PSYCHOLOGY AND COGNITIVE SCIENCES
ISSN: 3080-1893. eISSN: 3104-4611

IRSTI 15.41.59
Review article

https://doi.org/10.32523/3080-1893-2026-154-1-33-46

Interpersonal dependence, codependency, and psychological resources in substance-related and behavioral addictions

A. Ibragim

L.N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University, Astana, Kazakhstan

(E-mail: solinvictus2773@gmail.com)

Abstract. Background. Addictive disorders involve significant psychological and social consequences. Their development is shaped by interpersonal factors, such as the dependence–codependency nexus, and resources like meaning in life and hardiness, which influence maladjustment risk and behavioral persistence.

Objective. The study assessed associations between interpersonal dependence, codependency, hopelessness, and resource variables, while comparing psychological profiles of substance-related and behavioral addictions.

Methods. Data from 22 adults (M age=24.45; 18 men) with gambling (n=14), drug (n=7), and alcohol (n=1) addictions were analyzed. Instruments included the IDI, Weinhold Scale, BHS, PIL, and Hardiness Test. Analyses used Mann–Whitney U, Cliff's delta (FDR corrected), and Spearman's rho with 95% bootstrap confidence intervals.

Results. The substance-related group was younger (p=.039), showing higher codependency (p=.0036), greater emotional reliance (p=.010), and lower hardiness (p=.015). Interpersonal dependence correlated strongly with hardiness (ρ= −.87). Codependency was negatively associated with hardiness (ρ= −.79) and meaning in life (ρ= −.73). Hopelessness correlated negatively with meaning (ρ= −.64) and hardiness (ρ= −.68).

Conclusions. Meaning in life and hardiness serve as protective factors, while interpersonal dependence and codependency form a vulnerability dyad linked to hopelessness. Rehabilitation should target autonomy, personal boundaries, and meaning-based regulation.

Keywords: addictive behavior, codependency, interpersonal dependence, hardiness, meaning in life, hopelessness, psychodiagnostics

Received: 10.03.2026; Revised: 18.03.2026; Accepted: 22.03.2026; Available online: 30.03.2026

***corresponding author**

Introduction

Addictive disorders are a heterogeneous group of conditions that include both substance-related disorders and behavioral addictions. In contemporary classification systems and evidence syntheses, gambling disorder is the most firmly established form of behavioral addiction, and recent meta-analytic data indicate that problematic gambling affects a meaningful proportion of the adult population worldwide (American Psychiatric Association, 2022; Tran et al., 2024). At the same time, systematic reviews suggest that the risk architecture of gambling disorder cannot be reduced to classification alone and reflects the interaction of individual, interpersonal, and contextual variables (Moreira et al., 2023).

One of the most consistent clinical and psychological themes in addiction research is the link between addictive behavior, negative expectations about the future, and reduced subjective coping resources. The construct of hopelessness has long been associated with suicidality and severe maladjustment. In a longitudinal community-based study, Kuo et al. (2004) showed that hopelessness predicted suicidal outcomes over long-term follow-up even after adjustment for concomitant factors. From an applied perspective, this means that assessing hopelessness in populations with addictions is justified not only as an indicator of current distress but also as a marker of an unfavorable risk trajectory.

The literature also shows that addictions are associated with a considerable psychological burden and substantial impairment in social functioning. At the same time, risk-factor research indicates that classificatory frameworks alone do not adequately explain the psychological structure of vulnerability. This gap is especially important for rehabilitation practice, where it is necessary to understand not only the consequences of addiction but also the mechanisms through which interpersonal vulnerability and psychological resources become linked.

The theoretical and practical relevance of the present topic lies in the fact that the emotional and behavioral consequences of addiction have been described in considerable detail, whereas much less is known about how interpersonal dependence, codependency, hopelessness, and resource variables form a single network of associations. For rehabilitation practice, this issue is crucial: if interpersonal vulnerability is indeed accompanied by lower hardiness and reduced meaning in life, interventions should target not only symptom control, but also the restoration of autonomy, personal boundaries, and meaning-based regulation.

Meaning in life, broadly understood as a sense of purpose, value, and coherence in one's life course, may serve as a protective factor in clinical populations. For example, Marco et al. (2016) showed that meaning in life can buffer the association between suicide risk factors and hopelessness. In Russian psychometric research, the Purpose-in-Life Orientations Test has received additional support for its structure and validity in large samples, which strengthens its applicability in research designs of this kind (Osin & Kosheleva, 2020).

Hardiness is commonly conceptualized as a psychological resource grounded in commitment, control, and challenge. In Maddi's (2006) classic formulation, hardiness is described as a set of attitudes and skills that help transform stress into growth. Russian-language adaptations and short forms of the Hardiness Test with documented psychometric properties are available, which is important for reproducibility in local research contexts (Osin & Rasskazova, 2013).

Addiction is not only a biological and behavioral phenomenon but also an interpersonal one. The interpersonal model of relapse emphasizes the role of interpersonal stress, social

threat, and sensitivity to rejection in the risk of relapse in alcohol and drug addiction (Leach & Kranzler, 2013). Within this framework, it is theoretically reasonable to examine such variables as interpersonal dependence and codependency.

In the context of adapting psychodiagnostic tools and theoretical models to regional realities, the specific prevalence and clinical course of addictive disorders in the Republic of Kazakhstan acquire particular significance. Amidst intensive digitalization, economic transformations, and shifts in traditional social institutions, the landscape of addictive behavior is undergoing substantial changes. Traditional forms of substance-related addictions are increasingly being compounded by the rapid growth of non-substance disorders, among which gambling disorder occupies a dominant position.

As emphasized by Kazakhstani researchers (Zhatkanbaeva et al., 2021), the expansion of the gambling industry and aggressive marketing have led to gambling problems reaching a massive scale. An analysis of preventive measures shows that legal regulation alone is insufficient to fully mitigate the issue without a deep understanding of the psychological drivers of addiction. The severity of the situation is recognized at the state level: according to the current Clinical Protocol of the Ministry of Health of the Republic of Kazakhstan (2023), pathological gambling is classified as a severe disorder leading to the progressive destruction of the patient's social, professional, and, crucially, family values.

In parallel with the rise in behavioral addictions, substance abuse remains a serious threat, closely linked to a deficit in subjective personal resources. Examining the psychological mechanisms of deviant and addictive behavior among youth, Shakimova (2020) notes that the formation of addiction is associated with deep emotional deficits and an inability to cope constructively with life's difficulties. This deficit often transforms into risk-taking behavior and autoaggression. This premise is supported by research on the predictors of risk behavior and suicidal ideation among Kazakhstani students (Seksenbayev et al., 2021). The authors highlight the critical vulnerability of individuals with high levels of distress. In the context of the present study, this directly actualizes the construct of hopelessness: the loss of meaning in life and the feeling of an existential dead-end act as powerful catalysts for both the development of substance-related addiction and the formation of autoaggressive patterns.

Special attention should be given to integrating the problem of addiction with the phenomenon of codependency and interpersonal vulnerability, which requires consideration of local socio-cultural specifics. In a culture with traditionally strong family ties, the pathological codependency of relatives often becomes a factor that sustains the addictive cycle. The conceptual importance of such a comprehensive approach is corroborated by a recent large-scale study conducted by a team of authors, including researchers from L.N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University (Ibragim et al., 2025). Their work directly addresses the issues of psychological rehabilitation for individuals with alcohol, drug, and gambling addictions, and also analyzes the phenomenon of codependency within a single sample. The authors clearly demonstrated that the targets of effective therapeutic intervention in Kazakhstan must include not only the behavioral pattern of substance use or gambling itself but also distorted interpersonal relationships. The interpersonal dependence of the addict and the codependency of their environment form a rigid system, escaping from which is impossible without a purposeful reconstruction of the meaning sphere and an increase in the level of hardiness.

Thus, the transitional nature of modern society makes the study of resource indicators (meaning in life, hardiness) and markers of interpersonal vulnerability (hopelessness, codependency) a key direction for optimizing the rehabilitation process.

Despite the availability of both foundational and recent studies, an important gap remains in the integrated comparison of substance-related and behavioral addictions across multiple interrelated psychological indicators within a single sample. It remains insufficiently clear whether interpersonal dependence, codependency, hopelessness, and resource variables form a coherent cluster of vulnerability and protection, and whether this structure differs between substance-related and behavioral forms of addiction.

Object of the study. Adult participants with substance-related and behavioral addictions.

Subject of the study. Associations and differences among interpersonal dependence, codependency, hopelessness, meaning in life, and hardiness across different types of addiction.

Research question. Do the psychological profiles of substance-related and behavioral addictions differ, and do interpersonal dependence, codependency, hopelessness, and resource variables form a coherent system of interrelationships?

Objective. To assess differences in psychological profiles between substance-related and behavioral addictions and to describe the correlational structure of interpersonal dependence, codependency, hopelessness, meaning in life, and hardiness.

Hypothesis. Interpersonal dependence and codependency will be positively associated with hopelessness and negatively associated with meaning in life and hardiness. In addition, substance-related addiction will be characterized by greater interpersonal vulnerability and lower resource indicators than behavioral addiction.

Scientific novelty and practical significance. The study brings interpersonal and resource indicators in substance-related and behavioral addictions into a single analytical framework and generates testable assumptions for further rehabilitation and prevention programs.

Research objectives

1. To describe the composition of the sample and the structure of the source data.
2. To compare the substance-related and behavioral groups on key psychological indicators.
3. To assess the associations among interpersonal dependence, codependency, hopelessness, meaning in life, and hardiness.
4. To discuss the findings in relation to previous studies and to identify the study limitations.

The Interpersonal Dependency Inventory (IDI) was developed as a 48-item questionnaire comprising three components: emotional reliance on others, lack of social self-confidence, and assertion of autonomy (Hirschfeld et al., 1977). By contrast, the construct of codependency remains theoretically contested; classical critiques have emphasized the risk of pathologizing interpersonal strategies and the limited conceptual precision of the term (Anderson, 1994). At the same time, applied and clinical-psychological research continues to use codependency measures; in particular, the Barry Weinhold and Janae Weinhold scale is employed as a 20-item self-report instrument, and Russian-language applied studies describe its criterion validity and use in group comparisons (Kolenova et al., 2024).

Methods

Design. The study used a cross-sectional observational design. Data were collected in 2024 at the private rehabilitation center Krylatye Gody in a long-term inpatient setting.

Data and sample

The total sample comprised 22 participants. Mean age was 24.45 years (SD = 5.62), and the median age was 23.0 years [20.0, 28.8]. The sample was predominantly male (18 men and 4 women). Gambling disorder predominated (n = 14), followed by drug addiction (n = 7) and a single case of alcohol addiction (n = 1).

For comparative analyses, two broader groups were formed: behavioral addiction (gambling disorder; n = 14) and substance-related addiction (drug addiction plus alcohol addiction; n = 8). Table 1 presents the sample characteristics.

Table 1

Sample characteristics

Indicator	**Value**
N	22
Age, M (SD)	24.45 (5.62)
Age, Me [Q1; Q3]	23.0 [20.0; 28.8]
Gender	18 males; 4 females
Education	Higher education: 10; Secondary education: 4; None/not specified: 8
Type of addiction	Gambling disorder: 14; drug addiction: 7; alcohol addiction: 1

Study stages

1) checking the structure of the source data and operationalizing the two comparison groups;
2) calculating descriptive statistics and between-group differences;
3) analyzing the correlational structure of the indicators and conducting sensitivity analyses.

Psychodiagnostic instruments

A summary of the instruments used is presented in Table 2.

Table 2

Summary of the psychodiagnostic instruments

Instrument/indicator	Construct measured	Structure/notes	Source
IDI (total + 3 components)	Interpersonal dependence: emotional reliance on others, lack of social self-confidence, autonomy	48 items; 3 components	Hirschfeld et al., 1977
CSIS (Weinhold scale)	Codependent behavior and dysfunctional relationship patterns	20-item self-report instrument	Kolenova et al., 2024
BHS	Hopelessness and negative expectations about the future	20-item scale	Beck et al., 1974; Hanna et al., 2011
Purpose-in-Life Orientations	Meaning in life and life-purpose orientations	Total score used in the dataset	Osin & Kosheleva, 2020
Hardiness Test	Hardiness as a coping resource	Commitment, control, challenge	Maddi, 2006; Osin & Rasskazova, 2013

Statistical analysis

To address the study objectives, we used descriptive statistics (mean, standard deviation, median, interquartile range, minimum, and maximum), the Mann–Whitney U test for two independent groups, Cliff's delta with bootstrap 95% confidence intervals, and Spearman's rank correlation coefficient with bootstrap 95% confidence intervals. The Benjamini–Hochberg FDR correction was applied to control for multiple testing. Nonparametric methods were selected because of the small sample size, group heterogeneity, and the absence of sufficient grounds to assume normal distributions.

In addition, sensitivity analyses were performed by controlling for age through partial rank correlations and by excluding the single case of alcohol addiction from the substance-related group.

Results

Comparison of the substance-related and behavioral addiction groups

The between-group comparison results are presented in Table 3. After FDR correction, three differences remained statistically robust: the substance-related group showed higher codependency, greater emotional reliance on others, and lower hardiness. In addition, the substance-related group was younger, which required a separate sensitivity analysis for the possible influence of age.

The results of the intergroup comparison are presented in Table 3. After FDR correction, three differences proved to be statistically significant: the chemical group demonstrated higher codependency, more pronounced emotional reliance on others, and lower resilience. In addition, the chemical group was younger, which required a separate sensitivity check for the influence of age.

Table 3

Comparison of groups on key indicators (Mann–Whitney U, Cliff's δ, FDR)

As shown in Table 3, differences in total interpersonal dependence (IDI) and meaning in life did not reach the adjusted significance threshold; however, the directions of the effects remained substantively consistent. The substance-related group tended to show higher interpersonal dependence and lower meaning in life. From a research perspective, this pattern is important as a guide for future testing in larger samples.

Indicator	n (behavio-ral)	n (substan ce-rela-ted)	U	p	q (FDR)	δ (Cliff)	95% CI δ	Me (behavio-ral)	Me (substan-ce-rela-ted)
Age	14	8	86.5	0.039	0.088	0.545	[0.04; 0.96]	25.0	18
IDI total	14	8	28	0.060	0.108	−0.500	[−0.95; 0.04]	46.0	58
Emotional reliance on others	14	8	18	0.010	0.046	−0.679	[−1.00; −0.21]	38	50

Lack of social self-confidence	14	8	46	0.516	0.580	−0.179	[−0.68; 0.34]	29.0	36.5
Assertion of autonomy	14	8	52	0.811	0.811	−0.071	[−0.57; 0.46]	28.5	28.5
Weinhold Codependency Scale	14	8	13	0.0036	0.033	−0.768	[−1.00; −0.41]	38.5	54
BHS	14	8	39.5	0.272	0.349	−0.295	[−0.79; 0.26]	5.5	8.5
Meaning in life	14	8	80	0.108	0.162	0.429	[−0.09; 0.86]	86.0	72.5
Hardiness	14	8	92.0	0.015	0.046	0.643	[0.21; 0.96]	82	49.5

Correlational structure of the indicators

The key correlations are presented in Table 4. The overall pattern reveals two poles: a pole of interpersonal vulnerability (interpersonal dependence and codependency) and a pole of psychological resources (meaning in life and hardiness). The relationships between these poles are predominantly negative: higher interpersonal dependence and codependency are associated with lower resource indicators.

The strongest association was the negative correlation between interpersonal dependence and hardiness (ρ = −0.868), indicating a close link between interpersonal vulnerability and reduced coping resources. Codependency was also strongly negatively associated with both hardiness and meaning in life. Hopelessness occupied an intermediate position: it was negatively associated with the resource indicators and positively associated with interpersonal dependence.

Table 4

Key correlations among the indicators (Spearman's ρ, bootstrap CI, FDR)

Pair of indicators	ρ	95% CI ρ	p	q (FDR)
IDI ↔ Hardiness	−0.868	[−0.94; −0.70]	<0.000001	0.000002
Codependency ↔ Hardiness	−0.794	[−0.95; −0.52]	0.000010	0.000051
Meaning in life ↔ Hardiness	0.783	[0.52; 0.90]	0.000016	0.000055
Codependency ↔ Meaning in life	−0.734	[−0.89; −0.44]	0.000101	0.000253
IDI ↔ Codependency	0.717	[0.38; 0.90]	0.000175	0.000350
BHS ↔ Hardiness	−0.684	[−0.87; −0.33]	0.000453	0.000755
BHS ↔ Meaning in life	−0.644	[−0.81; −0.33]	0.001222	0.001745
IDI ↔ Meaning in life	−0.573	[−0.82; −0.21]	0.005288	0.006610
IDI ↔ BHS	0.556	[0.07; 0.87]	0.007168	0.007964
Codependency ↔ BHS	0.422	[−0.06; 0.78]	0.0503	0.0503

Sensitivity analyses

Controlling for age using partial rank correlations preserved both the direction and significance level of the key associations: IDI ↔ hardiness (ρ ≈ −0.835), codependency ↔ hardiness (ρ ≈ −0.743), and hopelessness ↔ meaning in life (ρ ≈ −0.672). Excluding the single case of alcohol addiction also did not alter the overall pattern: the substance-related group retained higher codependency and emotional reliance on others, as well as lower hardiness. Thus, neither age nor the single alcohol case fully accounted for the observed structure of results.

Discussion

The findings allow several principal conclusions. First, substance-related addiction in this sample is associated with greater interpersonal vulnerability: the substance-related group showed higher codependency and greater emotional reliance on others. This may indicate stronger dependence of behavioral and emotional regulation on external relationships and support, making coping less autonomous.

Second, the data support a coherent resource pattern: meaning in life and hardiness are positively related to each other and negatively related to interpersonal dependence, codependency, and hopelessness. This is consistent with the view of hardiness as a system of attitudes that enables the individual to process stress not as destruction but as a developmental challenge (Maddi, 2006), as well as with evidence for the buffering role of meaning in life in the context of hopelessness and adverse outcomes (Marco et al., 2016).

Third, in the present study, interpersonal dependence and codependency are treated not as independent diagnoses, but as operationally measurable relational patterns. This is important because the construct of codependency has repeatedly been criticized for its theoretical diffuseness (Anderson, 1994). Nevertheless, when treated as a measurable pattern rather than a nosological category, it shows a meaningful association in this sample with deficits in psychological resources.

When considered against previous studies, the resulting profile does not contradict the interpersonal model of addiction and relapse. When dependence on others is combined with deficits in autonomous regulation, greater hopelessness, and weaker coping resources, a psychological configuration emerges that may contribute to relapse vulnerability (Leach & Kranzler, 2013).

Furthermore, the pronounced interpersonal vulnerability and higher codependency observed in the substance-related group compared to the behavioral addiction group must be interpreted through the lens of recent comparative neuro-behavioral and psychosocial research. Recent literature indexed in Web of Science emphasizes that while both gambling and substance use disorders share neurobiological pathways and diagnostic overlaps (Volkow, Koob, & McLellan, 2016), their interpersonal consequences often diverge significantly. Substance use disorders tend to create a more visible and rapid deterioration of physical and social functioning. This deterioration forcibly binds the individual to their immediate caregivers in a pathological cycle of enabling and emotional reliance, heightening codependency scores. In contrast, gambling disorder—often characterized as a "hidden addiction"—allows individuals to maintain a facade of physical autonomy and functional independence for longer periods, even as profound financial and psychological crises escalate (Potenza et al., 2019). This distinction provides a solid empirical explanation for the relatively lower initial scores of emotional reliance on others

in our behavioral addiction sample, underscoring the necessity of mapping relational patterns beyond standard classificatory frameworks.

Equally important is the robust negative correlation found in this study between the resource contour (hardiness and meaning in life) and interpersonal vulnerability. Over the past decade, international research has increasingly conceptualized meaning in life not merely as a philosophical construct, but as a quantifiable, protective psychosocial buffer against relapse. According to Kim et al. (2020), a higher sense of purpose directly mitigates the likelihood of relying on substance misuse as a maladaptive coping mechanism for stress, fundamentally altering the individual's stress-response trajectory. Individuals lacking internalized, meaning-based regulation are highly susceptible to experiencing psychosocial stress as an insurmountable catastrophe. This deficit in hardiness actively facilitates the regression into dependent, addictive coping strategies as a pseudo-resolution to existential anxiety.

The construct of codependency, while historically debated, remains highly relevant when analyzed as a measurable relational pattern. Recent phenomenological analyses (Bacon et al., 2020) argue that the core of codependency—an excessive external focus, low self-worth, and the suppression of one's own emotional needs—thrives in environments that blur the line between normative support and pathological self-sacrifice. When individuals are trapped in this cycle, their innate capacities for resilience and psychological flexibility are severely compromised, validating our findings that codependency is strictly negatively correlated with hardiness.

These empirical findings necessitate a targeted refinement of rehabilitation protocols. Interventions must strategically navigate the dismantling of pathological codependency while preserving supportive social networks. Therapeutic efforts should explicitly target the reconstruction of personal boundaries and the fostering of individual autonomy. As demonstrated by recent population-level studies on addiction recovery (Kelly et al., 2017), integrating meaning-centered therapies and hardiness training provides a sustainable, internally driven defense against relapse, offering an evidence-based pathway to long-term recovery.

Limitations and future directions

1. The small sample size (N = 22) and the marked imbalance in gender and addiction type limit statistical power and the generalizability of the findings.

2. Duration of addiction, comorbidity, and other clinically significant characteristics were not specified in the dataset.

3. The cross-sectional design does not permit causal interpretation; larger, stratified, and preferably longitudinal studies are needed.

Conclusion

1. In this sample, participants with substance-related addiction were characterized by higher codependency and greater emotional reliance on others, as well as lower hardiness, compared with participants with gambling disorder.

2. Interpersonal dependence and codependency form a coherent cluster of interpersonal vulnerability that is statistically associated with greater hopelessness and lower resource indicators.

3. Meaning in life and hardiness form a resource contour that may be regarded as an important target for relapse prevention and rehabilitation programs.

4. The practical value of the findings lies in their implication that support programs should

include work on personal boundaries, autonomy, meaning-based regulation, and stable coping strategies.

4. The practical value of the results lies in the fact that they point to the need to include work with personal boundaries, autonomy, meaning regulation, and sustainable coping strategies in support programs.

References

American Psychiatric Association (2022). Substance-related and addictive disorders. Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders. URL: https://doi.org/10.1176/appi.books.9780890425787.x16_Substance_Related_Disorders.

Anderson S.C. (1994). A critical analysis of the concept of codependency. Social Work. 39 (6), P. 677-685.

Bacon I., McKay E., Reynolds F., McIntyre A. (2020). The lived experience of codependency: An interpretative phenomenological analysis International Journal of Mental Health and Addiction. 18 (3), P. 754-771.

Beck A.T., Weissman A., Lester D., Trexler L. (1974). The measurement of pessimism: The hopelessness scale. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology. –42 (6), P. 861-865.

Hanna D., White R.G., Lyons K., McParland M.J., Shannon C., Mulholland C. (2011). The structure of the Beck Hopelessness Scale: A confirmatory factor analysis in UK students. Personality and Individual Differences. 51 (1), P. 17-22.

Hirschfeld R.M.A., Klerman G.L., Gough H.G., Barrett J., Korchin S.J., Chodoff P. A (1977). measure of interpersonal dependency. Journal of Personality Assessment. 41 (6), P. 610-618.

Ibragim A., Issatayeva B., Kuanzhanova K., Mandykayeva A., Mambetalina A. (2025). Psychological rehabilitation of individuals with alcohol use disorder, drug addiction, gambling disorder, and codependency. Acta Psychologica. -URL: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/40381539/

Kelly J.F., Bergman B.G., Hoeppner B.B., Vilsaint C., White W.L. (2017). Prevalence and pathways of recovery from drug and alcohol problems in the United States population: Implications for practice, research, and policy. Drug and Alcohol Dependence. 181, P. 162-169.

Kim E.S., Ryff C., Hassett A., Brummett C., Yeh C., Strecher V. (2020). Sense of purpose in life and likelihood of future illicit drug use or prescription medication misuse. Psychosomatic Medicine. 82 (7), P. 715-721.

Kolenova A.S., Kukulyar A.M., Denisova E.G., Ermakov P.N. (2024). Self-attitude and reflection in codependent women: A comparative study. Psychology in Russia: State of the Art. 17 (1), P. 116-132.

Kuo W.-H., Gallo J.J., Eaton W.W. (2004). Hopelessness, depression, substance disorder, and suicidality: A 13-year community-based study. Social Psychiatry and Psychiatric Epidemiology. 39 (6), P. 497-501.

Leach D., Kranzler H.R. (2013). An interpersonal model of addiction relapse. Addictive Disorders & Their Treatment. 12 (4), P. 183-192.

Maddi S.R. (2006). Hardiness: The courage to grow from stresses. The Journal of Positive Psychology, 1 (3), P. 160-168.

Marco J.H., Pérez S., García-Alandete J. (2016). Meaning in life buffers the association between risk factors for suicide and hopelessness in participants with mental disorders. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 72 (7), P. 689-700.

Moreira D., Azeredo A., Dias P. (2023). Risk factors for gambling disorder: A systematic review. Journal of Gambling Studies, 39 (2), P. 483-511.

Potenza M.N., Balodis I.M., Derevensky J., Grant J.E., Petry N.M., Verdejo-Garcia A., Yau Y.H.C. (2019) Gambling disorder, Nature Reviews Disease Primers. 5 (1), P. 51.

Seksenbayev N.Zh., Inoue K., Moldagaliyev T.M., Sarsembina Zh.Zh., Altybayeva G.K., Almagambetova A.A., Yermekbayev A.U., Kaliyeva A.A., Noso Y., Hashioka S., Shalgumbayeva G.M., Chaizhunussova N.Zh.,

Ospanova N.N. (2021). Features of risk behavior and suicidal ideation in medical students. Science & Healthcare, 23(4), P. 138-146.

Tran L.T., Wardle H., Colledge-Frisby S., Taylor S., Lynch M., Rehm J., Volberg R., Marionneau V., Saxena S., Bunn C., Farrell M., Degenhardt L. (2024). The prevalence of gambling and problematic gambling: A systematic review and meta-analysis, The Lancet Public Health, 9(8), P. e594-e613.

Volkow N.D., Koob G.F., McLellan A.T. (2016). Neurobiologic advances from the brain disease model of addiction, New England Journal of Medicine, 374 (4), P. 363-371.

Zhatkanbaeva A.Y., Atakhanova S.K., Raiymbergenova K.T., Nakisheva M.K., Aydarkhanova K.N. (2021). Analysis of the legislation of the Republic of Kazakhstan on the prevention of gambling addiction. Journal of Actual Problems of Jurisprudence. 100 (4), P. 80-86.

Министерство здравоохранения Республики Казахстан (2023). Клинический протокол диагностики и лечения: Патологическое влечение к азартным играм (F63.0). URL: https://diseases.medelement.com/disease/патологическое-влечение-к-азартным-играм-кп-рк-2023/17766

Осин Е.Н., Кошелева Н.В. (2020). Тест смысложизненных ориентаций: Новые данные о структуре и валидности. Вопросы психологии. 6, С. 150-163.

Осин Е.Н., Рассказова Е.И. (2013). Краткая версия теста жизнестойкости: Психометрические характеристики и применение в организационном контексте. Вестник Московского университета. Серия 14. Психология. 2, С. 147-165.

Шакимова Л.С. (2020). Особенности преступного поведения современной молодежи с точки зрения криминальной психологии. ҚазҰУ Хабаршысы. Психология және әлеуметтану сериясы. 2, С. 48-54.

А. Е. Ибрагим

Евразийский национальный университет имени Л.Н. Гумилёва,
Астана, Казахстан
(E-mail: solinvictus2773@gmail.com)

Межличностная зависимость, созависимость и психологические ресурсы при химических и нехимических аддикциях

Аннотация. Актуальность. Аддиктивные расстройства влекут выраженные психологические и социальные последствия. В их развитии ключевую роль играют межличностные факторы (связка «зависимость – созависимость») и ресурсы (осмысленность жизни и жизнестойкость), влияющие на риск дезадаптации.

Цель. Исследование направлено на оценку связей между межличностной зависимостью, созависимостью, безнадежностью и ресурсами, а также на сравнение профилей химических и поведенческих аддикций.

Методы. Проанализированы данные 22 взрослых (M=24.45 года; 18 мужчин), включая лудоманию (n=14), наркоманию (n=7) и алкоголизм (n=1). Использовались тесты на межличностную зависимость, созависимость по Уайнхолд, безнадежность Бека, СЖО и жизнестойкость. Применялись U-критерий Манна–Уитни, дельта Клиффа (FDR-коррекция) и корреляция Спирмена (95 % CI).

Результаты. Группа с химической зависимостью была моложе (p=0.039) и демонстрировала более высокую созависимость (p=0.0036), эмоциональную опору на других (p=0.010) и более низкую жизнестойкость (p=0.015). Выявлены сильные отрицательные связи межличностной зависимости с жизнестойкостью (ρ=−0.87), созависимости с жизнестойкостью (ρ=−0.79) и осмысленностью (ρ=−0.73), а также безнадежности с ресурсами.

Выводы. Результаты подтверждают ресурсную интерпретацию: осмысленность и жизнестойкость — защитные факторы, а межличностная зависимость и созависимость — уязвимость, связанная с безнадежностью. Укрепление автономии и смысловой регуляции является перспективным направлением реабилитации.

Ключевые слова: зависимое поведение, созависимость, межличностная зависимость, жизнестойкость, осмысленность жизни, безнадежность, психодиагностика.

А.Е. Ибрагим
Л.Н. Гумилев атындағы Еуразия ұлттық университеті,
Астана, Қазақстан
(E-mail: solinvictus2773@gmail.com)

Химиялық және мінез-құлықтық аддикциялар кезіндегі тұлғааралық тәуелділік, бірге тәуелділік және психологиялық ресурстар

Аңдатпа. Өзектілігі. Аддиктивті бұзылыстар айқын психологиялық және әлеуметтік салдарларға әкеп соқтырады. Олардың дамуында тұлғааралық факторлар («тәуелділік – қосалқы тәуелділік» байланысы) мен бейімделе алмау қаупіне әсер ететін ресурстар (өмірдің мәнділігі және өміршеңдік) негізгі рөл атқарады.

Мақсаты. Зерттеу тұлғааралық тәуелділік, қосалқы тәуелділік, үмітсіздік және ресурстық айнымалылар арасындағы байланысты бағалауға, сондай-ақ химиялық және мінез-құлықтық (химиялық емес) тәуелділіктердің психологиялық профильдерін салыстыруға бағытталған.

Әдістері. Ойын (лудомания, n=14), есірткі (n=7) және алкоголь (n=1) тәуелділігі бар 22 ересек адамның (M=24.45; 18 ер адам) мәліметтері талданды. Тұлғааралық тәуелділік (IDI), Уайнхолдтың қосалқы тәуелділік шкаласы, Бектің үмітсіздік шкаласы (BHS), Өмір мәндік бағдарлар (PIL) және Өміршеңдік (Hardiness Test) тестері қолданылды. Деректерді талдау үшін Манн–Уитнидің U-критерийі, Клифф дельтасы және Спирмен корреляциясы пайдаланылды.

Нәтижелері. Химиялық тәуелділігі бар топтың жасы кішірек (p=0.039) болды, сондай-ақ оларда қосалқы тәуелділік (p=0.0036) пен эмоциялық тұрғыдан басқаларға сүйену (p=0.010) деңгейі жоғары, ал өміршеңдік көрсеткіші төмен (p=0.015) екені анықталды. Тұлғааралық тәуелділік пен өміршеңдік арасында күшті теріс байланыс (ρ=−0.87) байқалды. Қосалқы тәуелділік өміршеңдікпен (ρ=−0.79) және өмірдің мәнділігімен (ρ=−0.73) кері байланыс көрсетті. Үмітсіздік өмірдің мәнділігі (ρ=−0.64) және өміршеңдік (ρ=−0.68) көрсеткіштерімен теріс корреляцияланды.

Қорытынды. Нәтижелер ресурстық тұжырымдаманы растайды: өмірдің мәнділігі мен өміршеңдік қорғаныш факторлары болып табылады, ал тұлғааралық тәуелділік пен қосалқы тәуелділік үмітсіздікке жетелейтін осалдық тізбегін құрайды. Автономияны, жеке шекараларды және мағыналық реттеуді күшейту оңалтудың перспективалы бағыты болып саналады.

Түйін сөздер: тәуелді мінез-құлық, қосалқы тәуелділік, тұлғааралық тәуелділік, өміршеңдік, өмірдің мәнділігі, үмітсіздік, психодиагностика.

References

American Psychiatric Association (2022). Substance-related and addictive disorders. Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders. URL: https://doi.org/10.1176/appi.books.9780890425787.x16_Substance_Related_Disorders.

Anderson S.C. (1994). A critical analysis of the concept of codependency. Social Work. 39 (6), P. 677-685.

Bacon I., McKay E., Reynolds F., McIntyre A. (2020). The lived experience of codependency: An interpretative phenomenological analysis International Journal of Mental Health and Addiction. 18 (3), P. 754-771.

Beck A.T., Weissman A., Lester D., Trexler L. (1974). The measurement of pessimism: The hopelessness scale. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology. –42 (6), P. 861-865.

Hanna D., White R.G., Lyons K., McParland M.J., Shannon C., Mulholland C. (2011). The structure of the Beck Hopelessness Scale: A confirmatory factor analysis in UK students. Personality and Individual Differences. 51 (1), P. 17-22.

Hirschfeld R.M.A., Klerman G.L., Gough H.G., Barrett J., Korchin S.J., Chodoff P. A (1977). measure of interpersonal dependency. Journal of Personality Assessment. 41 (6), P. 610-618.

Ibragim A., Issatayeva B., Kuanzhanova K., Mandykayeva A., Mambetalina A. (2025). Psychological rehabilitation of individuals with alcohol use disorder, drug addiction, gambling disorder, and codependency. Acta Psychologica. -URL: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/40381539/

Kelly J.F., Bergman B.G., Hoeppner B.B., Vilsaint C., White W.L. (2017). Prevalence and pathways of recovery from drug and alcohol problems in the United States population: Implications for practice, research, and policy. Drug and Alcohol Dependence. 181, P. 162-169.

Kim E.S., Ryff C., Hassett A., Brummett C., Yeh C., Strecher V. (2020). Sense of purpose in life and likelihood of future illicit drug use or prescription medication misuse. Psychosomatic Medicine. 82 (7), P. 715-721.

Kolenova A.S., Kukulyar A.M., Denisova E.G., Ermakov P.N. (2024). Self-attitude and reflection in codependent women: A comparative study. Psychology in Russia: State of the Art. 17 (1), P. 116-132.

Kuo W.-H., Gallo J.J., Eaton W.W. (2004). Hopelessness, depression, substance disorder, and suicidality: A 13-year community-based study. Social Psychiatry and Psychiatric Epidemiology. 39 (6), P. 497-501.

Leach D., Kranzler H.R. (2013). An interpersonal model of addiction relapse. Addictive Disorders & Their Treatment. 12 (4), P. 183-192.

Maddi S.R. (2006) Hardiness: The courage to grow from stresses. The Journal of Positive Psychology, 1 (3), P. 160-168.

Marco J.H., Pérez S., García-Alandete J. (2016). Meaning in life buffers the association between risk factors for suicide and hopelessness in participants with mental disorders. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 72 (7), P. 689-700.

Moreira D., Azeredo A., Dias P. (2023). Risk factors for gambling disorder: A systematic review. Journal of Gambling Studies, 39 (2), P. 483-511.

Potenza M.N., Balodis I.M., Derevensky J., Grant J.E., Petry N.M., Verdejo-Garcia A., Yau Y.H.C. (2019). Gambling disorder, Nature Reviews Disease Primers. 5 (1), P. 51.

Seksenbayev N.Zh., Inoue K., Moldagaliyev T.M., Sarsembina Zh.Zh., Altybayeva G.K., Almagambetova A.A., Yermekbayev A.U., Kaliyeva A.A., Noso Y., Hashioka S., Shalgumbayeva G.M., Chaizhunussova N.Zh., Ospanova N.N. (2021). Features of risk behavior and suicidal ideation in medical students. Science & Healthcare, 23(4), P. 138-146.

Tran L.T., Wardle H., Colledge-Frisby S., Taylor S., Lynch M., Rehm J., Volberg R., Marionneau V., Saxena S., Bunn C., Farrell M., Degenhardt L. (2024). The prevalence of gambling and problematic gambling: A systematic review and meta-analysis, The Lancet Public Health, 9(8), P. e594-e613.

Volkow N.D., Koob G.F., McLellan A.T. (2016) Neurobiologic advances from the brain disease model of addiction, New England Journal of Medicine, 374 (4), P. 363-371.

Zhatkanbaeva A.Y., Atakhanova S.K., Raiymbergenova K.T., Nakisheva M.K., Aydarkhanova K.N. (2021). Analysis of the legislation of the Republic of Kazakhstan on the prevention of gambling addiction. Journal of Actual Problems of Jurisprudence. 100 (4), P. 80-86.

Ministerstvo zdravooxraneniya Respubliki Kazaxstan (2023). Klinicheskiy protokol diagnostiki i lecheniya: Patologicheskoe vlechenie k azartnym igram (F63.0) [Clinical protocol for diagnosis and treatment: Pathological gambling (F63.0)]. Available at: https://diseases.medelement.com/disease/патологическое-влечение-к-азартным-играм-кп-рк-2023/17766 [in Russian].

Osin E.N., Kosheleva N.V. (2020). Test smyslozhiznennyh orientaciy: Novye dannye o strukture i validnosti [Life-purpose orientations test: New evidence on structure and validity], Voprosy psihologii [Questions of psychology], 6, P. 150-163 [in Russian]. https://publications.hse.ru/pubs/share/direct/424514618.pdf

Osin E.N., Rasskazova E.I. (2013). Kratkaya versiya testa zhiznestoykosti: Psihometricheskie harakteristiki i primenenie v organizacionnom kontekste [A short version of the Hardiness Test: Psychometric properties and application in an organizational context], Vestnik Moskovskogo universiteta. Seriya 14. Psihologiya [Moscow University Psychology Bulletin. Series 14. Psychology], 2, P. 147-165 [in Russian]. http://msupsyj.ru/pdf/vestnik_2013_2/vestnik_2013-2_147-165.Pdf

Shakimova L.S. (2020). Osobennosti prestupnogo povedeniya sovremennoi molodezhi s tochki zreniya kriminal'noi psikhologii [Features of criminal behavior of modern youth from the perspective of criminal psychology], KazU Khabarshysy. Psikhologiya zhane aleumettanu seriyasy [KazNU Bulletin. Psychology and Sociology series], 2, P. 48-54 [in Russian]. https://doi.org/10.26577/JPsS.2020.v73.i2.06

Автор туралы мәлімет:

Ибрагим А.Е. – хат-хабар авторы, «Психология» мамандығы бойынша әлеуметтік ғылымдар магистрі, Л.Н. Гумилев атындағы Еуразия ұлттық университетінің оқытушысы, Сәтбаев көшесі, 2, 010000, Астана, Қазақстан.

E-mail: solinvictus2773@gmail.com

Information about the author:

A.E. Ibragim – corresponding author, Master of Social Sciences in Psychology, Lecturer, L.N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University, 2 Satpayev St., 010000, Astana, Kazakhstan.

E-mail: solinvictus2773@gmail.com

Сведения об авторе:

Ибрагим А.Е. – автор для корреспонденции, магистр социальных наук по специальности «Психология», преподаватель, Евразийский национальный университет имени Л.Н. Гумилёва, ул. Сатпаева, 2, 010000, Астана, Казахстан.

E-mail: solinvictus2773@gmail.com