

ENNEAGRAM STYLES AND MALADAPTIVE SCHEMAS: A RESEARCH INQUIRY

Jerome Wagner, Ph.D.

Abstract

Cognitive theory is one of the dominant paradigms in psychology and psychotherapy these days. Its concepts about adaptive and maladaptive schemas resonate with the Enneagram's notion of higher and lower intellectual centers with their divine ideas and fixations. This study explored the relationship between 11 maladaptive schemas, or lifetraps, and the 9 Enneagram styles. One-hundred-twenty-five participants in the author's Enneagram Training and Certification Program were administered the *Wagner Enneagram Personality Style Scales* (WEPSS) and the *Lifetraps Questionnaire* (Young's inventory). Correlation coefficients were determined for all the variables and small but statistically significant relationships were found in the direction that corroborated both cognitive and Enneagram theory. The interrelationships are presented and discussed with the intention of improving our techniques for noticing and addressing particular schemas corresponding to particular Enneagram types.

Introduction

The current *Zeitgeist* in psychology involves the study of cognitive processes (Schultz, 1981). Some have referred to the *cognitive revolution* in psychology (Hill, 2002) as a reaction to the behavioral approach. Others observe that psychology has had a long cognitive tradition and so present-day interests are more like a *cognitive evolution* (Hergenhahn, 2005).

Cognitive psychotherapy has gained ascendancy these days as a valid and effective approach to assessing and bringing about a change in how a person construes the world and responds to it.

The Enneagram's description of divine ideas, nine points of view, habits of attention, and different perspectives for looking at the world, is quite compatible with this contemporary spirit.

The Enneagram's and cognitive therapy's insights into our mental maps seem quite congenial. The intent behind this study is to discover just how congruent they are. Do particular Enneatypes employ or favor certain cognitive schemas over others? It's helpful to know what programs are running in the background of our mental computer because they determine what data get inputted into the system, how the data get processed once they're in, and then what response is generated to deal with the data. If we don't know what our mental computer is doing, we're governed by it. If we know what programs are operating, we can delete them, modify them, update, and upgrade them.

So the purpose of this study is to see what cognitive psychology has to offer Enneagram studies and whether the Enneagram might embody some of this cognitive theory and spirit. In particular we'll inquire into what correlations exist among Enneagram styles and various maladaptive schemas described by Aaron Beck and his protégé Jeffrey Young, two prominent practitioners of cognitive psychotherapy.

How Schemas Work Within the Enneagram System and Cognitive Therapy

From the Enneagram perspective, the nine personality styles represent different paradigms or schemas with particular points of view, or lenses, for looking at the world. For the purpose of this article, paradigms, schemas, and lenses are used interchangeably.

A *paradigm* is a way of organizing and giving meaning to the phenomena within and around us. Our paradigms are *objective* when we see the world as it is; our paradigms are *subjective* when we perceive the world as we imagine it to be, or how we are afraid it might be, or how we want it to be. *Schemas are adaptive* when they accurately represent reality and accommodate themselves to fit it; schemas are *maladaptive* when they distort reality and assimilate it into their preconceptions. Our *lenses are proper* when they are aligned with our true self or proprium (the term Allport suggests for the inner unity of the self) and when they enable us to see the world clearly as it is; our lenses are *inappropriate* when they arise from our false self and are refracting of reality or are out of date.

Paradigms, schemas, and lenses facilitate our interactions with the world or make them more difficult; they give us acute insights and resourceful problem-solving skills; or they blur our vision and give us headaches.

The mind likes and looks for regularities. Paradigms or schemas are based on and formed around the recurring patterns we notice. They help us make sense of our experiences and provide us with a predictive capacity to anticipate what's going to happen next and what affect our behavior will have on our surroundings.

Aaron Beck (1967), one of the early progenitors of cognitive therapy, describes a schema as

a cognitive structure for screening, coding, and evaluating the stimuli that impinge on the organism....On the basis of the matrix of schemas, the individual is able to orient himself in relation to time and space and to categorize and interpret experiences in a meaningful way. (p.283)

Beck (1967) noted that schemas bias our interpretation of reality in a consistent manner. When the distortions become pathological, they show up as "typical misconceptions, distorted attitudes, invalid premises, and unrealistic goals and expectations" (p. 284). Jeffrey Young (1999), a disciple of Beck's, describes early maladaptive schemas as: "extremely stable and enduring themes that develop during childhood, are elaborated throughout an individual's lifetime, and are

dysfunctional to a significant degree. These schemas serve as templates for the processing of later experience” (p. 9).

According to Young (1999):

1. Most early maladaptive schemas are unconditional beliefs and feelings about oneself in relation to the environment. Schemas are a priori truths that are implicit and taken for granted....When the schema is activated, individuals believe that they can, at best, delay or hide the inevitable bad outcome such as rejection or punishment.
2. Early maladaptive schemas are self-perpetuating, and therefore much more resistant to change. Because schemas are developed early in life, they often form the core of an individual’s self-concept and conception of the environment.
3. Early maladaptive schemas, by definition, must be dysfunctional in some significant and recurring manner.
4. Early maladaptive schemas are usually activated by events in the environment relevant to the particular schema.
5. Early maladaptive schemas are closely tied to high levels of affect. Early maladaptive schemas seem to be the result of the child’s innate temperament, interacting with dysfunctional experiences with parents, siblings, and peers during the first few years of life. (pp. 9-11)

The resourceful high side and the non-resourceful low side of the Enneagram styles can be thought of in terms of useful and not so useful paradigms, schemas, and lenses.

Oscar Ichazo (1982) speaks of *divine* ideas which reside in the higher intellectual center. For him divine ideas represent ego-free ways of apprehending reality. At a lesser level of consciousness, they might be thought of as *adaptive cognitive schemas* or *objective paradigms* or *proper lenses*, which align us with our true selves and with the real world. Since they more or less accurately map the territory, they’re useful.

In the lower intellectual center reside what Ichazo calls *mental fixations*. These are *maladaptive cognitive schemas* or *subjective paradigms* or *inappropriate lenses*, which distort the reality of who we are and the reality of our surroundings. Because they skew our view of life, they are not so helpful.

Jeffrey Young in his book *Reinventing Your Life* (1993), which he co-wrote with Janet Klosko, labels these early maladaptive schemas “lifetraps.” In this book he describes eleven of these lifetraps. He expands this list to eighteen early maladaptive schemas in his later works *Cognitive Therapy for Personality Disorders: a Schema-Focused Approach* (1999) and *Schema Therapy: A Practitioner’s Guide* (2003).

It is possible for us to employ several of these lifetraps or none of them. Some of us use bifocals or even trifocals and some meditators don’t need lenses at

all. Some lifetraps may have been more active when we were younger or might distort our perception when we are under stress. Some lifetraps lenses might be really strong and significantly distort reality, thus getting in the way of our negotiating the world; while others might be weak and only slightly interfere with our getting around.

In his words here are Young's (1993) brief descriptions of these 11 lifetraps from *Reinventing Your Life*. There are some remarkable similarities to the "automatic thinking" associated with the downside of certain Enneagram styles:

The Eleven Lifetraps

Two lifetraps relate to a lack of safety or security in your childhood family. These are *Abandonment and Mistrust*.

Abandonment

The *Abandonment* lifetraps is the feeling that the people you love will leave you, and you will end up emotionally isolated forever. Whether you feel people close to you will die, leave home forever, or abandon you because they prefer someone else, somehow you feel that you will be left alone. Because of this belief, you may cling to people close to you too much. Ironically, you end up pushing them away. You may get very upset or angry about even normal separations.

Mistrust and Abuse

The *Mistrust and Abuse* lifetraps is the expectation that people will hurt or abuse you in some way—that they will cheat, lie to, manipulate, humiliate, physically harm, or otherwise take advantage of you. If you have this lifetraps, you hide behind a wall of mistrust to protect yourself. You never let people get too close. You are suspicious of other people's intentions, and tend to assume the worst. You expect that the people you love will betray you. Either you avoid relationships altogether, form superficial relationships in which you do not really open up to others, or you form relationships with people who treat you badly and then feel angry and vengeful toward them.

Two lifetraps relate to the strength of your emotional connections to others: *Emotional Deprivation and Social Exclusion*.

Emotional Deprivation

Emotional Deprivation is the belief that your need for love will never be met adequately by other people. You feel that no one truly cares for you or understands how you feel. You find yourself attracted to cold and unresponsive people, or you are cold and unresponsive yourself, leading you to form relationships that inevitably prove unsatisfying. You feel cheated, and you alternate between being angry about it and feeling hurt and alone. Ironically, your anger just drives people further away, ensuring your continued deprivation.

Social Exclusion

Social Exclusion involves your connection to friends and groups. It has to do with feeling isolated from the rest of the world, with feeling different. If you have this lifetrapped, as a child you felt excluded by peers. You did not belong to a group of friends. Perhaps you had some unusual characteristic that made you feel different in some way. As an adult you maintain your lifetrapped mainly through avoidance. You avoid socializing in groups and making friends.

You may have felt excluded because there was something about you that other children rejected. Hence you felt socially undesirable. As an adult you may feel that you are ugly, sexually undesirable, low in status, poor in conversational skills, boring, or otherwise deficient. When you reenact your childhood rejection, you feel and act inferior in social situations.

It is not always apparent that someone has a *Social Exclusion* lifetrapped. Many people with this lifetrapped are quite comfortable in intimate settings and are quite socially skilled. Their lifetrapped may not show in one-to-one relationships. It sometimes surprises us to realize how anxious and aloof they may feel at parties, in classes, at meetings, or at work. They have a restless quality, a quality of looking for a place to belong.

Two lifetrappeds relate to your ability to function independently in the world. These lifetrappeds are *Dependence* and *Vulnerability*.

Dependence

If you are caught in the *Dependence* lifetrapped, you feel unable to handle everyday life in a competent manner without considerable help from others. You depend on others to act as a crutch and need constant support. As a child you were made to feel incompetent when you tried to assert your independence. As an adult, you seek out strong figures upon whom to become dependent and allow them to rule your life. At work, you shrink from acting on your own. Needless to say, this holds you back.

Vulnerability

With *Vulnerability*, you live in fear that disaster is about to strike whether natural, criminal, medical, or financial. You do not feel safe in the world. If you have this lifetrapped, as a child you were made to feel that the world is a dangerous place. You were probably overprotected by your parents, who worried too much about your safety. Your fears are excessive and unrealistic, yet you let them control your life, and pour your energy into making sure that you are safe. Your fears may revolve around illness: having an anxiety attack, getting AIDS, or going crazy. They may be focused around financial vulnerability: going broke and ending up on the streets. Your vulnerability may revolve around other phobic situations, such as a fear of flying, being mugged, or earthquakes.

The two lifetrappeds that relate to your self-esteem are: *Defectiveness* and *Failure*.

Defectiveness

With *Defectiveness*, you feel inwardly flawed and defective. You believe that you would be fundamentally unlovable to anyone who got close enough to really know you. Your defectiveness would be exposed. As a child, you did not feel respected for who you were in your family. Instead, you were criticized for your “flaws.” You blamed yourself and felt unworthy of love. As an adult, you are afraid of love. You find it difficult to believe that people close to you value you, so you expect rejection.

Failure

Failure is the belief that you are inadequate in areas of achievement, such as school, work, and sports. You believe you have failed relative to your peers. As a child, you were made to feel inferior in terms of achievement. You may have had a learning disability, or you may never have learned enough discipline to master important skills, such as reading. Other children were always better than you. You were called “stupid,” “untalented,” or “lazy.” As an adult, you maintain your lifetrap by exaggerating the degree of your failure and by acting in ways that ensure your continued failure.

Two lifetraps deal with Self-Expression, your ability to express what you want and get your true needs met: *Subjugation* and *Unrelenting Standards*.

Subjugation

With *Subjugation*, you sacrifice your own needs and desires for the sake of pleasing others or meeting their needs. You allow others to control you. You do this either out of guilt—that you hurt other people by putting yourself first—or fear that you will be punished or abandoned if you disobey. As a child, someone close to you, probably a parent, subjugated you. As an adult, you repeatedly enter relationships with dominant, controlling people and subjugate yourself to them or you enter relationships with needy people who are too damaged to give back to you in return. expected to be the best, and you were taught that anything else was failure. You learned that nothing you did was quite good enough.

Entitlement

The final lifetrap, *Entitlement*, is associated with the ability to accept realistic limits in life. People who have this lifetrap feel special. They insist that they be able to do, say, or have whatever they want immediately. They disregard what others consider reasonable, what is actually feasible, the time or patience usually required, and the cost to others. They have difficulty with self-discipline.

Many of the people with this lifetrap were spoiled as children. They were not required to show self-control or to accept the restrictions placed on other children. As adults, they still get very angry when they do not get what they want. (pp. 18-22)

Correlations Among Enneagram Styles and Lifetraps

To see whether there were any correlations among the Enneagram styles and these 11 lifetraps, the author gave participants in his Enneagram Spectrum Training and Certification Programs the *Wagner Enneagram Personality Style Scales*, published by Western Psychological Services (1999), and the *Lifetraps Questionnaire*, found in Young's book *Reinventing Your Life* (1993).

The *Lifetraps Questionnaire* is an unresearched inventory consisting of 10 items for each lifetraps. The questionnaire was intended to give a quick measure of the strength of the various lifetraps. So while it wasn't designed to be used for research, it is useful in a therapy setting to help an individual discover what maladaptive schemas he or she might be using. For this study the author used a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (*completely untrue of me*), 2 (*mostly untrue of me*), 3 (*somewhat true of me*), 4 (*mostly true of me*), and 5 (*describes me perfectly*). So the range of the scores for each scale goes from 10 – 50.

The *Wagner Enneagram Personality Style Scales* (WEPSS) measures the resourceful, adaptive side of each Enneagram style, the non-resourceful, maladaptive dimension of each style, and gives an overall score for each type. The WEPSS is a 200 item inventory, consisting of 22 items per scale, half measuring the positive features of each type and half measuring the negative dimensions of each type. It uses a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (*almost never fits me*), 2 (*rarely or seldom fits me*), 3 (*occasionally fits me*), 4 (*frequently fits me*), and 5 (*almost always fits me*). The WEPSS (1999) has considerable research behind it and has sufficient standardization, reliability, and validity data to be reviewed favorably in the *Buros Mental Measurements Yearbook, 15th Edition* (2003).

One-hundred-twenty-five people participated in this study. All were enrolled in Enneagram Training programs offered by the author. Most participants already knew their Enneagram type, though this wasn't required for this research. There were 44 men (35%) and 81 women (65%) whose ages ranged from 27-72 with an average age of 48. The majority of the participants were from across the United States, but there were also individuals from Asia, Europe, Africa, and Australia. All of the participants had four or more years of higher education.

SPSS software was used to find the means, standard deviations and Pearson correlations for the data, using a two-tailed test to measure the significance of the correlations since it is more stringent than a one-tailed test. This also yields lower correlations.

Results

Figure 1 gives the range, mean, and standard deviation for each scale on the WEPSS and Lifetraps Questionnaire. Figure 2 gives the intercorrelations among the WEPSS and lifetraps scales.

The results are quite consistent with the descriptions of the Enneagram styles and the 11 lifetraps or maladaptive schemas, thus providing some concurrent validity

Figure 1. Number, Range, Mean, and Standard Deviation for WEPSS and Lifetraps Scales

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
GENDER	125	1	2	1.65	.48
AGE	125	27	72	48.47	9.82
E1 POS	125	.0	98.5	46.771	30.034
E1NEG	125	.0	99.4	49.996	31.896
E1TOT	125	.0	99.2	48.067	31.871
E2POS	125	.0	98.9	45.007	29.715
E2NEG	125	.2	98.0	41.982	28.493
E2TOT	125	.0	98.0	42.874	29.099
E3POS	125	1.8	99.0	50.032	28.929
E3NEG	125	1.0	99.0	54.898	31.418
E3TOT	125	1.1	99.0	52.790	30.576
E4POS	125	.2	99.7	47.530	32.205
E4NEG	125	.1	99.6	53.622	29.881
E4TOT	125	.3	99.6	49.886	30.905
E5POS	125	.0	99.5	46.142	33.348
E5NEG	125	4.0	99.4	53.065	30.119
E5TOT	125	.0	99.2	48.452	33.495
E6POS	125	.0	98.0	46.051	29.359
E6NEG	125	1.5	99.0	53.885	30.405
E6TOT	125	1.0	99.0	50.562	30.185
E7POS	125	.0	99.0	46.442	31.000
E7NEG	125	.6	99.0	50.809	29.063
E7TOT	125	1.0	99.0	48.351	31.325
E8POS	125	.0	99.0	50.002	28.829
E8NEG	125	1.0	99.0	52.403	30.263
E8TOT	125	.0	99.5	51.659	30.537
E9POS	125	.0	99.7	43.782	33.240
E9NEG	125	.2	99.6	46.177	28.512
E9TOT	125	.0	99.8	43.706	33.108

Figure 2. Correlations among Enneagram Styles and Maladaptive Schemas

	abandon	mistrust	emot depr	soc excl	depend	vulner	defect	failure	subjug	unreal stds	entitle
enn 1 pos	0.012	0.071	0.127	0.122	-0.142	-0.022	0.067	-0.019	0.018	.380**	-0.199
enn 1 neg	0.166	.241**	.216**	0.175	0.124	0.097	.323**	0.149	0.173	.539**	0.12
enn 1 tot	0.1	.185*	.185*	0.154	-0.024	0.054	.207*	0.063	0.092	.501**	-0.045
enn 2 pos	0.096	-0.087	-0.087	-0.15	-0.041	0.86	-0.147	-0.082	.200*	0.022	-0.096
enn 2 neg	.325**	.186*	.185*	0.099	.237**	.204*	0.145	0.174	.353**	.274**	.282**
enn 2 tot	.261**	0.101	0.073	-0.003	0.141	0.173	0.021	0.072	.343**	0.169	0.128
enn 3 pos	0.017	0.079	0.072	-.185*	-.272**	-0.054	-0.052		-.186	.219*	0.061
enn 3 neg	0.132	0.094	0.046	-0.165	-0.143	0.105	-0.001	-0.113	-0.112	.234**	.257**
enn 3 tot	0.9	0.107	0.074	-0.17	-.194*	0.04	-0.016	-0.159	-0.141	.252**	.186*
enn 4 pos	.285**	0.057	0.063	-0.144	-0.02	.193*	0.06	-0.139	-0.004	0.023	0.037
enn 4 neg	.345**	.24**	.318**	.259**	.200*	.270**	.269**	0.2028	0.132	.188*	.243**
enn 4 tot	.367**	0.2128	.245**	0.139	0.121	.269**	.225*	0.051	0.076	0.131	0.164
enn 5 pos	-0.092	0.074	0.125	.271**	0.029	-0.117	-0.03	-0.027	-0.028	-0.022	-.288*
enn 5 neg	0.04	0.097	.237**	.422**	.249**	-0.025	0.14	0.161	0.12	0.005	-0.075
enn 5 tot	-0.019	0.094	.207*	.381**	.177*	-0.076	0.082	0.089	0.094	-0.004	-0.148
enn 6 pos	0.091	0.12	0.132	.219*	0.129	0.046	0.097	0.147	.	.226*	-0.146
enn 6 neg	.201*	0.1	.179*	.277**	.308**	.249**	.245**	.336**	.251**	0.161	0.127
enn 6 tot	0.164	0.125	.186*	.299**	.261**	0.173	0.197	.291**	.286**	.234**	0.007
enn 7 pos	-0.003	-0.064	-0.119	-.31**	-0.145	0.05	-.206*	-0.166	.199*	-0.114	0.095
enn 7 neg	0.102	0.068	0.084	-0.108	0.035	0.138	-0.041	-0.032	-0.087	-0.081	.241**
enn 7 tot	0.051	0.005	-0.035	-.221*	-0.059	0.089	-0.131	-0.104	-0.154	0.107	0.173
enn 8 pos	-0.109	0.052	-0.006	-0.213	.299**	-0.151	-0.148	-.212*	-.301**	0.126	0.045
enn 8 neg	0.03	0.151	0.089	-0.121	-0.109	-0.012	0.049	-0.052	-0.173	0.174	0.259
enn 8 tot	-0.039	0.119	0.046	-0.174	.96*	-0.094	-0.034	-0.122	-.249**	.181*	0.183
enn 9 pos	-0.108	-0.153	-.194*	-0.042	0.037	-0.069	-.23**	-0.045	0.117	-.314**	-.178*
enn 9 neg	0.021	-0.04	0.013	0.138	.281**	0.022	-0.067	0.147	.246**	-.27**	0.024
enn 9 tot	-0.054	-0.119	-0.113	0.031	0.145	-0.032	-.181*	0.029	0.174	-.310**	-0.099

for both measures.

You will notice that the negative or non-resourceful scales for each Enneagram style, which were designed to measure Ichazo's *fixations*, correlate consistently more highly with the 11 lifetraps than do the positive or resourceful scales of each Enneagram type, which were constructed to measure the healthy aspects of the Enneagram styles. That is what would be expected if the high side of the style utilizes adaptive schemas while the low side of the style uses maladaptive schemas.

The significant correlations are found on the left side of each box in Figure 2. A single asterisk means that 5 times out of 100 you would expect this large a correlation to occur by chance while a double asterisk means that 1 time out of 100 you would expect this large a correlation to occur by chance.

Discussion

Twos (.325), Fours (.345), and Sixes (.201) who are in a non-resourceful space identify with the *Abandonment* lifetraps at the .01 and .05 levels of confidence. Interestingly Fours also identify with the *Abandonment* lifetraps even when they are in a resourceful space (.285). Since abandonment has been recognized as a major fear of the Four style, this finding is consistent with the theory. A primary vulnerability for Twos is rejection, so it is not surprising that they would have an abandonment schema. And Sixes who have a strong need for group acceptance and belonging, fear being ejected from the group. So people will leave you unless you are helpful, special, or loyal enough. Paradoxically, your clinging, differentness, and suspiciousness may bring about the very thing you fear most: being rejected.

Ones (.241), Twos (.186), and Fours (.240), when they are in a non-resourceful space, identify with the *Mistrust* and *Abuse* lifetraps. While the correlations are small, they are significant at the .01 and .05 levels of confidence. People will hurt, abuse, or humiliate you in some way and you need to be aware of their intentions. If you are perfect, indispensable, or irreplaceable, people may not abuse or devalue you.

Ones (.216), Twos (.185), Fours (.318), Fives (.237), and Sixes (.179) in a non-resourceful place identify with the *Emotional Deprivation* lifetraps; while there is a low, but statistically significant, negative correlation with the Nines (-.194) when they are in a resourceful place. This is the maladaptive belief that your emotional needs won't be met. Your emotional response might be to feel angry and imperfect (type One), hurt and rejected (type Two), misunderstood and alone (type Four), cold and detached (type Five), cheated and exposed (type Six). When Nines are in a healthy state, they have some sense that their needs will be met in contrast to feeling uncared for and neglected when they are in an unhealthy place.

Fours (.259), Fives (.422), and Sixes (.277) identify with the *Social Exclusion* maladaptive schema when they are in a non-resourceful space. It is noteworthy

that Fives (.271) and Sixes (.219) fear social exclusion even when they are in a resourceful place. On the other hand, Threes (-.185) and Sevens (-.31) do not identify with this lifetrapped when they are in a healthy space. While Fours, Fives, and Sixes feel outside the game or on the periphery, Threes and Sevens put themselves in the middle of the action with the in crowd.

Twos (.237), Fours (.200), Fives (.249), Sixes (.308), and Nines (.281) identify with the *Dependence* lifetrapped when they are feeling non-resourceful. To the contrary, Threes (-.272) and Eights (-.299) correlate negatively with this schema when they are in a resourceful state. With the *Dependence* schema, you need others to reinforce your self esteem and you feel anxious when you stand alone. Twos need the attention of others to feel good about themselves and fear there may be no one home when they are alone. Fours believe they are worthwhile only when they are loved—even though they may appear to be aloof. Fives are said to be the most underdog of all the Enneagram types and often feel inadequate and incompetent. Their isolated lifestyle can be a counter-dependent maneuver against feeling too needy. Sixes may turn to authority figures to protect them. Nines may merge with a strong other to energize them and carry them through life. On the other hand, Threes and Eights tend to be proactive, assertive, competent, initiative-taking leaders. They are often the ones dependent individuals lean on.

Twos (.204), Fours (.270), and Sixes (.249) in a non-resourceful space identify with the *Vulnerability* lifetrapped. This is the maladaptive belief that the world is not safe and so you are prone to worry. Twos and Fours are particularly vulnerable to shame, while Sixes are vulnerable to just about anything.

Ones (.323), Fours (.269), and Sixes (.245) identify with the *Defectiveness* lifetrapped when they are in a non-resourceful place; while Sevens (-.206) and Nines (-.230), when they are feeling healthy, do not believe they are defective. This is the belief that you are flawed and if people really knew you, they would reject you. So, Ones are hyperaware of their imperfections, Fours of their flaws, and Sixes of their inadequacies. Sevens and Nines, on the other hand, are okay as they are and either look on the bright side of life or just don't hear the squeaks.

Sixes (.366), in a non-resourceful space, identify with the *Failure* lifetrapped. Threes (-.210) and Eights (-.212) do not identify with this maladaptive schema when they are in a resourceful space. Doubting Sixes seem to believe that they're not okay; while Threes and Eights believe that they are okay. They would be happy to help the not-okay Six to either be more effective (type Three) or else it's the Six's problem (type Eight).

Twos (.353), Sixes (.251), and Nines (.246), on their downside, identify with the *Subjugation* lifetrapped while Eights (-.301) and Sevens (-.199) on their upside do not. Subjugation means you put others' needs ahead of your own to please them (type Two), for fear you will be punished (type Six), lest you upset the harmony of the universe (type Nine). Eights would be those to whom Twos, Sixes, and

Nines subjugate themselves. Sevens tend to be rather egalitarian and don't give any particular obeisance to authority.

Ones (.539), Twos (.274), Threes (.234), Fours (.188), Sixes (.226), and Eights (.181) identify with the *Unrealistic Standards* schema while Nines (-.314) do not. Ones have a corner on the unrealistic standards market, and as would be expected, identify the most with this lifetrapped. This is the highest correlation of them all. All the types, when they identify with their idealized self image, strive to live up to the standards of their own egotype and so are tyrannized by their particular shoulds. The relaxed Nines, though, don't share this maladaptive schema of unrelenting standards. This might be their way of conforming to their anti-standard of being laid back, untroubled, unstriving, and undisturbed.

Finally Twos (.282), Threes (.257), Fours (.243), and Sevens (.241) identify with the *Entitlement* lifetrapped when they are in a non-resourceful place; while Fives (-.288) and Nines (-.178) do not identify with this maladaptive schema when they are in a resourceful mode. So it seems that Twos feel entitled for all that they've done for others, Threes for all that they've achieved, Fours for the special people they are, and Sevens just have a right to have fun. Fives and Nines don't feel entitled. Perhaps that's because Fives believe the world is depriving and don't expect to get any gifts and Nines believe the world is neglectful and so don't expect any special treatment.

Interestingly Eights only slightly identified with the maladaptive schema of unrealistic standards and negatively identified with the maladaptive schemas of dependency, failure, and subjugation. Otherwise they manifested no correlations with any maladaptive schemas. So either Eights not only "tell it like it is" but they also "see it like it is," or their favorite defense of denial is working well. It seems judicious at this time to leave it to the Eights to decide which option applies.

Conclusion

Though the correlations among these maladaptive lifetraps and Enneagram styles are small, they are statistically significant and are congruent with both cognitive schema and Enneagram theories, thus providing some construct validity for both systems.

The low correlations might be due in part to the items in the *Lifetrapped Questionnaire* which require its takers to endorse some rather strong statements such as: "Throughout my life people close to me have abused me." The presumption is that the participants in these Enneagram Training programs are mostly high functioning individuals who would not endorse such items very robustly. Hence the scale means are rather low. If a clinical population of individuals engaged in long term psychotherapy were tested, the hypothesis would be their scores would be more elevated.

So future studies might be conducted with such a population to see if the correlations would be higher. Even so, evidence is provided here that cognitive

theory and Enneagram theory can mutually share their insights thereby enriching both paradigms.

References

- Allport, G. (1955). *Becoming*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Beck, A. (1967). *Depression: Causes and treatment*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Hergenhahn, B.R. (2005). *An introduction to the history of psychology* (5th ed.). Belmont, CA: Thomson Wadsworth.
- Hill, W. (2002). *Learning* (7th ed.) Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Ichazo, O. (1982). *Interviews with Oscar Ichazo*. New York: Arica Institute Press.
- Plake, B. S., Impara, J. C., & Spies, R. A. (Eds.) (2003). *The fifteenth mental measurements yearbook*. Lincoln, NE: Buros Institute of Mental Measurements.
- Schultz, D. (1981). *A history of modern psychology* (3rd ed.). New York: Academic Press.
- Wagner, J. (1999). *Wagner Enneagram Personality Style Scales: Manual*. Los Angeles: Western Psychological Services.
- Young, J. & Klosko, J. (1993). *Reinventing your life*. New York: Dutton.
- Young, J. (1999). *Cognitive therapy for personality disorders: A schema-focused approach*. (3rd ed.). Sarasota: Professional Resource Press.
- Young, J. (2003). *Schema therapy: A practitioner's guide*. New York: Guilford Press.