Research Journal of Applied Sciences 11 (4): 144-153, 2016
ISSN: 1815-932X

Prediction of Coping Styles and Happiness Based on the Maladaptive Schemas in Clients of Aid Committee in Urmia, Iran

[1]Ahmad Esmali [2]Kobra Ghanizadeh Balderlou, [2]Masoumeh Alizadeh,
[2]Nezam Zeinali and [2]Roghayeh Hossein Gholizadeh
[1]Department of Psychology, University of Maragheh, Maragheh, Iran
[2]Department of Psychology, Islamic Azad University, Urmia, Iran

Abstract: The aim of the current study was predicting happiness and coping styles based on maladaptive schemas in clients of Urmia aid committee. The population of the current study included all clients whom admitted to aid committee during 2015. Because accurate statistics of clients was not available, so the convenience sampling method was used for determining sample and among all of them, 120 person were selected as a sample. Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) and Pearson correlation test have been used to investigate hypothesis. The Billings and Moos coping strategies questionnaire, Oxford Happiness Questionnaire and Young Schema Questionnaire-Short Form (YSQ-SF) were used to collect data. Based on the results and model obtained from regression analysis, it can be concluded that the predictor variables (rejection/disconnection, impaired autonomy and performance, impaired limits, other-directedness and over-vigilance/inhibition) explained 21% of variance of criterion variable (early schemas). In other words, all predictor variables had a significant impact on the criterion variable (coping styles) ($p<0.05$). In studying the relationship between early schemas and copying styles, the results showed that the correlation coefficient between early schemas and happiness (0.453) was significant at $p<0.01$ level.

Key words: Coping styles, happiness, maladaptive schemas, aid committee, sample

INTRODUCTION

Human has long sought how to live better and what more would provide his satisfaction and with what mechanisms can enjoy living in this world. Psychology of 20th century focused on negative emotions and depression rather than positive emotions like happiness and well-being. Although, happiness is not the opposite of depression but a necessary condition to achieve happiness is lacking of depression. Happiness indicates the presence of a number of positive cognitive and emotional states (Diener, 2002; Stephen *et al*., 2004). Positive and negative emotions are distinct from each other that set up the one to a degree of win-lose or win-win interactions (Seligman, 2002). Happy people associate with positive events more by valuating their skills than being associated with negative events. They perform better in decision-making regarding the future of their lives because they benefit strategies such as searching for information related to security risk. Generally, human will evolve in such a way that some positions make him happy and some others lead to the experience of feelings distress on him. The thing which leads to happiness is discussed in the scientific community. In this regard, the famous philosopher Aristotle believed that happiness is composed of synchronized internal and external factors.

On the other hand, coping is defined as efforts to enhance the proportion between the person and environment or as attempts to manage events that are perceived stressful by theorizers. Schwartz and Rubel (2005) knew coping as cognitive and behavioral efforts which are designed to meet the internal and external needs and conflicts between them. They believed these actions or cognitive-behavioral efforts are done to overcome, tolerate, reduce or minimize internal and external needs and conflicts pressure over self-interest. In order to adapt to schemas, people create maladaptive responses and coping styles early in life to avoid experiencing intense and frustrating emotions. This usually leads to the continuation of schemas. The important thing is that although coping styles sometimes help people to avoid the schema but do not improve the schema in practice. Hence, all coping styles act in the role of continuing

Corresponding Author: Ahmad Esmali, Department of Psychology, University of Maragheh, Maragheh, Iran

process of schema. Regarding to this all living beings show three basic responses encountering threats fight, escape or freeze up. The three reactions are compatible with the three coping styles of overcompensation, avoidance and surrender from the perspective of Young. When people apply overcompensation coping style, they fight with schema through thought, feeling, behavior and interpersonal relations in such a way as having conflicting schema. They try to be different with their childhood as a time of the formation of schemas as much as possible. If they felt worthless in childhood they try to appear as perfect and intact people later in adulthood. If they were the obedient child they repel in front of all in adulthood. People who use avoidance coping style try to set their life so that the schema does not activate at all. They try to live in ignorance as there is no schema, they avoid thinking about the schema and block thoughts and images marking schemas and in case of occurring such thoughts or mental images and they try to distract their attention. When people surrender to the schemas they abide to its correctness and never try to fight by the schema or avoid it but also accept this is true. They feel emotional pain of schema directly but act in a manner that confirmed the authenticity of schemas (Young, 2003). Excitation of a schema is a failure of a basic emotional need and emotions associate with this are as the threat to individuals that must be responded with certain coping style. Usually these coping style are adaptive in childhood and are part of wholesome survival mechanisms. But when a person puts into adulthood, coping styles become maladaptive because applying it leads to the continuation of the schemas. Even with the change of living conditions and creating better opportunities, an individual also applies the previous style. Maladaptive coping styles lead to the imprisonment of people behind the walls of their schemas ultimately (Young *et al*., 2003).

So, given that there are various ambiguities in the field of effects of maladaptive schemas on happiness and coping styles and the situation of happiness of the people couldn't be identified well. The present study was as a preliminary step to answer the above question and stated the research problem in the field of theoretical vacuum of the knowledge and has prompted researchers to examine the relationship between these variables determining the relationship between these variables and the effect of each variable in predicting coping styles and happiness. Therefore, the aim of this study was to examine the issue of whether maladaptive schemas can predict people's coping style and happiness?

MATERIALS AND METHODS

This research was applicable in terms of purpose and was descriptive and correlational in terms of data collection. Data has been collected in library and field methods. The library studies and up to date information tools such as the World Wide Web have been used in the field of theoretical basis and research literature. The field studies have also conducted to collect data through distributing questionnaires. This research was a field study that would be carried out using a questionnaire. Oxford Happiness Questionnaire, Billings and Moos coping strategies questionnaire of and Young Schema Questionnaire-Short Form (YSQ-SF) were used to assess the scales of happiness, coping styles and maladaptive schemas respectively. For better coordination, it was ensured that this information has been kept secure and questionnaires might be completed anonymously. After collecting the questionnaires, based on the specific instructions of the questionnaire, they were scored and have been prepared for analysis. The population of this study was clients of aid committee aged 35-45 years in 2015 in Urmia, Iran. Because accurate statistics on the number of clients was not available so the available sampling method was used to determine the sample and among all of them, 120 persons were selected as sample.

Data collecting tools

Billings and moos coping strategies questionnaire: Billings and Moos studied a cross-section of adults to find an easy and reliable method for evaluating copying responses. The respondents were asked to consider a personal crisis or a stressful event that recently have experienced and considering how they have involved with the event to complete 19 yes/no items of the questionnaire. With respect to the content validity, coping responses were divided to the active behavioral, active cognitive and social studies. In this case, values of the internal consistency of the three subscales have been reported from 0.44-0.80. Although, no significant correlation was found between the severity and life event with the cope but coping opinions increased the predictive power of stress levels significantly. They followed their work in 1984 by assessing coping behaviors in a group of patients with depression. Coping responses were increased to 32 items and a 4 point Likert scale was used instead of the yes/no scale. According to the choice, 0-3 score can be awarded to individual's response. 5 coping strategies were identified in the new questionnaire: 5 items on cognitive evaluation coping, 3 items related to the problem solving coping, 11 items on

the emotional inhibition coping, 4 items on getting social support coping and 9 items related to the body inhibition coping. This 32 item questionnaire was used in the current study. The 4 points scoring was from 0-3. It has been reported test-retest reliability coefficient as 0.79, subscale of problem solving as 0.90, the emotional inhibition coping as 0.65, for cognitive evaluation coping as 0.68, for the body inhibition coping as 0.90 and to cope with getting social support as 0.90. Internal consistency of the questionnaire have been reported from 0.41-0.66.

Oxford happiness questionnaire: This scale has been prepared has 29 items. Each of the questions in this test has 4 options scoring from 0-3 points. The maximum score of the test was 87. The total score ranged from 0-87. It is worth noting that the reliability and validity of the questionnaire were evaluated in several studies. For example, examined the reliability of the questionnaire using Cronbach's alpha on 347 subjects and the alpha coefficient was obtained 0.90. Also, Alipour and Noorbala obtained its reliability using Cronbach's alpha on 132 Iranian subjects as 0.93. Validity of the questionnaire have been reported as appropriate in many studies. Francis reported 0.52 significant correlation and Bayani reported o.65 significant correlation between the results of the questionnaire and Beck Depression Inventory. In addition, the validity of the questionnaire was confirmed by content validity by Noorbala and Abedi, Jafari and Liaghatdar.

Young Schema Questionnaire-Short Form (YSQ-SF): Young Schema Questionnaire (Young *et al*., 2003) has been made to measure early maladaptive schemas. As well, the short form of Schema Questionnaire was prepared to measure 15 early maladaptive schemas according to the original form. Long form has 205 items and short form has 75 items. Each item is scored on a 5 point scale (1 = very wrong, 2 = almost wrong, 3 = a little right, 4 = almost right, 5 = totally right). Each schema was measured by five items in the short form. In the questionnaire, the high score was indicative of early maladaptive schemas. These schemas concluded rejection/disconnection (abandonment/instability. mistrust/abuse emotional deprivation defectiveness/ shame social isolation/alienation), impaired autonomy and performance (dependence/incompetence vulnerability to harm and illness undeveloped self failure), impaired limits (entitlement/self-centeredness. Insufficient self-control/self-discipline), other-directedness (subjugation. Self-sacrifice) and over-vigilance/inhibition (emotional inhibition unrelenting standards/hypocriticalness). Several studies have been performed on the psychometric properties of YSQ-SF questionnaire (Riso, 2007). Baranoff *et al*. (2006) obtained Cronbach's alpha for the total scale as 0.94 and the reliability greater than the mean for each scale.

Also in Iran, Yousefi evaluated the validity and reliability of early maladaptive schemas questionnaire on a 579-subject sample in two phases (first phase with 394 individuals and second phase with 184 individuals) and reported its reliability by Cronbach's alpha and split-half method for the whole as 0.91 and 0.86 in the total sample, respectively so that it was 0.87 and 0.84 in women and 0.84 and 0.81 in men. Cronbach's alpha for all of the above factors was obtained higher than 0.81 and was 0.91 for the entire questionnaire. The highest value of Cronbach's alpha was obtained for the social isolation/alienation (α = 0.91). Convergent validity of scores of the questionnaire was examined by measuring tools of psychological distress, positive affect and negative affect, self-esteem, cognitive vulnerability to depression, personality disorder symptomatology and 90-question checklists questionnaire and correlations for the six criteria mentioned were reported in the order 0.37, 0.34, -0.40, -0.39, 0.35, 0.36 and 0.38.

Descriptive indexes: In order to do basic and descriptive analysis, it was measured frequency, percentages, means and standard deviations of the characteristics of research variables including early maladaptive schemas, coping styles and happiness and it has been obtained the means and standard deviations for early maladaptive schemas' variable and means and standard deviations for coping styles' variable and means and standard deviations for happiness' variable and early maladaptive schemas' variable. Table 1 has been provided the number of participants and the minimum and maximum scores, mean and standard deviation in each variable of early maladaptive schemas, coping styles and happiness. These indexes were also obtained on the subscales of coping styles (Table 2).

Table 1: Descriptive characteristics of the subjects in the research variables

Variables	No.	Min. score	Max. score	Mean	SD
Happiness	120	45	87	43.87	11.090
Coping styles	120	47	160	32.33	11.515
Early maladaptive schema	120	69	296	160.77	36.205

Table 2: Descriptive statistics of subscales for coping styles variable

Subscale (variables)	No.	Max. score	Min. score	Mean	SD
Emotional inhibition coping	120	19	4	34.81	2.478
Problem solving coping	120	21	2	23.68	2.824
Getting social support coping	120	16	4	33.91	2.054
Body inhibition coping	120	8	0	32.08	1.294
Cognitive evaluation coping	120	24	2	23.78	3.813

In order to do basic and descriptive studies, the number of questions, the maximum and minimum scores, mean and standard deviation for coping styles were measured that the mean was 32.33 and standard deviation was 11.51 (Table 3).

In order to do basic and descriptive studies, the number of questions, the maximum and minimum scores, mean and standard deviation for happiness were measured that the mean was 43.87 and standard deviation was 11.09 (Table 3).

In order to do basic and descriptive studies, the number of questions, the maximum and minimum scores, mean and standard deviation for early maladaptive schemas were measured that the mean was 160.77 and standard deviation was 36.205 (Table 4).

Table 3: Descriptive statistics of subscales for happiness variable

Subscale (variables)	No.	Min. score	Max. score	Mean	SD
Positive mood	120	26	6	39.40	4.266
Contentment	120	23	6	48.81	3.750
Subjective well-being	120	24	7	44.18	3.973
Self-esteem	120	24	6	40.81	3.942
Life-satisfaction	120	24	6	38.24	3.904

Table 4: Descriptive statistics of subscales for maladaptive schemas variables

Subscale (variables)	No.	Max. score	Min. score	Mean	SD
Rejection/disconnection	120	132	25	106.88	18.209
Impaired autonomy and performance	120	101	20	103.06	16.018
Impaired limits	120	58	10	155.89	9.886
Over-vigilance/inhibition	120	60	10	160.67	10.516
Other-directedness	120	56	10	105.92	8.736

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Analytical findings: In this part of the research, the findings and results of analysis of the studied sample would be presented separately by hypothesis proposed in this study aiming to respond them. The first hypothesis: early schemas are able to predict coping styles in clients aged 35-45 years in Imam Khomeini's aid committee. With the aim of responding to the second hypothesis, the multiple linear regression analysis was used stepwise. In this study, a number of assumptions would be examined before the regression analysis. Related F-value and the significance level were calculated for each variable to measure the linearity of relationship between predictor variables with the criterion variable. These values would show that whether the predictor variables could explain the criterion variable well or not? Results (Table 5) shows that F-value obtained from regression analysis was significant in 0.01 level and it can be concluded that there was a linear relationship among predictor variables (early schemas) with the criterion variable (coping styles) and the fitted regression model was significant. The result has also been confirmed with simple linear regression for all predictor variables with the criterion variable.

So, the model used was a good predictor for the criterion variable. As well, it can be observed in Table 5 that the Sum of Squares (SS) for residual in the final model (model 6) was smaller than the sum of squares for regression and this shows the high explanatory power of the model in describing changes in criterion variable.

Table 5: Analysis of variance to assess the linearity of the relationship between the predictor and the criterion variables

Models	Predictor variables	Source of changes	SS	df	MS	F-values	Sig.
1	Rejection/disconnection	Regression	124740.462	1	124740.4620		
		Residual	651224.409	318	2047.8760	912.60	0.001
		Total	775964.872	319			
2	Rejection/disconnection,	Regression	172929.199	2	86464.5990		
	impaired autonomy and	Residual	603035.673	317	1902.3210	45.452	0.001
	performance	Total	775964.872	319			
3	Rejection/disconnection,	Regression	182054.828	3	60684.9430		
	impaired autonomy and	Residual	593910.044	316	1879.4620	32.288	0.001
	performance, impaired limits	Total	775964.872	319			
4	Rejection/disconnection, impaired	Regression	226600.270	4	56650.0670		
	autonomy and performance, impaired	Residual	549364.602	315	1744.0150	32.483	0.001
	limits, other-directedness	Total	2281	319			
5	Rejection/disconnection, impaired	Regression	228183.452	5	45636.6900		
	autonomy and performance, impaired	Residual	547781.420	314	1744.5270	26.160	0.001
	limits, other-directedness,	Total	775964.872	319			
	over-vigilance/inhibition						
6	Rejection/disconnection, impaired	Regression	228616.746	6	38102.7910		
	autonomy and performance impaired,	Residual	547348.126	313	1748.4716	21.789	0.001
	limits other-directedness, over-vigilance/	Total	775964.872	319			
	inhibition, all of early schemas						

Criterion variable: coping style

Regression analysis: Table 6 shows summary of regression to predict the relevant variables to the early schemas in the Young Model. According to the results, it is clear that each one of 6 predictor variables have been entered to in the regression equation and none of the variables have been removed from the analysis (Table 7).

The correlation coefficient of predictor variables were shown in the column R, the coefficient of determination were in the column R^2 and adjusted coefficients of determination were in the column R^2_{adj}. The results showed the value of correlation coefficient equal to 0.401 and the adjusted coefficient of determination equal to 0.158 for the first model (first step) that the variable of rejection/disconnection was only entered into the analysis. This means that about 16% of the variance of early schemas would be explained by the predictor variable of rejection/disconnection. In the second model (second step), the correlation coefficient and adjusted coefficient of determination have been risen to the 0.472 and 0.218, respectively by adding the impaired autonomy and performance variable to the model. This means that about 22% of the variance of early schemas would be expressed by the predictor variables of rejection/disconnection and impaired autonomy and performance. In the third model (third step), the correlation coefficient and adjusted coefficient of determination have been risen to the 0.448 and 0.227, respectively by adding the impaired limits variable to the model. This means that about 23% of the variance of early schema would be expressed by the predictor variables of rejection/disconnection, impaired autonomy and performance and impaired limits. In the fourth model (fourth step), the correlation coefficient and adjusted coefficient of determination have been risen to the 0.540 and 0.283, respectively by adding the other-directedness variable to the model. This means that about 28% of the variance of early schemas would be expressed by the predictor variables of rejection/disconnection, impaired autonomy and performance, impaired limits and other-directedness. In the fifth model (fifth step), the correlation coefficient and adjusted coefficient of determination have been risen to the 0.542 and 0.283, respectively by adding the over-vigilance/inhibition variable to the model. This means that about 28% of the variance of early schemas would be expressed by the predictor variables of rejection/disconnection, impaired autonomy and performance, impaired limits, other-directedness and over-vigilance/inhibition. In the sixth model (sixth step), the correlation coefficient and adjusted coefficient of determination have been risen to the 0.543 and 0.295, respectively by adding all of the schemas variable to the model. This means that about 30% of the variance of early schemas would be expressed by the predictor variables of rejection/disconnection, impaired autonomy and performance, impaired limits, other-directedness, over vigilance/inhibition and early schemas. Therefore, based on the results of Table 6 and the model obtained from the regression analysis (the final model in fifth step), it can be deduced that the predictor variables (rejection/disconnection, impaired autonomy and performance, impaired limits, other-directedness, over-vigilance/inhibition) mentioned in this study have explained (predicted) 21% of the variance of criterion variable (early schemas). The rest of the changes (79%) that are known as square of error quantity were affected by variables outside the model (Table 7).

Information contained in Table 8 shows that the predictor variables (rejection/disconnection, impaired autonomy and performance, impaired limits, other-directedness, over-vigilance/inhibition and all of early schemas) have been entered into the regression equation within 6 model (6 steps) that these models are presented in Table 7. According to the t-values and sig (Table 8) it can be judged that the regression models were significant. In other words, all predictor variables had a significant impact on the criterion variable (coping styles)

Table 6: Method and consequence of entering the variables to the regression analysis

Models	Entered variables	Method
1	Rejection/disconnection	Stepwise
2	Impaired autonomy and performance	Stepwise
3	Impaired limits	Stepwise
4	Other-directedness	Stepwise
5	Over-vigilance/inhibition	Stepwise
6	All of early schemas	Stepwise

Table 7: Summary of regression to predict the variable associated with the schemas

Models	Predictor variables	R	R^2	R^2_{adj}	Predicted standard error
1	Rejection/disconnection	0.401	0.161	0.158	45.253
2	Rejection/disconnection, impaired autonomy and performance	0.472	0.223	0.218	43.616
3	Rejection/disconnection, impaired autonomy and performance, impaired limits and performance, impaired limits	0.448	0.235	0.227	43.353
4	Rejection/disconnection, impaired autonomy and performance, impaired limits, other-directedness	0.540	0.292	0.283	41.761
5	Rejection/disconnection, impaired autonomy and performance, impaired limits, other-directedness, over-vigilance/inhibition	542.000	0.294	0.283	41.768
6	Rejection/disconnection, impaired autonomy and performance, impaired limits, other-directedness, over-vigilance/inhibition, all of early schemas	543.000	0.295	0.281	41.818

Table 8: Stepwise regression equation of predictor variables with coping styles

Models	Predictor variables	Unstandardized coefficient (B)	SE	Standardized coefficient (β)	t-values	Sig.
1	Constant	265.150	11.219	-	23.633	0.001
	Rejection/disconnection	-4.636	0.594	-0.401	-7.805	0.001
2	Constant	211.099	15.253		13.834	0.001
	Rejection/disconnection	-3.870	0.592	-0.335	-6.534	0.001
	Positive belief	3.391	0.674	0.258	5.033	0.001
3	Constant	197.268	16.393		12.034	0.001
	Rejection/disconnection	-3.901	0.589	-0.337	-6.624	0.001
	Positive belief	2.667	0.746	0.203	3.575	0.001
	Cognitive consciousness	1.506	0.684	-0.121	2.204	0.010
4	Constant	148.140	18.544	-	7.989	0.001
	Rejection/disconnection	-2.690	0.616	-0.233	-4.369	0.001
	Positive belief	1.474	0.575	0.112	1.948	0.001
	Cognitive consciousness	1.114	0.663	0.090	1.680	0.001
	Negative belief	-0.25	0.09	-0.15	-2.88	0.004
5	Constant	144.535	18.928	-	7.636	0.010
	Rejection/disconnection	-2.616	0.621	-0.226	-4.213	0.001
	Positive belief	1.450	0.757	0.110	1.916	0.001
	Cognitive consciousness	0.886	0.705	0.071	1.256	0.001
	Negative belief	3.353	0.794	-0.268	4.224	0.001
	Thoughts' control	0.750	0.788	0.953	0.342	0.030
6	Constant	142.894	19.236	-	7.429	0.010
	Rejection/disconnection	-3.086	1/130	-0/267	-2/730	0/01
	Impaired autonomy and performance	0.962	1.239	0.073	0.777	0.001
	Impaired limits	0.369	1.255	0.030	0.294	0.77
	Other-directedness	0.288	1.218	0.023	0.237	0.81
	Over-vigilance/inhibition	0.511	1.026	0.111	0.498	0.62
	All coping styles	142/894	19/236	-	7/429	01.00

Criterion variable: coping style

Table 9: Analysis of variance to assess the linearity of the relationship between the predictor and the criterion variables

Models	Predictor variables	Source of changes	SS	df	MS	F-values	Sig.
1	Rejection/disconnection	Regression	15152.76	1	15152.76		
		Residual	85938.44	373	230.39	65.76	0.001
		Total	101091.2	374			
2	Rejection/disconnection,	Regression	17557.71	2	8778.85		
	impaired autonomy and performance	Residual	83533.49	372	224.55	39.09	0.001
		Total	101091.2	374			
3	Rejection/disconnection, impaired	Regression	18977.01	3	6325.67		
	autonomy and performance,	Residual	82114.21	371	221.33	28.58	0.001
	impaired limits	Total	101091.2	374			
4	Rejection/disconnection, impaired	Regression	20779.03	4	5194.75		
	autonomy and performance, impaired	Residual	80312.18	370	217.06	23.93	0.001
	limits, other-directedness	Total	101091.2	374			
5	Rejection/disconnection, impaired	Regression	21760.79	5	4352.15		
	autonomy and performance, impaired	Residual	79330.42	369	214.98	20.24	0.001
	limits, other-directedness,	Total	101091.2	374			
	over-vigilance/inhibition						
6	Rejection/disconnection, impaired	Regression	21760.79	6	3352.15		
	autonomy and performance impaired,	Residual	69330.42	368	214.98	17.24	0.001
	limits other-directedness, over-vigilance/	Total	101091.2	374			
	inhibition, all of early schemas						

($p<0.05$). The early schemas had the predictive power of happiness in clients aged 35-45 years to the Imam Khomeini's aid committee. With the aim of responding to the fourth hypothesis, the multiple linear regression analysis was used in a stepwise way. The multiple regression method has some assumptions in addition to common assumptions of parametric tests that in case of their indefeasibility they can be used more certainly. Related F-value and the significance level were calculated for each variable to measure the linearity of relationship between predictor variables with the criterion variable. These values would show that whether the predictor variables could explain the criterion variable well or not? Results (Table 9) shows that F-value obtained from regression analysis was significant in 0.01 level and it can be concluded that there was a linear relationship among predictor variables (rejection/disconnection, impaired autonomy and performance, impaired limits, other-directedness, over-vigilance/inhibition and all of early schemas) with the criterion variable (happiness) and

he fitted regression model was significant. So, the model used was a good predictor for the criterion variable.

As well, it can be observed in Table 9 that the Sum of Squares (SS) for residual in the final model (model 6) was greater than the sum of squares for regression and this shows the low explanatory power of the model in describing changes in criterion variable.

Regression analysis: After verifying the initial default (Table 10) relating the regression analysis, stepwise multiple linear regression analysis was used to predict the criterion variable from predictor variables. The following table suggests the way and sequence of entering variables to the regression analysis and equation.

The results of the table shows that each one of 5 predictor variables have been entered to in the regression equation and none of the variables have been removed from the analysis.

The correlation coefficient of predictor variables were shown in the column R, the coefficient of determination were in the column R^2 and adjusted coefficients of determination were in the column R^2_{adj}. The results showed the value of correlation coefficient equal to 0.39 and the adjusted coefficient of determination equal to 0.15 for the first model (first step) that the variable of rejection/disconnection was only entered into the analysis. This means that about 15% of the variance of happiness variable would be explained by the predictor variable of rejection/disconnection. In the second model (second step), the correlation coefficient and adjusted coefficient of determination have been risen to the 0.42 and 0.17, respectively by adding the impaired autonomy and performance variable to the model. This means that about 17% of the variance of happiness variable would be expressed by the predictor variables of rejection/disconnection and impaired autonomy and performance. In the third model (third step), the correlation coefficient and adjusted coefficient of determination have been risen to the 0.43 and 0.18 respectively by adding the impaired limits variable to the model. This means that about 18% of the variance of happiness variable would be expressed by the predictor variables of rejection/disconnection, impaired autonomy and performance and impaired limits. In the fourth model (fourth step), the correlation coefficient and adjusted coefficient of determination have been risen to the 0.45 and 0.20, respectively by adding the other-directedness variable to the model. This means that about 20% of the variance of happiness variable would be expressed by the predictor variables of rejection/disconnection, impaired autonomy and performance, impaired limits and other-directedness. In the fifth model (fifth step), the correlation coefficient and adjusted coefficient of determination have been risen to the 0.46 and 0.21, respectively by adding the over-vigilance/inhibition variable to the model. This means that about 21% of the variance of happiness variable would be expressed by the predictor variables of rejection/disconnection, impaired autonomy and performance, impaired limits, other-directedness and over-vigilance/inhibition. In the sixth model (sixth step), the correlation coefficient and adjusted coefficient of determination have been risen to the 0.46 and 0.23, respectively by adding all of the early schema variable to the model. This means that about 22% of the variance of happiness variable would be expressed by the predictor variables of rejection/disconnection, impaired autonomy and performance, impaired limits, other-directedness, over-vigilance/inhibition and early schemas. Therefore, based on the results of Table 11 and the model obtained from the regression analysis (the final model in sixth step), it can be deduced that the predictor variables (rejection/disconnection, impaired autonomy and performance, impaired limits, other-directedness, over-vigilance/inhibition and all of early schema) mentioned in this study have explained (predicted) 22% of

Table 10: Method and consequence of entering the variables to the regression analysis

Models	Entered variables	Method
1	Rejection/disconnection	Stepwise
2	Impaired autonomy and performance	Stepwise
3	Impaired limits	Stepwise
4	Other-directedness	Stepwise
5	Over-vigilance/inhibition	Stepwise
6	All of early schemas	Stepwise

Criterion variable: coping style

Table 11: Summary of regression to predict the variable associated with happiness

Models	Predictor variables	R	R^2	R^2_{adj}	Predicted standard error
1	Rejection/disconnection	0.39	0.15	0.15	15.18
2	Rejection/disconnection, impaired autonomy and performance	0.42	0.17	0.17	14.98
3	Rejection/disconnection, impaired autonomy and performance, impaired limits	0.43	0.19	0.18	14.87
4	Rejection/disconnection, impaired autonomy and performance, impaired limits, other-directedness	0.45	0.21	0.20	14.73
5	Rejection/disconnection, impaired autonomy and performance, impaired limits, other-directedness, over-vigilance/inhibition	0.46	0.22	0.21	14.66
6	Rejection/disconnection, impaired autonomy and performance, impaired limits, other-directedness, over-vigilance/inhibition, all of early schemas	0.47	0.23	0.22	14.55

Criterion variable: coping style

Table 12: Stepwise regression equation of predictor variables with happiness

Models	Predictor variables	Unstandardized coefficient (B)	SE	Standardized coefficient (β)	t-values	Sig.
1	Constant	127.19	4.28	-	29.67	0.001
	Rejection/disconnection	1.19	0.15	0.39	8.11	0.001
2	Constant	105.82	7.78	-	13.59	0.001
	Rejection/disconnection	1.06	0.15	0.34	7.03	0.001
	Impaired autonomy and performance	0.23	0.07	0.16	3.27	0.001
3	Constant	72.48	15.26	-	4.74	0.001
	Rejection/disconnection	1.02	0.15	0.33	6.82	0.001
	Impaired autonomy and performance	0.23	0.07	0.16	3.23	0.001
	Impaired limits	0.22	0.08	0.12	2.53	0.01
4	Constant	63.49	15.43	-	4.11	0.001
	Rejection/disconnection	.96	0.15	0.31	6.41	0.001
	Impaired autonomy and performance	0.24	0.07	0.16	3.37	0.001
	Impaired limits	0.36	0.09	0.20	3.66	0.001
	Other-directedness	-0.25	0.09	-0.15	-2.88	0.004
5	Constant	43.43	18	-	2.41	0.01
	Rejection/disconnection	0.95	0.15	0.31	6.38	0.001
	Impaired autonomy and performance	0.23	0.07	0.16	3.33	0.001
	Impaired limits	0.32	0.1	0.18	3.22	0.001
	Other-directedness	-0.28	0.09	-0.17	-3.17	0.002
	Over-vigilance/inhibition	1.96	0.91	0.10	2.14	0.03

Criterion variable: happiness

the variance of criterion variable (happiness). The rest of the changes (79%) that are known as square of error quantity were affected by variables outside the model.

It was also observed that the values of predicted standard error for the final model were smaller than the first model. In fact, the less the amount of the error would cause higher and more powerful correlation coefficient and more accurate predictions (Table 12). But the main purpose of regression analysis leading to respond to the research hypothesis is shown in Table 12.

Information contained in Table 12 shows that the predictor variables (rejection/disconnection, impaired autonomy and performance, impaired limits, other-directedness, over-vigilance/inhibition and all of early schemas) have been entered into the regression equation within 5 models (6 steps) that these models are presented in the table above. According to the t-values and Sig. (Table 8), it can be judged that the regression models were significant.

It was observed in Table 9 that the rejection/disconnection variable with a beta coefficient of 0.31 in $p<0.01$ level had the direct, positive and significant relationship with happiness in the fifth model. This means that the portion of rejection/disconnection variable in predicting happiness variable was equal to 0.31. So, primarily, rejection/disconnection variable has allocated the most important contribution and importance in explaining and predicting the happiness. It was observed in Table 9 that the impaired limit variable with a beta coefficient of 0.18 in $p<0.01$ level had the direct, positive and significant relationship with happiness in the fifth model. This means that the portion of impaired limits variable in predicting happiness variable was equal to 0.31. So in the second degree, impaired limits variable has allocated the most important contribution and importance in explaining and predicting the happiness. It was observed in Table 9 that the other-directedness variable with a beta coefficient of -0.17 in $p<0.01$ level had the direct, positive and significant relationship with happiness in the fifth model. This means that the portion of other-directedness variable in predicting happiness variable was equal to -0.17. So in the third step, over-directedness variable has allocated the most important contribution and importance in explaining and predicting the happiness. It was observed in Table 9 that the impaired autonomy and performance variable with a beta coefficient of 0.16 in $p<0.01$ level had the direct, positive and significant relationship with happiness in the fifth model. This means that the portion of impaired autonomy and performance variable in predicting happiness variable was equal to 0.16. So in the fourth degree, impaired autonomy and performance variable has allocated the most important contribution and importance in explaining and predicting the happiness. It was observed in Table 9 that the over-vigilance/inhibition variable with a beta coefficient of 0.10 in $p<0.05$ level had the direct, positive and significant relationship with happiness in the fifth model. This means that the portion of over-vigilance/inhibition variable in predicting happiness variable was equal to 0.10. So in the fifth degree, over-vigilance/inhibition variable has allocated the most important contribution and importance in explaining and predicting the happiness. In other words, a change of standard deviation in rejection/disconnection, impaired autonomy and performance, impaired limits, other-directedness and over-vigilance/inhibition (in the

same role for each variable) cause change in standard deviation in the amount of 0.31, 0.18, -0.17, 0.16 and 0.10 in the happiness of clients of Imam Khomeini's aid committee.

Thus, according to the findings of multiple regression analysis, it can be concluded that predictor variables (rejection/disconnection, impaired autonomy and performance, impaired limits, other-directedness and over-vigilance/inhibition) explained (predicted) about 21% of the variance of criterion variable (happiness). As well, the variables of rejection/disconnection, impaired autonomy and performance, impaired limits, other-directedness and over-vigilance/inhibition had the most importance and role in predicting happiness variable, respectively.

CONCLUSION

The results were somewhat consistent with the results from studies by Camara and Calvete (2012). These researchers had performed the study in order to investigate the role of schemas in the quality of life and coping strategies in people and concluded that indirect effect of maladaptive schemas on the quality of mental life was through coping strategies that act in the relationship between early maladaptive schemas and quality of mental life as a mediator. The results showed that early maladaptive schemas was associated with processes that people assess and cope stressful and problematic events with them. In other words, people who have maladaptive schemas use maladaptive coping strategies encountering the problems, then experience a lower quality of mental life. In explaining the findings, it can be said that some people create these maladaptive schemas and coping strategies in order to deal with problems and negative life events in childhood. Although, schemes don't work well at childhood but use of them in the next years of life is maladaptive because the perception of the world is not the same as childhood. However, schemas in adulthood cause problems in maladaptive ways and are as a threat to the well-being of people. Thus, the result of this hypothesis was consistent and in line with results of previous researches and it could be suggested that the early schemas had the predictive power for coping styles in clients aged 35-45 years in Imam Khomeini's aid committee. The results were somewhat in line with results of Stiles entitled as the early maladaptive schemas and happiness in adults. The findings of his study suggested that maladaptive schema of "emotional deprivation" was somewhat predicting the happiness. Schema of "defectiveness/ hame" predicted the happiness less in the happiness scale of Oxford. Also, Hamidpour and Andouz concluded in a study that the more maladaptive schemes decrease happiness. In explaining this hypothesis, it can be stated that the scheme made in individuals are as a result of negative childhood experiences that affect their happiness and feelings and behavior in social behaviors and other aspects of their lives. Thus, the result of this hypothesis was consistent and in line with results of previous researches and it could be suggested that the early schemas had the predictive power for happiness in clients aged 35-45 years in Imam Khomeini's aid committee. In order to adapt to schemas, people create maladaptive responses and coping styles early in life to avoid experiencing intense and frustrating emotions. This usually leads to the continuation of schemas. Behavior is not considered as a part of the schema but is as a part of coping responses that comes from schema. Coping styles are assessed in cognitive, emotional or behavioral consequences but are not considered as a part of the schema in any case. The main reason to distinguish between schemas and coping styles is that people behave differently in different situations of life styles to cope with the same schemas. Therefore, coping styles of people do not remain constant essentially over time while the schema is fixed in different times and places. In addition to that, different people use the spectrum of quite different and even contradictory behaviors in order to cope with a similar schema (Young *et al*., 2003). An early maladaptive schema in childhood is as a threat. The threat is considered as a failure to meet a child's basic emotional needs (such as secure attachment, autonomy, freedom of expression needs and healthy emotions, spontaneity and fun and realistic limits). The threat may also include fear of strong emotions that schemas do not restrain them. The individual when facing the threat can deal with the situation by using a combination of these three coping responses. The child can be surrendered, avoided or overcompensated. So, excitation of a schema the failure of a fundamental emotional needs and emotions along with it is a threat to the individual that should be responded with certain coping style. Usually, these coping styles are adaptive in childhood and are considered as a part of wholesome survival mechanism. But when a person puts into adulthood, coping styles become maladaptive, because applying it leads to the continuation of the schemas. Even with the change of living conditions and creating better opportunities, an individual also applies the previous style. Maladaptive coping styles lead to the imprisonment of people behind the walls of their schemas ultimately (Young *et al*., 2003). On the other hand, coping theories about happiness showed that happy individuals have thoughts and behaviors that are consistent and helpful, look for issues with a clear vision, prays, attempt

directly for solving their problems and ask help of others when needed, on the other hand, unhappy individuals thought and act destructively, plunge in imagination, blame themselves and others and avoid to work for solving problems (Diener, 2002).

REFERENCES

Baranoff, J., T.P.S. Oei, S.H. Cho and S.M. Kwon, 2006. Factor structure and internal consistency of the young schema questionnaire (short form) in Korean and Australian samples. J. Affect. Disorders, 93: 133-140.

Camara, M. and E. Calvete, 2012. Cognitive schemas predicting anxiety and depressive symptoms: The role of dysfunctional coping strategies. J. Eur. Congress Psychiatry, 32: 80-95.

Diener, E., 2002. Frequently asked question about subjective wellbeing (Happiness and Life satisfaction). J. Person. Soc. Psychol., 16: 36-42.

Riso, P.L., 2007. Cognitive Schemas and Core Beliefs in Psychological Problems: A Scientist Practitioner Guide. American Psychological Association Press, Washington, D.C., Pages: 240.

Schwartz, S.H. and T. Rubel, 2005. Sex differences in value priorities: Cross cultural and multi method studies. J. Person. Soc. Psychol., 89: 1010-1028.

Seligman, M.E.P., 2002. Vising the New Positive Psychology to Realize Your Potential for Lasting Fulfillment. Free press, New York.

Stephen, J. P., A. Linley, J. Harwood, C.A. Lewis and P. McCollam, 2004. Rapid assessment of well being: The Short Depression Happiness Scale (SDHS). Psychol. Theory Res. Practice, 77: 463-478.

Young, J.E., 2003. Schema Therapy: A Practitioners Guide. Guilford Press, New York, USA.

Young, J.E., J.S. Klosko and M.E. Weishar, 2003. Schema Therapy: A Practitioner's Guide. Guilford Press, New York, USA.