Abstract

Objective: The aim of this study was to investigate the causal relationship of parenting styles and insecure attachment style with addiction potential under the mediating role of personality traits and identity styles in students of Shahid Chamran University. Method: This was a correlational study where 178 participants were selected by multistage random sampling method. Iranian addiction potential scale, Parenting Styles Scale, Insecure Attachment Style Scale (ambivalent/anxiety and avoidance), NEO Personality Inventory (neuroticism and openness to experience), and Identity Style Scale (diffusion and premature identity) constituted the data collection tools in this study. Results: The proposed model was tested using path analysis. To test the indirect correlates, Bootstrap test was used. The results indicated that the proposed model was well fitted with the data. Specifically, the results showed that permissive and authoritarian parenting styles and insecure attachment style had a significant direct effect and an indirect effect through neuroticism, openness, diffusion identity, and premature identity on addiction potential. Conclusion: It was concluded that both proximal factors (personality traits) and distal factors (identity and parenting styles) should be considered for the control and treatment of addiction.
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Introduction
Drug abuse is one of the most important problems of the present era, which has become global and has turned into a psychological, social and family disorder (Rahimi-Maugher, 2006). In all societies in the world, adolescents are the most vulnerable ones to the fatal addiction phenomenon. The lack of proper health, educational, cultural, and social conditions for transition from such a sensitive stage leads to social harms such as addiction. Therefore, for accurate, realistic and effective planning of primary prevention of drug use, risk factors and protective factors should be identified (Pandina, 2006).

Various studies have shown that unhealthy developmental backgrounds are necessary for drug admission and use. The first factor is parenting style, which is linked to the tendency to drug abuse, a parental style set is crucial for the healthy performance and adaptation of children. Adolescents with permissive or authoritarian parents have worse adjustment than the ones who do not have such parents. Also, permissive parents can make children confused or distressed in finding their identity or they might cause premature identity for them; additionally, if parents completely control their teens, they will be in the same crisis (Isle, Soenens, Koen, Duriez, & Berzonsky, 2008). Hartman et al. (2015) attributed the permissive and authoritarian styles to addiction potential, since these families choose the wrong way of communicating with the child. The results of the study by Juvovic and Mariana (2014) indicated that in the addicted group, the poor family performance and wrong permissive and authoritarian parenting styles increased the addiction potentiality among adolescents. Annabel et al. (2014) in a study examined the vulnerable adolescents to drug abuse and considered the personality trait and openness to experience as important predictors of addiction potential. Individuals with a diffused / foreclosed style avoid personal problems and conflicts, and they are reluctant to their future, thus delay making decisions and commit deadly actions like drug use (Diener & Crics, 2012). The concept of insecure attachment style is another important factor directly affecting the mental health of an individual. According to Bowlby (1907), the objective of the psychological-biological system in a child is to achieve a sense of safety and real or perceived support of close and intimate engagement with an attachment figure (Ainsworth, 1989; Mickolsiner and Shaver, 2005). Thoughts, expectations and feelings that are created as a result of initial attachment experiences in a child create intrinsic active patterns with cognitive-emotional attitudes and as a result, the child considers himself valuable and loving, self-positive model (consider others trustworthy and valuable), the model of others positive (or considering himself ineffective and vulnerable to rejection), the self-negative model (and consider others unreliable and worthless) and the model of others negative. Therefore, attachment style can predict the future decisions of the adolescent (Ainsworth, 1989; Mickolsiner and Schawer, 2005). Kassel, Wardle, & Robert (2014), following the investigation
of a group of drug users, considered insecure attachment styles (ambivalent/anxiety and avoidance) as a predictor of drug use. Also, Taylor, Magby, Kushner, & Atkinson (2014) showed a positive relationship between insecure attachment style and addiction potential in a clinical sample of alcoholic patients. Torabiyan, Ameri, and Khodabakhsh (2012) have indicated that those with insecure attachment who are neurotic and do not show self-control in the experience of new events, are prone to dangerous Conducts, including addiction. Amani and Majzubi (2011) indicated that the individuals with insecure attachment style who do not have any organized relationship with others and are uncertain in their decisions are at the risk of exposure to identity diffusion and identity foreclosure.

As said, it can be argued that parenting styles and interpersonal relationships of the early life that determine the attachment style play a crucial role in neuroticism, openness to experience and diffused and foreclosed identity styles. Other factors can affect the youth and adolescents’ addiction potential. The aim of this study was to investigate the causal relationship of parenting styles (permissive and authoritarian) and insecure attachment style (ambivalent/anxious and avoidant) with addiction potential under the mediating role of personality traits (neuroticism and openness to experience) and identity styles (diffused and foreclosed) in students of Shahid Chamran University. The hypothesized model of the present study is shown in Figure 1.

**Methodology**

**Population, sample and sampling method**
This was a correlational study, in which relations between research variables were analyzed in the form of a causal model of path analysis. The statistical population consisted of male and female undergraduate students of Shahid Chamran University of Ahvaz who studied at academic year of 2015-2016. 178 participants were selected by multistage random sampling method. At first,
among 12 colleges, 5 colleges were randomly selected and then from each college, forty students (totally 200 individuals) were randomly selected and research questionnaires were distributed among them. Finally, 178 analyzable questionnaires were returned.

**Instrument**

1- Iranian addiction potential scale: This scale has been developed by Zargar (2006) based on the psychosocial status of the Iranian community. This scale includes 36 items and 5 lie assessment items measuring two factors of passive and active potentiality. 28 items are related to active potentiality and 8 items are related to passive potentiality. Scoring of each question ranges from (totally disagree) to 3 (totally agree). In the first factor (active potentiality), the most frequent questions were related to antisocial behaviors, desire to use drugs and excitement. In the second factor (passive potentiality), the most frequent questions are related to the lack of expression and depression. Zargar (2006) has obtained the reliability of the Iranian scale of addiction potential using the Cronbach's alpha at 0.90. The active factor was reported 0.91 and the passive factor was 0.75. In this research, validity of the Cronbach's alpha and split half in the active factor were 0.88 and 0.83 respectively, and in the passive factor they were 0.73 and 0.70 respectively. Two methods were used to calculate the validity of this scale. In criterion validity, the addiction potentiality questionnaire distinguished two groups of addicted and non-addicted well. Structural validity was also reported via correlating its scores with the scores of the 25-item questionnaire of clinical symptoms (0.45) (Zargar, Najarian and Nami, 2008).

2- Parenting Styles Scale: Parenting styles scale by Bamirand (1971) includes 30 items, of which 10 items are permissive style, 10 items, authoritarian styles, and 10 items measure authoritative style. In this study, two permissive and authoritarian parenting styles were investigated. The items scored range from 0-4 (Pazany, 2004). Bamirand (1971) obtained the reliability of this scale by a test-retest method with an interval of one week; 0.81 for permissive parenting style and 0.85 for authoritarian style. Buri (1991) reported the reliability of the scale using a test retest method with a one week interval in the mothers group at 0.81 for permissive style and 0.86 for authoritarian style. In the present study, Cronbach's alpha and split-half for permissive parenting style and authoritarian parental style were 0.78, 0.76, 0.79 and 0.73, respectively. Esfandiari (1995) performed the necessary corrections to determine its formal validity and added other sentences. The result of this study showed that this scale has face validity (Esfandiari, 1995).

3. Attachment style scale: The attachment style scale of Simpson (1990) includes 13 items that 5 items measure secure attachment style, 4 items measure avoidant attachment style and 4 other items evaluate ambivalent anxiety attachment style. A five-point Likert scale (from totally agree to totally) is applied. The Cronbach's alpha coefficients and split half for secure attachment
were obtained 0.57 and 0.54 respectively, and for insecure attachment style (ambivalent / anxiety and avoidance) 0.66 and 0.69, respectively (Rezazadeh, 2002). In the present study, reliability of the scale of insecure attachment styles (ambivalent / anxiety and avoidance) was obtained by the Cronbach's alpha and split half 0.61 and 0.99, respectively. Simpson (1990) considered the validity of this scale to be acceptable. Also, the results of the construct validity of this scale showed that it has a good validity (Abbasi and Sarcheshmeh, 2005).

4. Short NEO Personality Inventory: It includes 60 items that are used to measure five personality traits (neuroticism, extraversion, openness to experience, agreeableness, and conscience). There are 12 items for each factor. Scoring was performed on a 5-point Likert scale (Ranging from totally disagree to totally agree). The reliability coefficients of subscales of neuroticism and openness to experience have been reported to be 0.79 and 0.80 (Costa and McCraey, 1985). The reliability coefficients of these two subscales in Iran were 0.75 for neuroticism and 0.80 for openness to experience (Farshi, 2001). In this study, the reliability of this questionnaire using the Cronbach’s alpha and split half methods for neuroticism and openness to experience was calculated as 0.83, 0.71, 0.68 and 0.68, respectively.

5. Extended ego identity scale: This test, based on Marcia's (1993) theory, includes 64 items and 4 subscales. In response to each question, one must choose one of the six-state options (from totally agree to totally disagree). These subscales identify 4 identity states (Diffused, Foreclosed, Moratorium, and Achieved), and each subset contains 16 items. Adams and Binon (1986) obtained the Cronbach's Alpha for the identity foreclosure 0.75 and the identity diffusion 0.63. In the study of Hassan-Nejad (2011), coefficients of validity were reported by Cronbach’s alpha for identity diffusion 0.72 and identity foreclosure 0.66. In the present study, the reliability of the scale of identity styles (diffused) was obtained using Cronbach’s alpha and split half of 0.45 and 0.40 and for identity foreclosure 0.67 and 0.49. The results of construct, concurrent and content validity showed acceptable validity (Aqa Soltani, 1999). Adams, Shea, & Fitch (1979) reported the validity and reliability of test acceptable.

**Findings**

Descriptive statistics of the studied variables are presented in Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Permissive parenting</td>
<td>17/66</td>
<td>6/62</td>
<td>Neuroticism</td>
<td>20/17</td>
<td>4/44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>style</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authoritarian parenting</td>
<td>16/83</td>
<td>6/83</td>
<td>Openness to experience</td>
<td>32/12</td>
<td>5/44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>style</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insecure attachment</td>
<td>17/83</td>
<td>4/90</td>
<td>Identity diffusion</td>
<td>33/60</td>
<td>5/31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>style</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The correlation matrix of variables is presented in Table 2
Table 2: Correlation Matrix of the Studied Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-Permissive parenting style</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Authoritarian parenting style</td>
<td><strong>0/21</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-Insecure attachment style</td>
<td><strong>0/24</strong></td>
<td><strong>0/34</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-Neuroticism</td>
<td><strong>0/18</strong></td>
<td><strong>0/32</strong></td>
<td><strong>0/41</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-Openness to experience</td>
<td><strong>0/34</strong></td>
<td><strong>0/48</strong></td>
<td><strong>0/30</strong></td>
<td><strong>0/28</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-Identity diffusion</td>
<td><strong>0/36</strong></td>
<td><strong>0/36</strong></td>
<td><strong>0/45</strong></td>
<td><strong>0/37</strong></td>
<td><strong>0/25</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-Identity foreclosure</td>
<td><strong>0/24</strong></td>
<td><strong>0/42</strong></td>
<td><strong>0/51</strong></td>
<td><em>0/11</em>*</td>
<td><strong>0/34</strong></td>
<td><strong>0/27</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-Addiction potential</td>
<td><strong>0/49</strong></td>
<td><strong>0/40</strong></td>
<td><strong>0/53</strong></td>
<td><strong>0/49</strong></td>
<td><strong>0/55</strong></td>
<td><strong>0/21</strong></td>
<td><strong>0/59</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p ≤ 0/05, ** p ≤ 0/01

As shown in Table 2, all relationships between variables are significant. In order to test the research model, the path analysis method was used. The fit indices are presented in Table 3.

Table 3: The goodness of fit indices of research model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indices</th>
<th>χ²</th>
<th>Degree of freedom</th>
<th>χ²/df</th>
<th>GFI</th>
<th>AGFI</th>
<th>NFI</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>IFI</th>
<th>χ²</th>
<th>TLI</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposed model</td>
<td>8/532</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1/706</td>
<td>0/988</td>
<td>0/95</td>
<td>0/97</td>
<td>0/987</td>
<td>0/983</td>
<td>8/532</td>
<td>0/80</td>
<td>0/063</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Table 3, all indicators are within an acceptable limit. Figure 2 illustrates the standard coefficients of the relationship between the model variables. The path coefficients show that parenting styles and insecure attachment affect the personality traits and identity dimensions, and they also affect addiction potential. In other words, all assumed direct effects in the model are statistically significant.

Figure 2: The Path Coefficients of the Proposed Model
In this model, the path of permissive parenting style to addiction potential (0.30), the path of permissive parenting style to neuroticism (0.55), the path of permissive parenting style to openness to experience (0.36), the path of permissive parenting style to identity diffusion (0.32), and path of permissive parenting style to identity foreclosure (0.24) are statistically significant. Additionally, the authoritarian parenting style path to addiction potential (0.16), the path of the authoritarian parenting style to neuroticism (0.20), the path of the authoritarian parenting style to identity foreclosure (0.24) were statistically significant. The path of insecure attachment style to addiction potential (0.28), the path of insecure attachment style to neuroticism (0.33), the path of insecure attachment style to openness to experience (0.24), the path of insecure attachment style to identity diffusion (0.37), the path of insecure attachment style to identity foreclosure (0.18) were statistically significant.

Bootstrap method was used to determine the significance of intermediary relations. Table 4 shows the results of Bootstrap.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Path</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Lower limit</th>
<th>Upper limit</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Permissive style</td>
<td>Neuroticism</td>
<td>Addiction potential</td>
<td>0/12</td>
<td>0/018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permissive style</td>
<td>Openness to experience</td>
<td>Addiction potential</td>
<td>0/13</td>
<td>0/071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permissive style</td>
<td>Identity diffusion</td>
<td>Addiction potential</td>
<td>0/12</td>
<td>0/017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permissive style</td>
<td>Identity foreclosure</td>
<td>Addiction potential</td>
<td>0/16</td>
<td>0/102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authoritarian style</td>
<td>Neuroticism</td>
<td>Addiction potential</td>
<td>0/13</td>
<td>0/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authoritarian style</td>
<td>Identity foreclosure</td>
<td>Addiction potential</td>
<td>0/16</td>
<td>0/102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insecure attachment</td>
<td>Neuroticism</td>
<td>Addiction potential</td>
<td>0/13</td>
<td>0/071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insecure attachment</td>
<td>Openness to experience</td>
<td>Addiction potential</td>
<td>0/13</td>
<td>0/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insecure attachment</td>
<td>Identity diffusion</td>
<td>Addiction potential</td>
<td>0/18</td>
<td>0/109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insecure attachment</td>
<td>Identity foreclosure</td>
<td>Addiction potential</td>
<td>0/17</td>
<td>0/07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The significance level in Table 4 shows the significance of indirect relations. Thus, the study hypotheses regarding the mediation of neuroticism and openness to experience, diffused and foreclosed identity styles between the permissive, authoritarian parenting styles and insecure attachment styles are confirmed.

Discussion and conclusion
The purpose of this study was to investigate the relationship between the causal parenting style (permissive and authoritarian) and insecure attachment style...
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(ambivalent / anxiety and avoidance) with the mediating role of personality traits (neuroticism and openness to experience) and identity styles (Identity diffusion and identity foreclosure) with addiction potential in students of Shahid Chamran University of Ahwaz. The results of the study showed that a permissive parenting is indirectly related to addiction potential via neuroticism and openness to experience. These results are consistent with the findings of Hoeve et al. (2009), Klimstra, Crocetti, & Hale (2011). In a family where children receive much love from parents and there are no rules for the family, an unorganized family might emerge which causes neuroticism. In these families, individuals who gain a high score in openness to experience and often seek new, varied and new experiences; after much experience, they form identity foreclosure, and feel diffused to their tasks and view drug use as a different experience. Additionally, the authoritarian parenting style is indirectly associated with addiction potential via neuroticism and identity foreclosure. Parents with authoritarian and disciplined education have less opportunity for their children to express opinions, views and feelings and they cannot share stress and concerns with their parents. These Neurotic and unhealthy people receive well-defined identity with strict rules and experience maladaptive behaviors such as addiction and delinquency at an early age (Shekar Beigi and Yasmine Nejad, 2014; Ganji et al., 2014).

In general, in families with authoritarian and permissive parenting styles, the supportive environment that is a requirement for individual growth for children is not provided, because parents do not have adequate control over the behavior of children and do not support them (Ahmadi, et al, 2014). In a family environment without support and assurance, it is likely that negative identity styles such as identity foreclosure and identity diffusion styles and negative personality traits, such as neuroticism are brought up in children, or if potential positive personality traits such as openness to experience is created in them, they use it in a negative way, such as pursuing high-risk behaviors like drug addiction. Also, the results of this study showed that insecure attachment style is indirectly related to the lack of addiction potential via neuroticism and openness to experience with addiction potential. Insecure attachment styles and undeveloped defense mechanisms place the adolescent in a state of stress and distress and make Him/her neurotic. They do everything to reduce stress and move toward smoking and drug use. These results are consistent with findings of (Fathi and Mehrabizadeh Harmandand, 2011) and (Wedekind et al., 2013). Additionally, insecure attachment style is indirectly related to identity diffusion and identity foreclosure with addiction potential. Individuals with insecure attachment style have interpersonal problems, are vulnerable to life events, are confused in their duties, or feel insecure and anxious due to their identity foreclosure, and to overcome their disabilities; they get inclined to drug use. These results are consistent with the findings (Vojudi et al., 2014) and (Fathi and Mehrabizadeh Honarmand, 2011). In addition, Kassel et al. (2006; cited from Borhani 2013) argue that individuals with an insecure attachment style don’t have the necessary
skills to establish and shape social relationships, thus, use drug in dealing with problems. Terberg and Liors (2010) also reported that a person’s attachment style predicts His or her emotional self-regulation. It is likely that people with identity foreclosure and identity diffusion attachment styles cannot manage their life-threatening problems due to lack of ability to control their emotions, which is a hallmark of individuals with neurotic personality, so they are trapped in drug use.

The results of the present study showed that many internal and external factors in the environment affect drug addiction and drug use. Some people tend to use drugs due to wrong parenting style and insecure attachment style, and the characteristics of neuroticism and openness to experience and identity diffusion and identity foreclosure of the children facilitate this action. According to the explanation, identifying the effective factors on addiction potential is one of the important research topics.

Since the structural modeling method has been used to assess the fitness of the proposed model, the cause and effect conclusions should be made with caution. The results of the present study are related to undergraduate students; therefore, generalization of results to other groups should be done carefully.
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