0.160 3.787 15 10 9.89 Submissive mentality -1.033 0.296 8.406 5 16 15.90 Indifferent protective mindset -0.193 0.734 7.048 10 14 14.61 Indifferent self-calming mentality -1.084 0.023 7.873 30 17.50 17.71 Self-consciousness of great character -1.097 -0.178 7.810 5 19 18.10 The mentality of the punishing parent -0.631 -0.318 6.550 16 17 16.63 Healthy adult mentality 15.540 2.436 7.576 19 17 16.77	117				18	15	
Submissive mentality -1.033 0.296 8.406 5 16 15.90 Indifferent protective mindset -0.193 0.734 7.048 10 14 14.61 Indifferent self-calming mentality -1.084 0.023 7.873 30 17.50 17.71 Self-consciousness of great character -1.097 -0.178 7.810 5 19 18.10 The mentality of the punishing parent -0.631 -0.318 6.550 16 17 16.63 Healthy adult mentality 15.540 2.436 7.576 19 17 16.77							
Indifferent protective mindset -0.193 0.734 7.048 10 14 14.61 Indifferent self-calming mentality -1.084 0.023 7.873 30 17.50 17.71 Self-consciousness of great character -1.097 -0.178 7.810 5 19 18.10 The mentality of the punishing parent -0.631 -0.318 6.550 16 17 16.63 Healthy adult mentality 15.540 2.436 7.576 19 17 16.77						16	
Indifferent self-calming mentality -1.084 0.023 7.873 30 17.50 17.71 Self-consciousness of great character -1.097 -0.178 7.810 5 19 18.10 The mentality of the punishing parent -0.631 -0.318 6.550 16 17 16.63 Healthy adult mentality 15.540 2.436 7.576 19 17 16.77	•						
Self-consciousness of great character -1.097 -0.178 7.810 5 19 18.10 The mentality of the punishing parent -0.631 -0.318 6.550 16 17 16.63 Healthy adult mentality 15.540 2.436 7.576 19 17 16.77							
The mentality of the punishing parent -0.631 -0.318 6.550 16 17 16.63 Healthy adult mentality 15.540 2.436 7.576 19 17 16.77							
Healthy adult mentality 15.540 2.436 7.576 19 17 16.77							
, , ,	, , ,						
Bullying and aggressive mentality -0.333 -0.284 2.527 8 8 7.83	Bullying and aggressive mentality	-0.333	-0.284	2.527	8	8	7.83
Expectant parent mentality Variable -0.295 -0.509 2.599 10 9 8.45							

There is a relationship between early maladaptive schemas and consciousness.

Table 3. Pearson correlation coefficients between early maladaptive schemas and consciousness

Initial maladaptive schemas	Sig.	Correlation coefficient	result
Emotional deprivation	0.001	-0.205	Inverse and significant correlation
Punishment	0.001	-0.205	Inverse and significant correlation
Abandonment	0.004	-0.170	Inverse and significant correlation
Distrust	0.551	0.035	Non-meaningful
Social isolation	0.102	-0.097	Non-meaningful
Defects and shame	0.0001	-0.293	Inverse and significant correlation
Break	0.0001	-0.218	Inverse and significant correlation
Dependence incompetence	0.0001	-0.206	Inverse and significant correlation
Sensitivity to injury	0.001	-0.196	Inverse and significant correlation
Caught	0.0001	-0.487	Inverse and significant correlation
Obedience	0.669	-0.026	Non-meaningful
Negativity / Pessimism	0.0001	-0.361	Inverse and significant correlation
Sacrifice	0.001	-0.204	Inverse and significant correlation
Emotional deterrence	0.0001	-0.230	Inverse and significant correlation
Stubborn criteria	0.0001	-0.384	Inverse and significant correlation
Entitlement	0.0001	-0.564	Inverse and significant correlation
self-control	0.002	-0.188	Inverse and significant correlation
Acceptance / Attention	0.002	-0.188	Non-meaningful

The table above shows the correlation between consciousness and early maladaptive schemas. It is observed that the correlation of consciousness with the schemas of distrust, isolation, acceptance / attention and obedience is not significant. But the direction of correlation in other schemas is significant and negative. This means that people with low alertness score higher on these schemas. Thus, it is confirmed that between consciousness and schemas of emotional deprivation (at 99% level), punishment (at 99% level), abandonment (at 95% level), failure (at 99% level), sensitivity To injury (at 95% level), adversity (at 99% level), self-sacrifice (at 99% level), emotional inhibition (at 99% level), stubborn criteria (at 99% level), entitlement (at 99% level) There is an inverse and significant relationship between self-control (at the level of 59%), imperfection and shame (at the level of 99%), negativity / pessimism (at the level of 99%) and dependence (at the level of 99%).

In order to investigate the prediction of the independent variable (early maladaptive schemas) of the dependent variable (consciousness), the regression model was used by the regression method.

Thus, the criterion variable (consciousness) is assumed and the variables that have a significant correlation with the criterion variable are included in the regression model as predictor variables. The results of this study are presented in the following tables:

Table 4. Model Significance

Vari	ables	chi square	Df	Sig.
Step 9 (last)	Step	-2.408	1	-2.408
	Block	150.001	4	150.001
	Model	150.001	4	150.001

The regression model was performed by retrospective regression method which has been continued up to 9 steps. The following tables are the results of the ninth (last) step. The above table shows that the amount of chi-square in the ninth step is equal to 150, the level of significance is less than 5% and shows the share of predictor variables in the criterion variable and the model has a good fit.

Table 5. Model coefficients

Step	-2 Log likelihood	Cox & Snell R ²	Nagelkerke R ²
9	0.528	127.258	0.704

The table above shows the Naglerck correlation square statistic, which is actually the predictor coefficient of the model. This value is equal to 70% for step 9, which indicates that 70% of the changes in the criterion variable are predicted by the independent variables entered into the model. In this way, it can be stated with at least 95% confidence that the initial maladaptive schemas can explain 70% of consciousness.

Table 6. Parent statistics results for the variables entered in the model

The varial	bles entered in the step 9	beta	Parent statistics	Df	Sig.	Superiority ratio
Step 9	Defect / Shame	-0.132	13.731	1	0.0001	0.876
	Sacrifice	0.056	2.797	1	0.094	1.058
	Entitlement	0.419	38.650	1	0.0001	1.520
	You have self-control	-0.120	3.091	1	0.079	0.887
	Total	-0.684	0.496	1	0.481	0.505

The variables entered in the first step: emotional deprivation, abandonment / instability, defect / shame, failure, dependence / inadequacy, sensitivity to injury, immature / trapped, self-sacrifice, emotional inhibition, stubborn criteria, entitlement and self You are. The results of the above table and parent statistics show that in the ninth step, the variables (schemas) of defect / shame, self-sacrifice, entitlement and self-control are present in the model. Eligibility is

Predicting Consciousness Based On Initial Maladaptive Schemas ...

significant at the 5% error level. It is observed that the direction of the beta coefficient for the defect / shame scheme is negative. This means that a high individual score in this schema will reduce alertness. However, the direction of the beta coefficient for the schema is positive, so increasing the individual's score in this schema will increase the probability of consciousness. It should be noted that schemes of self-sacrifice and self-control are not significant at the 5% error level. In this way we can say:

- 1. Early maladaptive schemas predict conscious thoughts.
- 2. The sensitivity of the model is 86.5%.
- 3. 70% of consciousness changes are predicted by early maladaptive schemas.
- 4. Accordingly, the first hypothesis of the research is confirmed.

Second sub-hypothesis: There is a relationship between mindfulness and schema mindsets.

Schematic mindsets	Correlation coefficient	Sig.	Result
Vulnerable child mentality	-0.285	0.0001	Inverse and significant correlation
Angry child mentality	-0.423	0.0001	Inverse and significant correlation
Angry child mentality	-0.358	0.0001	Inverse and significant correlation
Happy child mentality	0.633	0.0001	Direct and meaningful correlation
Impulsive child mentality	-0.318	0.0001	Inverse and significant correlation
Undisciplined child mentality	-0.284	0.0001	Inverse and significant correlation
Submissive mentality	-0.430	0.0001	Inverse and significant correlation
Indifferent protective mindset	0.072	0.227	Non-meaningful
Indifferent self-calming mentality	-0.418	0.0001	Inverse and significant correlation
Self-consciousness of great character	-0.170	0.004	Inverse and significant correlation
The mentality of the punishing parent	-0.231	0.0001	Inverse and significant correlation
Healthy adult mentality	0.141	0.017	Direct and meaningful correlation
Bullying and aggressive mentality	-0.013	0.829	Inverse and significant correlation
Expectant parent mentality	-0.066	0.286	Inverse and significant correlation

Table 7. Correlation coefficients between schema mentalities and consciousness

The table above shows the correlation between mindfulness and schema mindsets. It can be seen that the correlation of consciousness with the indifferent protective mentality is not significant. But it is negative for solidarity in mentalities other than a happy child and a healthy adult. This means that people with low consciousness have a higher score in these mentalities. This confirms that between consciousness and schematic mindsets of vulnerable children (at 99% level), angry child mindsets (at 95% level), angry child mindsets (at 99% level), child mindsets Impulsive (at 95% level), undisciplined child mentality (at 99% level), submissive mentality (at 99% level), indifferent self-calming mentality (at 99% level), self-aggrandizement mentality (at 99% level) There is a significant inverse relationship between the mentality of the punishing parent (at the level of 99%) and the mentality of the expectant parent (at the level of 99%).

In order to evaluate the prediction of the independent variable (schematic mindsets) of the dependent variable (consciousness), the regression model was used in a retrospective method.

Variables that had a significant correlation with the criterion variable (vulnerable child schema mentality, angry child mentality, angry child mentality, impulsive child mentality, undisciplined child mentality, submissive mentality, indifferent self-calming mentality, mentality Self-aggrandizement, the mentality of the disciplining parent, the expectant and healthy, and the mentality of the happy child) are included as predictor variables in the regression model. The results of this study are presented in the following tables:

Table 8. Model Significance

		chi square	Df	Sig.
Step 7 (Last)	Step	-1.829	1	.176
	Block	226.259	5	0.0001
	Model	226.259	5	0.0001

This regression model was also performed by the regression method, which lasted up to 7 steps. The following tables are the results of the seventh (last) step. Also, the above table shows that the chi-square value in the seventh step is equal to 226.25, which has a significance level of less than 5% and shows the effect of predictor variables on the criterion variable and the model has a good fit.

Table 9. Model coefficients

Step	-2 Log likelihood	Cox & Snell R ²	Nagelkerke R ²
Seventh	51	.677	.903

The table above shows the Naglerck correlation square statistic, which is actually the coefficient of explanation of the model. This value is equal to 0.9 for the seventh step, which shows that 90% of the changes in the criterion variable (consciousness) are predicted by the independent variables entered into the model. In this way, it can be stated with at least 95% confidence that schematic mindsets can predict 90% of consciousness.

Table 10. Parent statistics results for variables entered in the model

	Variables	beta	Parent statistics	Df	Sig.	Superiority ratio
Step 7	Vulnerable child	-0.226	5.883	1	0.015	0.798
	Happy baby	0.470	24.383	1	0.0001	1.600
	Submissive mentality	-0.649	17.228	1	0.0001	0.523
	Healthy adult mentality	0.519	9.557	1	0.002	1.680
	Indifferent self-calming	-0.262	9.526	1	0.002	0.770
	Total	2.789	3.582	1	0.058	16.270

The variables entered in the first step: the schematic mentality of the vulnerable child, the mentality of the angry child, the mentality of the impulsive child, the mentality of the undisciplined child, the submissive mentality, the indifferent self-calming mentality The mindset of the punishing parent is expectant and healthy, and the mindset of the child is happy. The results of the above table and parent statistics show that in the seventh step, the variables of vulnerable child schematic mentality, submissive mentality, indifferent self-calming mentality, healthy parent mentality and happy child mentality are present in the model. For these schemas, a significance level of 5% is significant. It is observed that for the beta coefficient for the vulnerable child, the submissive and submissive mindset is indifferently negative. This means that a high score in these mentalities will reduce the likelihood of consciousness. But the beta coefficient is positive for happy and healthy adult schematic mindsets, so that increasing the individual's score in these mindsets will increase the likelihood of consciousness. In this way we can say:

- 1. Schematic mindsets predict consciousness.
- 2. The sensitivity of the model is 94%.
- 3. 90% of changes in consciousness are predicted by schematic mindsets.
- 4. Accordingly, the second hypothesis of the research is also confirmed.

The main hypothesis: Early maladaptive schemas and emotional schemas, in a combined model, predict consciousness.

To examine this hypothesis, the variables that had a significant correlation with the criterion variable (emotional deprivation, abandonment / instability, defect / shame, failure, dependence / inadequacy, sensitivity to injury, unchanged / trapped, self-sacrifice, emotional inhibition, Stubborn criteria, entitlement / magnanimity and self-control, vulnerable child schema mentality, angry child mentality, angry child mentality, impulsive child mentality, undisciplined child mentality, submissive mentality, indifferent self-calming mentality, Self-aggrandizement mentality, punitive, expectant and healthy parent mentality, and happy child mentality) have been included as predictor variables in the regression model. The results of this study are presented in the following tables:

Table No. 11. Model Significance

		Sig.	Df	Chi square
Step 18 (Last)	Step	5.101	1	0.024
	Block	262.211	8	0.001
	Model	262.211	8	0.001

This regression model was performed with a regression method that lasted up to 18 steps. The following tables are the results of the eighteenth (last) step. Also, the above table shows that the value of chi-square in step 18 is equal to 226.21, the level of significance of which is less than 5% and shows the effect of predictor variables on the criterion variable and the model has a good fit.

Table 12. Model coefficients

Step	-2 Log likelihood	Cox & Snell R Square	Nagelkerke R Square
Step 18	15.048	0.73	0.974

The table above shows the Naglerck correlation square statistic, which is actually the coefficient of explanation of the model. This value for step 18 is equal to 974.0, which indicates that more than 97% of the changes in the criterion variable are predicted by the independent variables entered into the model. In this way, it can be stated with at least 95% confidence that early maladaptive schemas and schematic mindsets can predict 97% of consciousness.

Variables entered in the first step: emotional deprivation, abandonment / instability, defect / shame, failure, dependence / inadequacy, sensitivity to injury, immature / trapped, self-sacrifice, emotional inhibition, stubborn criteria, entitlement / greatness Secretary and self-control, vulnerable child schematic mentality, angry child mentality, angry child mentality, impulsive child mentality, undisciplined child mentality, submissive submissive mentality, indifferent self-calming mentality, self-aggrandizement mentality, mentality The disciplining parent is expectant, healthy, and the child's mindset is happy.

Table 13. Parent statistics results for the variables entered in the model

Imported variables		beta	Parent statistics	Df	SL	Superiority ratio
Step 18	Defects and shame	-1.089	4.030	1	0.0045	0.337
	Vulnerable child	-1.881	4.223	1	0.0040	6.561
	Indifferent self-calming	-1.033	4.391	1	0.0036	0.356
	Healthy adult mentality	0.486	2.645	1	0.0056	1.627
	Entitlement	2.355	4.580	1	0.0032	10.539
	Total	-18.708	3.698	1	0.0054	0

The results of the above table and parent statistics show that in step 18, the variables of schemas of defect and shame and entitlement and the schematic mindsets of vulnerable, indifferent self-calming and healthy adult minds are present in the model that parent statistics, The significance of disability, shame, entitlement, and schematic mentalities of a vulnerable child, indifferent self-calming, and a healthy adult mentality was confirmed at an error rate of 5%. It is observed that due to the beta coefficient in defect and shame, the vulnerable and self-

comforting child is indifferently negative. This means that a high score in these variables will reduce the likelihood of alertness. But for the beta coefficient for other schemas, the entitlement and mentality of a healthy adult is positive, so that increasing the individual's score in this schema will increase the likelihood of alertness.

CONCLUSION

According to the results obtained in the present study in explaining the main hypothesis, it can be stated that the research findings indicate that early maladaptive schemas and schematic mindsets as cognitive, emotional and behavioral infrastructures can increase the level of consciousness of individuals be effective. Not much research has been done in this regard. In the article the relationship between mindfulness and early maladaptive schemas in men who are looking for substance abuse. The result was a negative correlation strong between mindfulness and 15 Schema 18 maladaptive schema there. In addition, men with multiple maladaptive schemas also had lower alertness than those with fewer schemas. It can be assumed that people with a lot of maladaptive schemas may live longer in the past and may not be well. When faced with psychological damage and problems, especially chronic injuries, as well as having negative schemas, these people cannot cope with them satisfactorily.

Also, since consciousness involves a receptive and judgment-free awareness of current events. Mindful people understand internal and external realities freely and without distortion, and have a great ability to deal with a wide range of thoughts, emotions, and experiences. Mindfulness is positively associated with peace of mind and psychological well-being, while self-awareness is associated with low levels of stress reduction due to psychological well-being. On the other hand, according to Yang, the model of schematic mentality manifests itself in the form of inefficient mindsets that are activated rapidly and cyclically. Young argues that an inefficient schema mentality is in fact a form of "self" that is not continuously integrated into the personality structure and acts discretely. It is this discontinuous shift between dysfunctional schema mindsets that is responsible for the unstable pattern of emotion, self-concept, interpersonal relationships, and poor impulse control. Thus, without the existence of a disorganized personality, there were no dysfunctional schematic mindsets, as well as sudden states of change. Therefore, the more disconnected there is in the schematic mindsets of individuals, the more inefficient, widespread, and inflexible and ignorant these mindsets become. Now the question that arises is, how can this process be related to consciousness? In mindfulness, the person becomes aware of his mental style at every moment, and after being aware of the two ways of mind, one doing and the other being, he learns to move the mind from one way to another, which requires the training of behavioral strategies. Cognitive is a special metacognition for focusing the process of attention, and it is precisely this that maintains the integrity and coherence that prevents the destructive influence of schematic mindsets.

In this regard, the effect of each of the early maladaptive schemas on consciousness is explained in such a way that reducing the effect of schemas reduces negative emotion and psychological symptoms and increases self-esteem, optimism and positive emotion. In this regard, it increases awareness and gives clarity to people's experiences and teaches people to experience their life moment by moment, which reduces negative psychological symptoms and increases psychological well-being.

Also, because awareness in clinical psychology and psychopathology means cultivating the power of attention to increase awareness of thoughts, emotions and bodily feelings, and the purpose of this technique is to focus, reduce judgment and create purposefulness in the way of

paying attention. It has to do with internal and external issues, so clinical experience shows that people who perform better in schematic mindsets make the most progress in mindfulnessfocused techniques. For example, through mindfulness techniques, the mentality of a vulnerable child can be accessed and then re-parented. Since most of the main schemas are located in the mentality of the vulnerable child, so most of the process of improving the schema is achieved while dealing with this mentality. Therapists should try to show the patient that these mindsets are throwing stones at the vulnerable child's mentality, and what benefits he or she will gain if he or she abandons or modifies this mindset through mindfulness techniques.. Clinical experience shows that mental imagery techniques provide the therapist with the most effective way to communicate with a vulnerable child. The therapist asks the patient to visualize the vulnerable child, then enters the mental image as a healthy adult and talks to the vulnerable child. The therapist helps patients to express their incomplete needs while activating the mentality of the vulnerable child, and at the same time the therapist, through open parenting, provides a space to express the child's needs (security, love, autonomy, and self-expression). And constraints) (we use this technique on a regular basis, even if we do not intend to do the usual mindset-focused techniques).

REFERENCES

- Addis, Donna Rose, Wong, Alana T, & Schacter, Daniel L. (2007). Remembering the past and imagining the future: common and distinct neural substrates during event construction and elaboration. *Neuropsychologia*, 45(7), 1363-1377.
- Bach, Bo, Lockwood, George & ,Young, Jeffrey E. (2018). A new look at the schema therapy model: organization and role of early maladaptive schemas. *Cognitive behaviour therapy*, 47(4), 328-349.
- Ball, Samuel A. (2007). Cognitive-Behavioral and Schema-Based Models for the Treatment of Substance Use Disorders *Cognitive schemas and core beliefs in psychological problems: A scientist-practitioner guide*. (pp. 111-138). Washington, DC, US: American Psychological Association.
- Beck, Sarah R, Riggs, Kevin J, & Gorniak, Sarah L. (2009). Relating developments in children's counterfactual thinking and executive functions. *Thinking & reasoning*, 15(4), 337-354.
- Bishop, Scott R, Lau, Mark, Shapiro, Shauna, Carlson, Linda, Anderson, Nicole D, Carmody, James, . . . Velting, Drew. (2004). Mindfulness: A proposed operational definition. *Clinical psychology: Science and practice*, 11(3), 230-241.
- Coombs, Robert Holman. (2004). *Handbook of addictive disorders: A practical guide to diagnosis and treatment*: John Wiley & Sons.
- Ellis, Albert. (1969). Rational-emotive therapy. *Journal of Contemporary Psychotherapy: On the Cutting Edge of Modern Developments in Psychotherapy, 1*(2), 82-90. doi: 10.1007/BF02110062
- Farrell, Joan M, Shaw, Ida A, & Webber, Michael A. (2009). A schema-focused approach to group psychotherapy for outpatients with borderline personality disorder: a randomized controlled trial. *Journal of behavior therapy and experimental psychiatry*, 40(2), 317-328.
- Fassbinder, Eva, Schweiger, Ulrich, Martius, Desiree, Brand-de Wilde, Odette, & Arntz, Arnoud. (2016). Emotion regulation in schema therapy and dialectical behavior therapy. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 7, 1373.
- Flink, Niko, Honkalampi, Kirsi, Lehto, Soili M, Leppänen, Virpi, Viinamäki, Heimo, & Lindeman, Sari. (2018). Comparison of early maladaptive schemas between borderline personality disorder and chronic depression. *Clinical psychology & psychotherapy*, 25(4), 532-539.
- Hayes, Steven C. (2004). Acceptance and commitment therapy, relational frame theory, and the third wave of behavioral and cognitive therapies. *Behavior therapy*, 35(4), 639-665.
- Kabat-Zinn, J. (2006). Some clinical applications of mindfulness in medical and mental health practice.

January, 2021 45

- Paper presented at the Meditation in Psychotherapy, Boston, USA.
- Kaluzniacky, Eugene. (200 .(*Managing psychological factors in information systems work: An orientation to emotional intelligence: IGI Global.
- Kessler, R C, Andrews, Gavin, Colpe, L J, Hiripi, Eva, D K, Mroczek, T Normand, SL, . . . Zaslavsky, A M. (2002). Short screening scales to monitor population prevalences and trends in non-specific psychological distress. *Psychological medicine*, 32(6), 959.
- Khorshid Zadeh, Mohsen, & Borjali, Ahmad. (2011). The study of effectiveness of Schema Therapy in Reducing the Activity of the Early Maladaptive Schema in Women with Social Anxiety Disorder. *Counseling Culture and Psycotherapy*, 2(6), 1-39.
- Khorshidzadeh, Mohsen, Borjali, Ahmad, Sohrabi, Framarz, & Delavar, Ali. (2012). The effectiveness of schema therapy in the treatment of women (females) with social anxiety disorder. *Research in Clinical Psychology and Counseling*, 1(2), doi:10.22067/ijap.v22061i22062.29420.
- Leahy, Robert L. (2016). Emotional schema therapy: A meta-experiential model. *Australian Psychologist*, 51(2), 82-88.
- Morvaridi, Maryam, Mashhadi, Ali, & Sepehri Shamloo, Zohre. (2019). The effectiveness of group therapy based on emotional schema therapy on decrease of anxiety sensitivity in woman with social anxiety disorder. *J Neyshabur Univ Med Sci*, 7(1), 26-35.
- Naito, Yumi ,Enomoto, Noriyuki, Kameno, Yosuke, Yamasue, Hidenori, Suda, Takafumi, & Hotta, Yoshihiro. (2021). Kessler Psychological Distress (K6) Questionnaire Scores Can Predict Autistic Traits and the Current and Prospective Suicidal Ideation in Medical University Students: A Prospective Study. *SAGE Open*, 11(1), 2158244021994590.
- Rafaeli, Eshkol, Bernstein, David P, & Young, Jeffrey. (2010). *Schema therapy: Distinctive features*: Routledge.
- Renner, F, Arntz, A, Leeuw, I, & Huibers, M. (2014). Schema therapy for chronic depression: Rationale. *Chronic depression: an integrative approach to the study of underlying vulnerability factors and psychological treatment*, 151.
- Singh, Nirbhay N, Wahler, Robert G, Adkins, Angela D, Myers, Rachel E, & Group, Mindfulness Research. (2003). Soles of the feet: A mindfulness-based self-control intervention for aggression by an individual with mild mental retardation and mental illness. *Research in Developmental Disabilities*, 24(3), 158-169.
- Soygüt, Gonca, Karaosmanoğlu, Alp, & Cakir, Zehra. (2009). Assessment of early maladaptive schemas: A psychometric study of the Turkish Young Schema Questionnaire-Short Form-3. *Turkish Journal of psychiatry*, 20(1), 75-84.
- Waelde, Lynn C, Thompson, Jason M, Robinson, Alicia, & Iwanicki, Sierra .(2016). Trauma therapists' clinical applications, training, and personal practice of mindfulness and meditation. *Mindfulness*, 7(3), 622-629.
- Winston, Sally M, & Seif, Martin N. (2017). Overcoming unwanted intrusive thoughts: A CBT-based guide to getting over frightening, obsessive, or disturbing thoughts: New Harbinger Publications.
- Young, Jeffrey E, Klosko, JS, & Weishaar, ME. (2003). Schema therapy. New York: Guilford, 254.
- Young, Jeffrey E. (1999). Cognitive therapy for personality disorders: A schema-focused approach, 3rd ed. Sarasota, FL, US: Professional Resource Press/Professional Resource Exchange.