

Addiction as a Multidimensional Disorder: A Biopsychosocial Theoretical Analysis

Souad guernina *

Yahia Fares University of Medea (Algeria), souadguernina9@gmail.com

Receipt date: 12/02/2026; Acceptance Date: 01/06/2026

Abstract

Addiction is a chronic and relapsing disorder shaped by complex interactions between biological vulnerability, psychological regulation processes, and social–environmental determinants. This article examines addiction through the biopsychosocial model as a dynamic and integrative framework that moves beyond reductionist explanations. Drawing on contemporary diagnostic systems such as the DSM–5–TR and ICD–11, the review highlights how clinical criteria emphasize impaired control, compulsive engagement, and persistence of substance use despite harmful consequences, reflecting multidimensional mechanisms rather than single–cause pathways. The paper argues that addiction cannot be fully understood without considering the reciprocal influence of neurobiological adaptations, maladaptive cognitive–emotional patterns, and broader cultural and structural contexts. Particular attention is given to the importance of culturally sensitive applications of the biopsychosocial approach, especially in Arab societies where stigma, family structures, and social norms shape both help–seeking and treatment engagement. Ultimately, the article calls for integrated models linking diagnosis, etiology, prevention, and intervention within a coherent biopsychosocial perspective

Keywords: Addiction, Biopsychosocial Model, DSM–5–TR, Culture, Mental Health

*souad guernina.

1 - Introduction

Addiction represents one of the most persistent and complex challenges in contemporary mental health. It cannot be adequately understood as a purely biological dysfunction, an individual psychological weakness, or a form of social deviance. Rather, addiction is increasingly conceptualized as a chronic and relapsing disorder shaped by the dynamic interaction of multiple determinants operating across biological, psychological, and social levels. This multidimensional understanding reflects a profound transformation in scientific perspectives, moving away from earlier moralistic interpretations that framed addiction as a lack of willpower or personal failure, toward integrative models grounded in empirical research (Engel, 1977; Volkow & Koob, 2022).

Clinical and epidemiological evidence further reinforces this shift. Individuals exposed to similar substances or comparable environmental conditions often follow markedly different trajectories, ranging from experimental use to chronic dependence and recurrent relapse. Such variability cannot be sufficiently explained by linear or reductionist approaches that prioritize either neurobiological mechanisms alone or individual choice in isolation. Instead, it highlights the role of differential vulnerability, psychological regulation processes, and social–environmental constraints in shaping addictive behavior (Heather, 2018).

Contemporary diagnostic systems reflect this evolving scientific understanding. The Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (DSM–5–TR) conceptualizes addiction within the category of substance use disorders, emphasizing impaired control, compulsive engagement, and continued use despite harmful consequences (American Psychiatric Association, 2022). Similarly, the International Classification of Diseases (ICD–11) defines addiction as a disorder of behavioral regulation characterized by strong internal urges and persistence despite adverse outcomes (World Health Organization, 2022). Although these classification frameworks remain primarily descriptive rather than etiological, their diagnostic logic implicitly acknowledges that addiction is a multidimensional phenomenon involving intertwined biological, psychological, and social processes.

Despite these advances, a substantial portion of addiction research and clinical practice continues to rely on fragmented or reductionist perspectives. Neurobiological models often focus predominantly on alterations in reward circuitry and executive control, psychological models may emphasize maladaptive cognitions

and emotional dysregulation while neglecting underlying neuroadaptations, and social models tend to prioritize structural determinants without fully accounting for individual vulnerability. This theoretical fragmentation has limited the explanatory power of single-domain approaches and has contributed to persistent challenges in relapse prevention and long-term recovery.

Against this background, the present article examines addiction through the biopsychosocial model as an integrative theoretical framework capable of overcoming the limitations of reductionist explanations. The article aims to analyze how biological vulnerability, psychological processes, and social context interact dynamically in the development, maintenance, and relapse of addictive behaviors. In doing so, it seeks to clarify the added explanatory and clinical value of a multidimensional approach compared to single-factor models.

The original contribution of this article does not lie in merely reiterating the biopsychosocial model, but rather in theoretically repositioning it as a dynamic and interactional framework aligned with contemporary diagnostic systems. By systematically linking DSM-5-TR and ICD-11 diagnostic criteria to biological mechanisms, psychological regulation processes, and social determinants, the paper demonstrates that current classifications implicitly rely on multidimensional pathways rather than single-cause explanations. This perspective critically exposes the limitations of reductionist models, particularly their inability to account for differential vulnerability, relapse dynamics, and long-term recovery trajectories.

Furthermore, the article emphasizes that biopsychosocial integration cannot be applied as a culturally neutral template. Instead, it must be contextually adapted, especially in Arab and culturally diverse settings where stigma, family structures, and sociocultural norms strongly influence both the experience of addiction and patterns of help-seeking. This culturally sensitive repositioning aims to enhance the explanatory coherence and clinical relevance of the biopsychosocial model beyond its traditional descriptive use.

Methodologically, the article adopts a theoretical narrative review approach based on the analysis of peer-reviewed literature, authoritative diagnostic classifications, and official international guidelines. Rather than applying systematic review procedures, the objective is to provide an integrative theoretical synthesis that compares competing perspectives, identifies convergent themes across levels of analysis, and derives implications relevant to assessment, treatment planning, and prevention.

1. Conceptualization and Diagnostic Framing (DSM-5-TR / ICD-11)

Contemporary conceptualizations of addiction are closely aligned with advances in diagnostic classification systems, which increasingly frame addiction as a complex disorder of regulation rather than a purely volitional behavior. Both the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (DSM-5-TR) and the International Classification of Diseases (ICD-11) reflect this shift by emphasizing patterns of impaired control, compulsive engagement, and persistence of use despite harmful consequences, while moving away from moralistic or punitive interpretations.

In the DSM-5-TR, addiction is classified under substance use disorders and defined as a problematic pattern of substance use leading to clinically significant impairment or distress. Diagnostic criteria include impaired control over substance use, social impairment, risky use, and pharmacological indicators such as tolerance and withdrawal (American Psychiatric Association, 2022). Importantly, the DSM-5-TR conceptualizes addiction as a spectrum condition, ranging from mild to severe, thereby acknowledging heterogeneity in clinical presentation and trajectories. This dimensional approach implicitly recognizes the interaction of neurobiological processes, psychological functioning, and social context in shaping addictive behavior.

Similarly, the ICD-11 conceptualizes addiction within the broader category of disorders due to substance use, characterizing it as a pattern of use marked by a strong internal drive, diminished capacity to regulate behavior, and persistence despite adverse consequences (World Health Organization, 2022). Unlike earlier classifications, ICD-11 places particular emphasis on impaired self-regulation and loss of control, rather than on the quantity or frequency of substance consumption alone. This focus aligns with contemporary psychological and neuroscientific models that highlight dysfunctions in motivational and executive control systems.

While the DSM-5-TR and ICD-11 differ in structure and terminology, they converge on several core assumptions. Both systems conceptualize addiction as a chronic and potentially relapsing condition, recognize its functional impairment across multiple life domains, and implicitly acknowledge that addictive behaviors emerge from interactions across biological, psychological, and social levels. Neither classification explicitly adopts the biopsychosocial model as a formal framework;

however, their diagnostic criteria and underlying logic are consistent with a multidimensional understanding of addiction.

At the same time, these diagnostic systems have inherent limitations. Their primary purpose is clinical classification rather than etiological explanation, which constrains their capacity to fully capture the dynamic mechanisms underlying addiction. As a result, while DSM-5-TR and ICD-11 provide a standardized diagnostic language, they do not, on their own, offer a comprehensive account of how neurobiological vulnerability, psychological processes, and social determinants interact over time to produce addiction and relapse.

This conceptual gap highlights the relevance of integrative theoretical models. By situating diagnostic criteria within a broader biopsychosocial framework, it becomes possible to move beyond descriptive classification toward a more comprehensive understanding of addiction as a multidimensional disorder. Such an approach provides a conceptual bridge between diagnostic practice and the subsequent analysis of biological, psychological, and social dimensions, which are examined in the sections that follow.

1.1 - Biological Dimension of Addiction

The biological dimension of addiction has been extensively examined in contemporary neuroscience, particularly through research on brain reward systems, neuroadaptation, and genetic vulnerability. From this perspective, addiction is understood as a disorder involving dysregulation of neural circuits responsible for motivation, reward processing, stress response, and executive control, rather than merely as the pharmacological effect of psychoactive substances.

Central to this framework is the role of the Mes corticolimbic dopamine system, which includes the ventral tegmental area, nucleus accumbens, and prefrontal cortex. Substances with addictive potential have been shown to alter dopaminergic signaling within this circuit, thereby reinforcing drug-seeking behavior and strengthening learned associations between substance use and contextual cues (Volkow & Koob, 2022). With repeated exposure, these alterations give rise to neuroadaptive changes that diminish sensitivity to natural rewards while enhancing responsiveness to substance-related stimuli, contributing to compulsive patterns of use.

Beyond reward-related mechanisms, addiction is also associated with impairments in executive control processes mediated by the prefrontal cortex. Neuroimaging studies indicate that chronic substance use is linked to reduced inhibitory control,

impaired decision-making, and a diminished capacity to anticipate long-term consequences (Murnane, 2023). Such deficits compromise the individual's ability to regulate behavior and align closely with diagnostic emphases on impaired control and compulsivity in both DSM-5-TR and ICD-11 classifications (American Psychiatric Association, 2022; World Health Organization, 2022).

Genetic factors further contribute to biological vulnerability. Evidence from molecular genetics and neurogenetics suggests that variations in genes associated with dopamine transmission, stress reactivity, and impulse regulation may increase susceptibility to addiction, particularly when combined with environmental exposure (Darcq et al., 2024). Importantly, genetic influence is probabilistic rather than deterministic, underscoring that biological predisposition interacts dynamically with psychological and social factors across development.

Recent neurobiological models also emphasize the role of stress and negative affect systems in addiction. Dysregulation of the hypothalamic–pituitary–adrenal (HPA) axis and related neurochemical pathways has been implicated in craving, withdrawal symptoms, and relapse, especially under conditions of chronic stress (Volkow & Koob, 2022). This shift from reward-driven substance uses toward use motivated by relief from negative emotional states highlights the evolving nature of neurobiological mechanisms across different stages of addiction.

Despite the robustness of neuroscientific evidence, purely biological models of addiction remain theoretically and clinically insufficient. Neurobiological alterations alone do not fully explain why individuals with comparable neural adaptations exhibit divergent behavioral trajectories, such as sustained abstinence, controlled use, or repeated relapse. Moreover, biological accounts struggle to capture the subjective meaning attributed to substance use, the strategies individuals employ to regulate distress, and the role of intentionality and agency in recovery processes. When detached from psychological regulation and social context, neurobiological explanations risk reducing addiction to neural dysfunction while overlooking the experiential and environmental dimensions that shape behavior.

While neurobiological mechanisms provide an essential foundation for understanding addiction, they offer limited insight into how individuals interpret substance-related experiences, regulate emotions, and make decisions in everyday contexts. These experiential and regulatory processes are more adequately addressed at the psychological level of analysis, which is examined in the following section

1.2 Psychological Dimension of Addiction

The psychological dimension of addiction focuses on the cognitive, emotional, and behavioral processes that contribute to the initiation, maintenance, and relapse of addictive behaviors. Beyond neurobiological vulnerability, psychological factors shape how individuals interpret substance-related experiences, regulate emotions, and engage in decision-making, thereby influencing both risk trajectories and recovery processes.

From a cognitive perspective, addiction is associated with maladaptive beliefs and expectancy patterns regarding substance use. Individuals with substance use disorders often develop distorted cognitions that exaggerate the anticipated benefits of substances while minimizing or rationalizing their harmful consequences. These cognitive biases reinforce continued use and undermine motivation for change, particularly in high-risk situations (Beck et al., 1993). Within learning-based frameworks, repeated reinforcement strengthens substance-related schemas and promotes automatic behavioral responses that operate with limited conscious control.

Emotion regulation represents another central psychological mechanism in addiction. A substantial body of evidence indicates that substances are frequently used as a means of coping with negative affective states such as anxiety, depression, shame, or psychological distress. Over time, reliance on substances for emotional regulation may inhibit the development of adaptive coping strategies, increasing vulnerability to craving and relapse under conditions of stress (Urban et al., 2023). This functional use of substances to manage internal states complements neurobiological accounts emphasizing the shift from reward-driven use toward relief from negative affect.

Behavioral and learning theories further highlight the role of conditioning processes in addiction. Through classical conditioning, environmental cues associated with substance use acquire motivational salience and can elicit craving even in the absence of the substance itself. Operant conditioning mechanisms reinforce substance use through both positive reinforcement (pleasure) and negative reinforcement (relief from distress), contributing to the persistence of addictive behavior (Beck et al., 1993). These learned associations help explain why relapse often occurs in familiar contexts or during periods of emotional strain.

Personality traits and psychological vulnerabilities also modulate addiction risk. Traits such as impulsivity, sensation seeking, and low distress tolerance have been consistently associated with higher susceptibility to substance use disorders,

particularly when combined with environmental stressors. Importantly, these traits interact with neurobiological predispositions rather than operating independently, underscoring the need for an integrative explanatory framework.

Despite their explanatory value, psychological models remain limited when examined in isolation from biological and social determinants. Psychological processes alone cannot fully account for neuroadaptive constraints on self-regulation, nor can they explain why similar cognitive or emotional vulnerabilities result in addiction in some individuals but not in others. Moreover, an exclusive focus on intrapsychic mechanisms risks individualizing responsibility while overlooking structural and contextual influences that shape exposure, stress, and access to resources.

Psychological functioning, therefore, cannot be fully understood outside the social environments in which it develops. Cognitive schemas, emotion regulation strategies, and behavioral patterns are continuously shaped by interpersonal relationships, cultural norms, and social contexts, highlighting the necessity of examining the social dimension of addiction, addressed in the following section

1.3 Social Dimension of Addiction

The social dimension of addiction emphasizes the role of social structures, cultural norms, interpersonal relationships, and environmental conditions in shaping vulnerability to substance use, patterns of continuation, and pathways to recovery. From this perspective, addiction is not viewed solely as an individual pathology but as a phenomenon embedded within broader social contexts that influence exposure, meaning-making, and access to material and symbolic resources.

Socioeconomic conditions constitute a central social determinant of addiction. Empirical evidence consistently indicates that poverty, unemployment, social marginalization, and limited educational opportunities are associated with higher rates of substance use disorders. Such conditions increase exposure to chronic stressors while simultaneously restricting access to protective resources, including healthcare, social support, and stable living environments (Stanikzai & Wahidi, 2023). Within this framework, addictive behavior may function as a maladaptive response to structural adversity rather than as an isolated or purely voluntary behavioral choice.

Interpersonal relationships further shape the development and maintenance of addictive behaviors. Family environments characterized by conflict, neglect, or inconsistent caregiving have been linked to heightened vulnerability, particularly

when combined with early exposure to substances. Peer networks also play a decisive role through processes of social learning, normalization, and reinforcement. In many cases, substance use becomes embedded within group identity, rendering cessation more difficult due to fears of social exclusion, loss of belonging, or identity disruption.

Cultural norms and societal attitudes toward substance use influence both behavioral patterns and responses to addiction. In some contexts, substance use is socially normalized or symbolically associated with coping, masculinity, or social status, whereas in others it is heavily stigmatized. Stigma, in particular, constitutes a significant barrier to help-seeking and treatment engagement, as individuals may internalize negative social judgments and avoid formal support systems (World Health Organization, 2022). These dynamics can intensify social isolation, undermine recovery efforts, and contribute to relapse.

At the structural level, public policies and institutional responses play a critical role in shaping the social environment of addiction. Criminalization-oriented approaches often exacerbate social exclusion and hinder access to treatment, whereas public health-oriented strategies that prioritize prevention, harm reduction, and integrated care have been associated with more favorable outcomes (UNODC & WHO, 2020). Beyond service availability, such policy frameworks influence broader societal narratives regarding addiction, responsibility, and recovery.

Despite its substantial explanatory value, the social dimension alone remains insufficient for fully accounting for individual differences in addiction trajectories. Social adversity does not inevitably lead to addictive behavior, nor does the presence of social support uniformly guarantee recovery. Without integrating individual neurobiological vulnerability and psychological regulation processes, social explanations risk overstating contextual causality while underestimating personal variability. A comprehensive understanding of addiction therefore requires situating social determinants within an interactional framework that integrates biological predisposition and psychological processes.

Taken together, the social dimension elucidates how addiction is produced and sustained within relational, cultural, and structural contexts, while also highlighting its limits as a standalone explanatory model. This recognition provides a direct conceptual bridge to the biopsychosocial model, examined in the following section as an overarching framework for understanding addiction.

1.4 The Biopsychosocial Model as an Integrative Framework

The biopsychosocial model conceptualizes addiction as the outcome of dynamic and reciprocal interactions among biological vulnerability, psychological processes, and social contexts. Rather than treating these dimensions as additive components, the model emphasizes their continuous interplay across the initiation, maintenance, and relapse stages of addiction. This integrative perspective provides a coherent framework capable of bridging etiological explanation, diagnostic classification, and clinical intervention.

At the biological level, neuroadaptations in reward, stress, and executive control systems shape susceptibility to substance use and constrain self-regulatory capacity. However, these neural processes do not operate in isolation. Psychological mechanisms—such as cognitive appraisals, emotion regulation strategies, and learning histories—mediate how neurobiological signals are interpreted and translated into behavior. For example, heightened cue reactivity may result in craving or restraint depending on cognitive expectancies, coping skills, and motivational states. Thus, biological predisposition sets probabilistic boundaries within which psychological processes exert regulatory influence.

Social contexts further modulate both biological vulnerability and psychological functioning. Socioeconomic adversity, interpersonal relationships, cultural norms, and policy environments shape exposure to substances, stress burden, and access to protective resources. These social conditions interact with individual predispositions to amplify risk or promote resilience. For instance, chronic social stress may exacerbate dysregulation of stress-response systems, while supportive relationships can buffer vulnerability and facilitate recovery by reinforcing adaptive coping and treatment engagement.

Importantly, contemporary diagnostic frameworks implicitly reflect this multidimensional logic. DSM-5-TR and ICD-11 criteria emphasize impaired control, persistence despite harm, and compulsive patterns of use—features that cannot be adequately explained by any single level of analysis. Instead, these diagnostic constructs emerge from the interaction of neurobiological constraints, psychological regulation failures, and social-environmental pressures. The biopsychosocial model thus provides an explanatory structure that aligns diagnostic description with underlying mechanisms.

From a clinical perspective, the biopsychosocial model underscores the necessity of integrated intervention strategies. Effective treatment requires addressing neurobiological stabilization, psychological skill development, and social-contextual

modification in a coordinated manner. Interventions limited to a single domain—whether pharmacological, psychotherapeutic, or social—are unlikely to produce sustained outcomes in the absence of complementary support across levels.

Despite its strengths, the biopsychosocial model is not without limitations. Its breadth poses challenges for operationalization, empirical testing, and implementation within resource-constrained systems. Moreover, the model risks becoming a descriptive label rather than a functional framework if interactions among levels are not explicitly specified. Addressing these limitations requires moving beyond general integration toward clearer articulation of interaction pathways and context-sensitive applications.

Taken together, the biopsychosocial model offers a theoretically robust and clinically relevant framework for understanding addiction as a multidimensional disorder. By integrating biological predisposition, psychological regulation, and social context, it provides a foundation for comprehensive assessment, culturally responsive intervention, and sustained recovery. This integrative approach sets the stage for the discussion of clinical implications and future directions in addiction research and practice

3. Therapeutic and Preventive Implications

Viewing addiction through a biopsychosocial lens has important implications for both treatment and prevention, as it shifts clinical focus from symptom reduction alone to comprehensive, person-centered care. Rather than privileging a single modality, this perspective supports interventions that simultaneously address neurobiological mechanisms, psychological processes, and social conditions influencing addictive behavior.

From a therapeutic standpoint, the biopsychosocial model underscores the necessity of multimodal treatment strategies. Pharmacological interventions may target neurobiological dysregulation associated with craving, withdrawal, and relapse risk, yet their effectiveness is significantly enhanced when combined with evidence-based psychotherapies that address maladaptive cognitions, emotion regulation deficits, and behavioral patterns (Volkow & Blanco, 2023). Cognitive-behavioral approaches, in particular, have demonstrated efficacy in modifying distorted beliefs about substance use and strengthening coping skills, while humanistic and motivational frameworks emphasize engagement, self-efficacy, and therapeutic alliance (Beck et al., 1993; Rogers, 1961).

Equally critical is the integration of social interventions into treatment planning. Addressing social determinants such as housing instability, unemployment, stigma, and limited access to healthcare is essential for sustaining recovery beyond the clinical setting. International guidelines highlight that treatment outcomes improve when medical and psychological care are coordinated with social support services, including family involvement, vocational rehabilitation, and community-based recovery programs (UNODC & WHO, 2020). Such integration reflects the understanding that relapse often emerges from cumulative social stressors rather than isolated individual failure.

Preventive implications are similarly shaped by the biopsychosocial framework. Prevention strategies that focus exclusively on individual behavior change or biological risk overlook the broader contextual factors that contribute to vulnerability. Effective prevention therefore requires multi-level interventions that combine early identification of psychological risk factors, reduction of social inequities, and policy measures that limit harmful exposure while promoting protective environments (World Health Organization, 2022). School-based programs, family-focused interventions, and community-level initiatives are particularly relevant in addressing early risk trajectories.

Importantly, the biopsychosocial approach also calls for cultural sensitivity in both treatment and prevention. Interventions developed in Western contexts may not fully translate to other cultural settings if they fail to consider local meanings of substance use, family structures, and help-seeking norms. In Arab and other culturally diverse contexts, tailoring interventions to sociocultural realities—while maintaining evidence-based principles—remains a critical but underdeveloped area of practice and research.

Despite its strengths, implementing biopsychosocially informed interventions presents practical challenges, including resource constraints, fragmented service systems, and limited interdisciplinary collaboration. Nevertheless, the model provides a coherent framework for aligning clinical practice with the complex realities of addiction. By integrating biological, psychological, and social levels of intervention, it enhances both therapeutic effectiveness and preventive impact.

Taken together, these implications demonstrate that addressing addiction requires coordinated strategies that extend beyond the individual to encompass relational, structural, and cultural dimensions. This integrative orientation sets the foundation

for a critical discussion of the model's strengths, limitations, and future directions, which are examined in the following section.

4. Discussion

The present theoretical analysis advances the understanding of addiction by framing it as a multidimensional disorder arising from the dynamic interaction of biological, psychological, and social processes. Rather than reiterating the characteristics of each dimension, this discussion focuses on the explanatory advantages of their integration and the implications of this perspective for theory, diagnosis, and clinical practice.

One of the central contributions of the biopsychosocial model lies in its ability to account for heterogeneity in addiction trajectories. Reductionist models, whether biological, psychological, or social, struggle to explain why individuals with similar exposure or vulnerability follow markedly different paths, ranging from sustained abstinence to chronic relapse. By contrast, an integrative framework captures how variability emerges from reciprocal interactions between neurobiological predisposition, psychological regulation capacities, and social context. This interactional logic provides a more plausible explanation for differential vulnerability, treatment response, and recovery outcomes.

The alignment between the biopsychosocial model and contemporary diagnostic systems further strengthens its theoretical relevance. Although DSM-5-TR and ICD-11 are primarily descriptive classification tools, their emphasis on impaired control, compulsive engagement, and persistence despite harm implicitly reflects multidimensional mechanisms. Interpreting diagnostic criteria through a biopsychosocial lens allows for a deeper understanding of how symptoms emerge from interacting constraints across levels of analysis, thereby narrowing the gap between diagnostic description and etiological explanation.

From a clinical standpoint, the findings underscore the limitations of single-domain interventions. Pharmacological approaches targeting neurobiological stabilization, psychotherapeutic interventions focused on cognitive and emotional regulation, and social strategies addressing environmental stressors each address important components of addiction. However, when applied in isolation, these approaches often yield partial or unstable outcomes. The biopsychosocial model supports the rationale for integrated treatment planning that simultaneously targets biological vulnerability, psychological skill development, and social-contextual modification. Despite its strengths, the biopsychosocial model also presents conceptual and practical challenges. Its broad scope complicates operationalization and empirical

testing, and without clear specification of interaction pathways, the model risks remaining a general heuristic rather than a testable framework. Addressing this limitation requires future research to move beyond broad integration toward identifying specific mechanisms through which biological, psychological, and social factors interact over time and across stages of addiction.

Cultural context represents another critical dimension highlighted by this analysis. Biopsychosocial integration cannot be assumed to be universally applicable without adaptation. Cultural norms, stigma, family structures, and health system organization influence how addiction is experienced, interpreted, and treated. The relevance of culturally sensitive applications is particularly salient in non-Western and Arab contexts, where prevailing models may inadequately capture lived experiences or social meanings associated with substance use.

In sum, this discussion emphasizes that the value of the biopsychosocial model lies not in its inclusiveness alone, but in its capacity to generate more coherent explanations and guide comprehensive intervention strategies. By situating addiction within an interactional and context-sensitive framework, the model offers a more nuanced understanding of addiction and provides a foundation for advancing both research and clinical practice.

5. Conclusion

This article has examined addiction as a multidimensional disorder emerging from the dynamic interaction of biological vulnerability, psychological processes, and social contexts. By moving beyond reductionist explanations, the analysis demonstrates that no single level of analysis is sufficient to account for the complexity, variability, and persistence of addictive behaviors. Instead, addiction is best understood as an interactional phenomenon shaped by reciprocal influences across multiple levels.

A central contribution of this work lies in theoretically repositioning the biopsychosocial model as a dynamic and explanatory framework aligned with contemporary diagnostic classifications. By linking DSM-5-TR and ICD-11 criteria to underlying biological, psychological, and social mechanisms, the article bridges the gap between descriptive diagnosis and etiological understanding. This integration enhances the conceptual coherence of addiction theory and provides a more nuanced interpretation of impaired control, compulsivity, and relapse.

From a clinical perspective, the findings underscore the necessity of integrated and coordinated intervention strategies. Effective treatment and prevention require addressing neurobiological stabilization, psychological regulation, and social-contextual conditions simultaneously rather than sequentially or in isolation. Such an approach not only improves explanatory adequacy but also increases the likelihood of sustained recovery.

The analysis further highlights the importance of cultural and contextual sensitivity in applying the biopsychosocial model. Addiction does not occur in a cultural vacuum, and theoretical frameworks must be adapted to reflect local meanings, social norms, and structural realities. This consideration is particularly relevant in Arab and other non-Western contexts, where prevailing models may insufficiently capture lived experience and social dynamics.

Despite its strengths, the biopsychosocial model faces challenges related to operationalization and empirical testing. Future research should focus on specifying interaction pathways among biological, psychological, and social factors and on developing methodological approaches capable of capturing these dynamics over time. Advancing the model from a broad integrative perspective to a more testable and context-responsive framework represents a critical direction for addiction research.

In conclusion, conceptualizing addiction as a multidimensional disorder provides a more comprehensive and clinically relevant understanding of its etiology, diagnosis, and treatment. The biopsychosocial model, when applied as an interactional and culturally sensitive framework, offers a robust foundation for advancing research, informing practice, and improving outcomes for individuals affected by addiction.

References

- American Psychiatric Association. (2022). *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders* (5th ed., text rev.; DSM-5-TR). American Psychiatric Publishing
- Beck, A. T., Wright, F. D., Newman, C. F., & Liese, B. S. (1993). *Cognitive therapy of substance abuse*. Guilford Press.
- Darcq, E., Kieffer, B. L., & Koob, G. F. (2024). Genetic and neural correlates of addiction vulnerability. *Nature Neuroscience*, 27(1), 9–15. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41593-023-01467-2>
- Engel, G. L. (1977). The need for a new medical model: A challenge for biomedicine. *Science*, 196(4286), 129–136. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.847460>
- Ferrer-Pérez, C., García-Fernández, J., & Maldonado, R. (2024). Dopamine modulation and addiction neurocircuits. *Neuroscience Letters*, 821, Article 137263. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neulet.2024.137263>
- Heather, N. (2018). *Is addiction a brain disease?* Routledge.

- Loscalzo, Y., & Giannini, M. (2025). Methodological issues in behavioral addictions' research. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 21, Article 100594.
- Murnane, K. S. (2023). Updated perspectives on the neurobiology of substance use disorders. *Substance Abuse Research*, 12(4), 5–9.
- Roberts, A. (2023). The biopsychosocial model: Its use and abuse. *Journal of Medicine and Philosophy*.
- Rogers, C. R. (1961). *On becoming a person: A therapist's view of psychotherapy*. Houghton Mifflin.
- Stanikzai, A., & Wahidi, A. (2023). Social determinants of addiction: A global review. *International Journal of Public Health Studies*, 17(2), 4–10.
- United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime, & World Health Organization. (2020). *International standards for the treatment of drug use disorders*. UNODC & WHO.
- Volkow, N. D., & Blanco, C. (2023). Substance use disorders: A comprehensive update of classification, epidemiology, neurobiology, clinical aspects, treatment and prevention. *World Psychiatry*, 22(2), 203–229. <https://doi.org/10.1002/wps.21073>
- Volkow, N. D., & Koob, G. F. (2022). Substance use disorders: A comprehensive update. *Frontiers in Psychiatry*, 13, Article 10168177. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyt.2022.10168177>
- World Health Organization. (2022). *International classification of diseases for mortality and morbidity statistics* (11th rev.; ICD-11). WHO.