



"HENRI COANDA"  
AIR FORCE ACADEMY  
ROMANIA



"GENERAL M.R. STEFANIK"  
ARMED FORCES ACADEMY  
SLOVAK REPUBLIC

INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE of SCIENTIFIC PAPER  
AFASES 2015  
Brasov, 28-30 May 2015

## IRRATIONAL BELIEFS, PROFESSIONAL STRESS AND PERSONALITY IN THE MILITARY

**Constantin-Edmond Cracsner\*, Lidia Mogoşan\***

\*Faculty of Psychology, Ecological University, Bucharest, Romania

**Abstract:** *The study covers relations between the distorted or convictions irrational beliefs, the different magnitudes of occupational stress and their influences on the personality traits in the military. The study was conducted on a sample of 90 military of different professional categories (officers, low ranking officers, non-commissioned officers and soldiers/other military professionals). From the study, we can draw some robust findings, as such: in a certain measure distorted convictions/irrational beliefs may interact directly both with professional stress, as well as with some personality traits; on a greater extent, professional stress interacts directly with the personality structure and may augment the interaction between the distorted convictions/irrational beliefs and the military's personality. Psychological assistance offered to the military personnel, as support or intervention, should be aimed at simultaneously reducing the role of the magnitude of the stressors and of the distorted beliefs/irrational convictions on the personality of the military.*

**Keywords:** *stress, distorted convictions, irrational beliefs, personality, psychological assistance*

### 1. INTRODUCTION

In the contemporary society, psychology's mission is to contribute, along with the other sciences, at increasing the efficiency of human activity at both individual and organizational level. In this regard, out of the various fields of psychology, major roles are assigned to clinical psychology, psychological counselling and psychotherapy.

In terms of theory and cognitive-behavioural therapy strategy, the triad composed of distorted beliefs, automatic negative thoughts and maladaptive behaviours with regard to self, society and the world, might be viewed as the major directions of therapeutic intervention as stated by many experts (Ellis, 1962 Beck, 1979, Anderson,

1990, Young, 1990, Beck 1995, Taylor 1996, Alford & Beck, 1997, Williams & al., 1997, Leahy & Holland, 2000 Holdevici 2009, Clark & Beck, 2010, etc. ).

The cognitive therapeutic approach of various mental disorders (Beck, 1995 Leahy, 2003) integrates a number of essential components of rational-emotive therapy developed by Ellis (1994, 2004, 2011), thus harmonizing the concepts related to: cognitive distortions which make the stressed person vulnerable to negative life events that will be interpreted in a catastrophic and exaggerated manner; at different levels of cognitive integration - thoughts, beliefs and negative cognitive schemes which make the person enter automatism and become fragile; furthermore, emotions emphasize the already

weakened role of resistance to frustration and of cognition invasion with categorical and inflexible imperatives (Leahy & Holland, 2000; Holdevici, 2009).

From the perspective of the cognitive model there were developed counselling and psychotherapeutic intervention strategies, demonstrated empirically and scientifically and validated for various disorders especially on axis I and axis II of the DSM-IV-R (APA, 2000). Out of these, psychotherapy and treatment for stress disorder is a major direction of action. For the military, occupational stress, in its most dramatic and probable form - posttraumatic stress disorder (PTSD), can be approached theoretically and practically, from the perspective of the cognitive model put forward by Clark & Beck (2010), which is based on three cognitive models developed by Ehlers & Clark (2000), Brewin, Dalgleish & Joseph (1996) and Foa & al. (1998, 2004), which apart from the distinct perspectives, share " the fundamental assumption that PTSD symptoms are the result of erroneous beliefs and estimations on trauma, as well as of dysfunctional encoding and recovery of memory and trauma" (Clark & Beck, 2010, p .285). Therefore, the proposed model deals with PTSD as a cognitive organization disorder on three interrelated levels of conceptualization: the etiologic level, the automated processing level and the strategic processing level (Clark & Beck, 2010, p.285-286). In essence, developing trauma is a dynamic, hyper-complex, multiphase and multi-level interaction: the etiologic level connects the traumatic experience with pre-existing vulnerability and associated with some personality traits and dysfunctional cognitive schemes; the automatic, or primary, processing level uses maladaptive cognitive structures for traumatic memories and for self convictions, on world and future beliefs, where the biases of attention and memory favour the threats, allowing a erroneous recovery of the traumatic memory, traumatic intrusions and physiological stimulations; the strategic, or secondary, processing level allows for a negative estimate of intrusions and stimulations in the efforts to find self safety, through denial and avoidance actions, or by

gaining control, all under the pressure of persistent negative emotions (Clark & Beck, 2010, p.284-295 ).

Therefore, the literature provides empirical evidence and theoretical assumptions about the presence of some interdependent relations between distorted beliefs, professional stress and personality traits.

This study aimed to identify the existence of such relations in a military structure, in order to ensure knowledge and specialized psychological support for the specialised military personnel.

## 2. METHOD

**2.1. Objectives.** Within this research there are formulated three objectives: theoretical, methodological and practical.

The theoretical objective is to study the relationships between the dimensions of distorted beliefs, personality and military occupational stress level, given the requirements, demands and specificities of the profession, on the one hand and military status, on the other hand.

The methodological objective is the application of psychological tools with which to assess the size of irrational beliefs, professional stress level and the size of various personality traits of the randomly selected subjects within a military unit.

The practical objective is to demonstrate the assumptions' validity regarding the inter-relationships between irrational beliefs, professional stress and personality traits in the military environment.

**2.2. Hypotheses.** In this paper we present only two of the assumptions that have been made within the research, as follows:

$I_1$  - in the military environment, the existence of irrational beliefs generate a high level of professional stress;

$I_2$  - the irrational beliefs, occupational stress and status indicators (age and professional occupation) influence the manifestation of personality traits;

**2.3. Variables.** In this research there were established two categories of variables, as follows:



"HENRI COANDA"  
AIR FORCE ACADEMY  
ROMANIA



"GENERAL M.R. STEFANIK"  
ARMED FORCES ACADEMY  
SLOVAK REPUBLIC

INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE of SCIENTIFIC PAPER  
AFASES 2015

Brasov, 28-30 May 2015

a) dependent variables: personality traits and their emerging manifestations, measured using a personality questionnaire;

b) independent variables: the size of the psychological instruments used to measure irrational beliefs and the level of stress factors, as well as the dimensions of certain status indicators.

**2.4. Participants.** The study included a group of soldiers ( $N = 90$ , 100% men,  $M_{age} = 33,24$  years,  $SD_{age} = 7.2$ , age rank: 21-56 Also,  $N = N_1 + N_2 = 90$ , where  $N_1 = 45$  (50%) non-commissioned officers (NCOs) and  $N_2 = 45$  (50%) military personnel (officers, low ranking officers and other foremen). The distribution of the military professionals on staff or personnel bodies, is as follows: eight officers (8.9%) and 37 low ranking officers and other foremen (41.1%).

**2.5. Procedures.** The study was directed to verify the established hypotheses and, in this respect there were used certain investigative tools to gather the necessary information.

The gathered information were summarized in relevant databases and were processed by various specific methods of descriptive and inferential statistics, such as trend calculations of central values (mean, median, mode, standard deviation) correlation study and regression analysis.

**2.6. Instruments.** The data were collected from the application of three tools that have measured the irrational beliefs, professional stress magnitude and the dimensions of personality traits for some subjects in the military. Also, an individual form was used to record the status indicators.

These tools are presented below:

2.6.1. *The individual form* is a tool for collecting information on a range of indicators of status (data identification, military rank,

position, age, education, marital status etc.). For this study we retained only two status indicators - SI, i.e. age - AG and occupation or socio-professional military status - O.

2.6.2. *Personality Questionnaire (SID)* is a psychological assessment tool used in the army (SEPA Archive, 1992). It has proven its ecological validity in highlighting the main features of personality, deemed important to the efficient performance of the military service (Chițu & al., 2005, p.86-92). Having premised on a theoretical model of the ideal soldier, able to undergo the military educational process in optimal conditions, there were determined three factors, absolutely necessary, for working efficiently: stability - S; integration - I; dynamism - D, thus given the acronym SID. Stability Factor - S is composed of 30 items, which make up two subscales: a) stability of self - Ss, with 20 items, expressing self-control in critical situations, the balanced character of actions and decisions, the emotional adequacy in certain situations; b) emotional stability - Sem, with 10 items, which highlight the general affective tonus, the overall allure of emotional moods, their dynamics in time. Integration factor - I has 30 items that make up the three scales: a) sociability - So, which expresses the ability to initiate and maintain interpersonal relationships, desire and need for communication and involvement in the life of the group, with 11 items; b) Cooperation - Co, which highlights the possibilities for cooperation with individuals and groups, the tend to avoid, not to generate or to settle conflicts and tensioned situations, tolerance and adaptation capacity, with 10 items; c) friendship - Fr, which expresses the patience and tact manifested towards others, understanding their problems and difficulties,

peer acceptance, with 9 items. Dynamic factor - D groups 30 items, which consist of three scales: a) activism - Ac, expressing dynamism, energy, pleasure and speed of action, excitement, with 20 items; b) ascendance - As, which identifies the force of self, the individual's ability to reveal, to impose its own personality and ideas, with 8 items; c) objectivity - Ob, which expresses the ability to realistically and accurately assess the current life and activity problems, with two items (SEPA Archive, 1992). For this study, internal consistency is as follows: stability factor - S,  $\alpha = .556$ ; integration factor I,  $\alpha = .719$ ; dynamic factor - D,  $\alpha = .518$ ; the entire questionnaire -  $\alpha = .725$ .

2.6.3. *Stress Level Questionnaire (SLQ)* was designed by J. Abraham (1985). The questionnaire assesses the overall intensity of stress on the six factors, which are sources and also its manifestation areas, such as: ambiance, damaging ego/self harm, interpersonal relationships, occupation, use of time and lifestyle. The questionnaire contains 84 items and has an increased sensitivity due to the four possible answers for each item, graded according to the intensity of the event in question. The ambiance factor - A, highlights the stress responses generated by the lack of privacy in terms of psychological space, which the person has the feeling that he, or she, can not control and within which does not experience peace and relaxation, accompanied by the perception of physical space as uncomfortable. The self harm/damaging ego factor - EP highlights stress responses expressed by feelings of personal failure consisting of fear, anxiety, inability to assert, guilt, devaluation, avoidant and submissive behaviour. The interpersonal relations factor - RI illustrates stress responses of guilt and disappointment affecting family relationships, financial difficulties, sexual problems, the inability to maintain lasting relationships of friendship, insufficient and unsatisfactory relationship with oneself. The occupation factor - AP demonstrates stress responses due to the inability to organize ones workload, the inability to refuse additional tasks and to delegate responsibilities when they become overwhelming, the inability to ask for help, or to request appropriate rewards, show the job's

dull and non-stimulating character, or the harmful conditions in which it takes place. The use of time factor - AT highlights stress responses arising from the lack of ability to plan ones own spare time, voluntary overflows with tasks that often force the person to run out of time, thus, creating conflicting feelings towards the person's family, the failure to separate professional and personal activities, which would imply making time for relaxation and rest. Lifestyle factor - RV underlines stress responses produced by an imbalance between activity and rest, intense exercise and unbalanced nutrition. This factor also reflects the effects of accumulated stress in other areas, both translated by compensatory behaviours (overeating, abuse of stimulating products etc.) and by weakening the overall body resistance, thus increasing the risk for disease. The internal consistency of the questionnaire is  $\alpha = .885$ , for the present study.

2.6.4. *Rating Scale for vulnerability to stress - adapted (SEVS-A)* is modelled after The Shortened General Attitude and Belief Scale (SGABS), which was designed by Lindner, Kirkby, Wertheim and Birch (1999, p.651-663) to measure irrational beliefs, largely considered to be stress generators (David Lynn Ellis, 2010 Macavei, McMahon, 2010, Owings, Thorpe, McMillan, Burrows, Sigmon, Alley, 2013). As the name implies, The Shortened General Attitude and Belief Scale (SGABS) is a short version of the General Attitude and Belief Scale (GABS), whose scientific validation was conducted by Bernard (1998, p.183-196). SGABS was translated into Romanian and adapted by Simona Trip (2007) and can be found in the paper "Clinical Evaluation System" published by RTS in Cluj-Napoca and coordinated by Daniel David (2007). The scale was adapted and calibrated from a cultural standpoint for the military professionals (S.P. Archive, 2009), thus being used as a scale for assessing vulnerability to stress (SEVS). The scale is applied in order to identify people who have high potential to generate stress. The scale's dimensions in terms of irrational beliefs, appears to be effective predictors of a broadened psychopathological spectrum (Sava & al., 2011, Bridges, Harnish, 2010, Terjesen, Salhany, Scitutto 2009, Chang, D'Zurilla, 1996



"HENRI COANDA"  
AIR FORCE ACADEMY  
ROMANIA



"GENERAL M.R. STEFANIK"  
ARMED FORCES ACADEMY  
SLOVAK REPUBLIC

INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE of SCIENTIFIC PAPER  
AFASES 2015  
Brasov, 28-30 May 2015

Muran, Motta, 1993 Wertheim, Poulakis, 1992). The scale is based upon the theory that people who formulate their wishes in terms of imperative needs, have a high potential for generating emotional stress (Ellis, 1994 Ellis, 2004 Vernon, 2010, Ellis & Ellis, 2011). The measurement of the degree to which people formulate their desires in terms of imperative needs, which they internalize, can be accomplished by evaluating their irrational cognitions (Zurawski, Smith, 1987, Lindner & al., 1999, MacInnes, 2003). Irrational beliefs are logically incorrect, absolutistic and dogmatic in nature; they also are inconsistent with the objective reality, causing negative and maladaptive emotions, which block the capacity to achieve the individual's aims (Lohr, bong, 1981 Lindner & al., 1999, David Lynn Ellis, 2010). The test includes 26 statements grouped into 8 specific subscales (Lindner & al., 1999, Tripp, 2007 Macavei, McMahon, 2010, Sava & al., 2011), which covers the following dimensions: the need for achievement – NR, the need for approval - NA, the need for comfort - NC, absolutist requirement of justice - NJ overall assessment of self - EP, the overall assessment of others - EC, rationality - R and irrationality IB.

The usage of The General Attitudes and Beliefs Scale – Short Version (GABS-SV) (Lindner et al., 2007) allowed the measuring of a global score for irrational beliefs - IB as a result of the first six dimensions above.

In another study (Sava & al., 2011), a ranking of the irrational beliefs scales was made, in accordance with their internal consistency, thus: the distribution obtained from  $\alpha = .57$  for the overall evaluation of others - EC (other- downing) to  $\alpha = .85$  for the overall evaluation of oneself - EP (self-downing); the internal consistency score of

irrationality global scales was  $\alpha = .86$ ; high scores indicate higher levels of irrational beliefs.

In this study, the internal consistency of the overall score scales for irrationality was  $\alpha = .83$ .

**2.7. Results.** In accordance with previous theoretical assertions, irrational beliefs generate stress, which in turn affects ones personality and behaviour.

However, Table 1 shows that there are no significant simultaneous correlations between the dimensions measured by Shortened General Attitude and Belief Scale (SGABS), Stress Level Questionnaire (SLQ) and Personality Questionnaire (DIS) and Status Indicators (SI), but a few, which we shall explain below.

As can be seen in Table 2, we reversed the order of the variables in the regression equations.

Although theories generally state that irrational beliefs, stress and status indicators should be predictors of personality behaviour, we used them as criteria, while personality, namely the stability dimension of it, we considered as predictor. This decision allowed the simultaneous look at the relationship between the two categories of variables, as well as testing their interactive effect, without affecting, from a statistical perspective, the degree of relation between variables.

We hereby present the data in Table 2. Case one: stabilitate - S din SID și nevoia de aprobare - NA din SGAVS stability - S from SID and the need for approval - NA from SGAVS are in negative and significant correlation ( $r = -.212$ ,  $p < .05$ ); the statistical results of the regression equation show that  $R = .212$ ,  $R^2 = .045$ ,  $\Delta R^2 = .034$ ,  $\beta = -.212$ ,  $p < .05$ , which demonstrates a good ability for

making predictions; from the statistics of change's effect results that  $R^2c = .045$ ,  $F_c = 4.135$ ,  $\text{Sig. } F_c = .045$ , and  $D-W = 1 < 1,8 < 3$  which reinforces the idea of a good ability for making predictions. Case two: based on inductive reasoning, we find that the need for approval - and the need to achieve NA - NR in SGAVS present a strong, positive and significant correlation ( $r = .362$ ,  $p < .01$ ); furthermore, the need to achieve - NR in SGAVS and Self harm - PE in SLQ correlate strongly, positively and significantly ( $r = .286$ ,  $p < .01$ ); Self harm - PE and the need for comfort - CN from SGAVS show a strong, positive and significant correlation ( $r = .234$ ,  $p < .01$ ); Self harm - PE in SLQ and irrational beliefs - IB in SGAV correlated positively and significantly ( $r = .260$ ,  $p < .05$ ); age - AG (SI) and the need for approval - NA in SGAVS correlated in negative strong and significant result ( $r = -.311$ ,  $p < .01$ ); ); the statistical results of the regression equation are  $R = .552$ ,  $R^2 = .305$ ,  $\Delta R^2 = .255$ ,  $\beta$  (PE) =  $-.503$ ,  $p < .01$  and  $\beta$  (NR) =  $.369$ ,  $p < .05$ , which shows a good ability for making predictions where the two predictors are concerned; the statistics of change's effect results in  $R^2c = .305$ ,  $F_c = 6.069$ ,  $\text{Sig. } F_c = .045$ , and  $D-W = 1 < 1,6 < 3$ , which reinforces the idea of a good ability for making predictions. Case three: the results obtained in case two lead us to give up four of the predictors, i.e. NA, NC, IB and AG as the values of the tests of significance are not acceptable; from the regression equation statistics results  $R = .495$ ,  $R^2 = .245$ ,  $\Delta R^2 = .228$ ,  $\beta$  (EP) =  $.211$ ,  $p < .05$  și  $\beta$  (NR) =  $-.513$ ,  $p < .01$ , which show a good ability for making predictions; from the change's effect statistics results that  $R^2c = .245$ ,  $F_c = 14.148$ ,  $\text{Sig. } F_c = .000$ , and  $D-W = 1 < 1,5 < 3$ , which reinforces the idea of a good ability for making predictions. As shown in the last two columns of Table 2, according to F test of significance of the ANOVA model, in all three cases, multiple regression coefficient is statistically significant ( $\text{Sig.} = .000$ ).

**2.8. Discussion.** This research supports our general hypothesis, resulted also from the literature review, thus, by empirical evidence and theoretical assumptions, confirming the presence of interdependent relationships between distorted beliefs, professional stress

and personality traits (Leahy & Holland, 2000 Clark & Beck, 2010). More specifically, our findings, in case one, is consistent with the specific relationship between the predictor (need of approval) and the criterion (stability of personality), which shows that a structured, mature, stable and balanced personality is better aware of its social and professional roles and responsibilities and feels less the need for approval and supervision. Also, in a somewhat similar manner, in the second case it appears that the personality structure, through the dimension of stability, relates negatively to aspects that can lead to self-harm, namely to self-esteem (Sava & al., 2011) and positively to the need achievement. In the third case as well, the results show that the stability of the personality structure maintains the related rapports between the Ego and the need to achieve, while the standardized  $\beta$  coefficient values change to various degrees, whilst keeping their rank contribution to the variability criterion. Consequently, the possible harms of the Ego would adversely affect the stability of the whole personality ( $\Delta\beta_{PE} = 51,3\% - 50,3\% = 1\%$ ), while the need for achievement, even if it would have a positive influence on personality's stability, would lose significantly in terms of its contribution to variability  $\Delta\beta_{NR} = 36,9\% - 21,1\% = 15,8\%$ ).

From the perspective of the ego-personality rapport, more specifically between self-harm/damaging ego (PE) and personality stability (S), any aspect adversely affecting the Ego will produce significant changes in the structure of personality, through its destabilization. In this regard, the specialty literature offers numerous and consistent arguments, of which we retain only the following: a) if a person is unstable, it is because one's core, meaning the ego is unstable, and the discrepancies between the various manifestations of the ego, particularly those unstable, duplicated and accentuated, correlate with a wide variety of emotional vulnerabilities interpreted as negative psychological states of personality or personality psychological discomfort (Zlate, 2002); b) if there are discrepancies between certain aspects of the ego (real ego - ideal ego), then they are associated with the



"HENRI COANDA"  
AIR FORCE ACADEMY  
ROMANIA



"GENERAL M.R. STEFANIK"  
ARMED FORCES ACADEMY  
SLOVAK REPUBLIC

INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE of SCIENTIFIC PAPER  
AFASES 2015  
Brasov, 28-30 May 2015

emergence of emotions related to rejection, disappointment, dissatisfaction, and if those appear among others (real ego and expected ego), then they generate negative emotional states of fright, fear, agitation (Higgins, 1987).

From the perspective of the distorted beliefs - personality rapport, namely the need for achievement (NR) and stability of personality structure (S), emerges the idea that in a significant proportion, the constraints within the motivational structure affect the stability of personality structure. In this respect too, the present study is consistent with the literature, which, based on theoretical assumptions and empirical research, highlights extensively the motivation-personality relationship, especially the association between motivation, performance and job satisfaction. Without being considered restrictive and unilaterally we present as arguments only those theories on motivation which focus needs' satisfaction: the needs' hierarchical model (Abraham Maslow, 1954), the two-factor motivation-hygiene theory (Frederick Herzberg, 1960), the AAP theory (Achievement, Affiliation, Power) of the three motivational agents (McClelland, 1961), and the ERG theory (Existence, Relatedness, Growth) concerning other three motivational factors (Clayton Paul Alderfer, 1969).

If for the need of achievement predictor (NR) measured for this study, we associate the superior needs to achieve of the personality (the necessity of esteem and self-realization - Maslow, assessing performance - Herzberg, the need for self-fulfilment and power - McClelland, need for development - Alderfer), than their influence on stability in the sense of personality or homeostasis becomes more explicit and intuitive (equilibrium), when there are compatibility

relations, either in the sense of entropy (imbalance), or in the sense of incompatibility relations between the need for achievement and the need for a stable personality.

We agree with the studies found in the scientific literature which show that the relations of incompatibility between the need for achievement (NR) and stability of personality structure (S) are generating professional stress and even PTSD (Gabor, Jianu & Prisăcaru 2014 2013, Cracsner, 2003 Foa, & Rothbaum, 1998).

We also consider that the results of the study also highlight a number of limitations related to: the relatively small number of evaluated subjects; the investigated sample group was established randomly; the structure of the lot is uneven where professionals or staff bodies are concerned, and genderwise - the study population is represented exclusively by men.

### 3. CONCLUSIONS

Occupational stress in the military is present in the life of the combatants, being driven by various military connections relating to the military's type of work, echelon, career development, employment relations, structure and dynamics of organizational climate, etc. (Cracsner 2003, Gabor & al., 2013, 2014).

Through this study, we tried to highlight how and in which manner some of irrational beliefs or distorted convictions and professional stress can influence the military's personality.

As a consequence, we have analyzed the relationship between stress levels, values and personality dimensions, but also the emotional balance of the military, based on correlations between different variables (age, occupation, size of the measurement tools), all leading to

both the confirmation and validation of the hypotheses, but furthermore, helped to identify some favourable conditions of stress management, especially PTSD (Cracsner, 2003 Foa, & Rothbaum, 1998), as well as certain managerial and professional measures in order to provide assistance and psychological intervention in the military (Gabor, Jianu & Prisăcaru 2014, 2013).

The identification of positive significant correlations, between the socio-professional category, the measured dimensions of stress and age reflect the need for compatibility between the job requirements, the skills of the military personnel and their levels of experience in service, as well as approaching stress.

The stability and integration dimensions of the personality structure are found to be good predictors for an effective stress management, but also critical in achieving an efficient management of human resources in the military.

Achieving significant positive correlations between the various measured dimensions of stress (ambiance, self-harm, interpersonal relationships, use of time, employment, and lifestyle), prove that the knowledge and proper management of internal and external factors of stress, allow for an optimal functioning of the military personnel.

The identification of several positive significant correlations between the different dimensions of irrational beliefs and maladaptive convictions (need for achievement, need for approval, the need for comfort, the absolutist requirement for justice, the global assessment of oneself, the overall assessment of others and the degree of internalization of all the other necessities transferred into the unconscious as forms of irrationality) allows for a better understanding of military vulnerability where stress is concerned, and provides multiple opportunities for the prevention, prophylaxis and psychotherapy of individual and organizational stress.

The usage of the multiple linear regression in the present study, revealed the relationship between the criterion variable (the stability of the personality structure) and predictors variables (need for achievement and self-

harm), arguing that, on the one hand, the personality can be evaluated according to a certain type of resilient behaviour performance-oriented, but on the other hand, the non-resilient amplitude in situations which can damage the ego, the self image and explicit self-esteem (Sava & al., 2011, David, 2007 Trip, 2007).

Hence, the present study generates several solutions on establishing strategies and means to prevent, limit or eliminate irrational beliefs and distress effects, and these should be a management priority, due to the high degree of risk, danger and unexpected, which call for all the physical resources of the human being in the modern armed struggle.

## REFERENCES

1. Alford, B.A, & Beck, A.T., *The Integrative Power of Cognitive Therapy*, New York: Guilford Press (1997).
2. Anderson, J.R., *Cognitive Psychology and Its Implications*, New York: W.H. Freeman and Company (1990)
3. Beck, A.T., *Cognitive Therapy and Emotional Disorders*, New York: International University Press (1979).
4. Beck, J.S., *Cognitive Therapy: Basics and beyond*, New York: Ghe Guilford Press (1995).
5. Bernard, M. E.. Validation of the General Attitude and Belief Scale. *Journal of Rational-Emotive and Cognitive -Behavior Therapy*, 16 (1998).
6. Brewin, C.R., Dalgleish, T., & Joseph, S., A dual representation theory of posttraumatic stress disorder, *Psychological Review*, 103, 670-686, (1996).
7. Bridges, K. R., Harnish, R. J. Role of irrational beliefs in depression and anxiety: A review. *Health*, 2, 862-877. (2010).
8. Chang, E. C., D'Zurilla, Th.J., Irrational beliefs as predictors of anxiety and depression in a college population, *Personality and Individual Differences*, Volume 20, Issue 2, February 1996.
9. Chișu, Gh., Voloșin, L., Velescu., M., Alecsoaie, A.M, Verza, C.. Studiu comparativ și perspective în selecția psihologică a tinerilor la recrutare și a recruților în vederea încorporării. În Cracsner, C.E.





"HENRI COANDA"  
AIR FORCE ACADEMY  
ROMANIA



"GENERAL M.R. STEFANIK"  
ARMED FORCES ACADEMY  
SLOVAK REPUBLIC

INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE of SCIENTIFIC PAPER

AFASES 2015

Brasov, 28-30 May 2015

- (coord.). *Psihologie aplicată în mediul militar*, București: Editura U.N.Ap. (2005).
10. Clark, D.A., & Beck, A.T., *Cognitive Therapy of Anxiety Disorders: Science and Practice*, New York: The Guilford Press (2010)
  11. David, D., Lynn, S. J., & Ellis, A. (Eds.). *Rational and irrational beliefs: Research, theory, and clinical practice*. New York, NY: Oxford (2010).
  12. David, D.. *Sistem de evaluare clinică*. Cluj Napoca: RTS (2007).
  13. Ehlers, A., & Clark, D.M., A cognitive model of posttraumatic stress disorder. *Behaviour Research and Therapy*, 38, 319-245 (2000).
  14. Ellis, A., Ellis D.J., *Rational Emotive Behavior Therapy*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association (2011).
  15. Ellis, A., *Reason and Emotion in Psychotherapy, Revised and Updated*. Secaucus, NJ: Carol Publishing Group, (1962, 1994).
  16. Ellis, A.. *Rational emotive behavior therapy: It works for me; it can work for you*. Amherst, NY: Prometheus Books (2004).
  17. Foa, E.B., & Rothbaum, B.O., *Treating the trauma of rape: Cognitiv-behavioral therapy for PTSD*. New York: Guilford press (1998).
  18. Hembree, E.A., & Foa, E.B., Promoting cognitive changes in posttraumatic stress disorder. In M.A. Reinecke & D.A. Clark (Eds.), *Cognitive therapy across the lifespan: Evidence and practice* (pp. 231-257), Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press (2004).
  19. Holdevici, I., *Tratat de psihoterapie cognitiv-comportamentală*, București: Ed. Trei (2009).
  20. Leahy, R.L., & Holland, S.J., *Treatment Plans and Interventions for Depression and Anxiety Disorders*, New York: Guilford Press (2010).
  21. Lindner, H., Kirkby, R., Wertheim, E., & Birch, P. A brief assessment of irrational thinking: The Shortened General Attitude and Belief Scale. *Cognitive Therapy and Research*, 23 (1999).
  22. Lohr, J., Bonge, D.. On the distinction between illogical and irrational beliefs and their relationship to anxiety. *Psychological Reports*, 48, 1981.
  23. Macavei, B., & McMahon, J.. The assessment of rational and irrational beliefs. In D. David, S. J. Lynn, & A. Ellis (Eds.), *Rational and irrational beliefs: Research, theory, and clinical practice* (pp. 115-147). New York, NY: Oxford (2010).
  24. MacInnes, D., Evaluating an assessment scale of irrational beliefs for people with mental health problems, 2003, PubMed, [online], <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/12838819>, Available: 25.03.2015.
  25. Muran, E.M., Motta, R.W., Cognitive distortions and irrational beliefs in post-traumatic stress, anxiety, and depressive disorders, *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 49 (1993).
  26. Owings L. R., Thorpe, G. L., McMillan, E. S., Burrows R.D., Sigmon S. T., and Alley D. C.. Scaling Irrational Beliefs in the General Attitude and Belief Scale: An Analysis Using Item Response Theory Methodology. *SAGE Open*, April-June 2013: 1-10, DOI: 10.1177/2158244013484156 [online], Available: <http://www.sgo.sagepub.com>, 25.03.2015.
  27. Sava, F.A., Maricuțoiu, L.P., Rusu, S., Vîrgă, D., Macinga, I. Implicit and Explicit Self-Esteem and Irrational Beliefs, *Journal of Cognitive and Behavioral Psychotherapies*, Vol. 11, No. 1, March (2011).

28. Taylor, S., Meta-analysis of cognitiv-behavioral treatments for social phobia, *Journal of Behavior Therapy and Experimental Psychiatry* 27(1), 143, p. 498-510, 1996.
29. Terjesen, M. D., Salhany, J., & Sciutto, M. J. A psychometric review of measures of irrational beliefs: Implications for psychotherapy. *Journal of Rational-Emotive and Cognitive-Behavior Therapy*, 27 (2009).
30. Trip, S., Scala de atitudini și convingeri generale, forma scurta – GABS-SV (trad.). În David, D.. *Sistem de evaluare clinică*. Cluj-Napoca: RTS (2007).
31. Vernon, A.. *Rational Emotive Behavior Therapy Over Time*, Washington, DC: American Psychological Association (2010).
32. Wertheim, E.H., Poulakis, Z.. The relationships among the General Attitude and Belief Scale, other dysfunctional cognition measures, and depressive or bulimic tendencies, *Journal of Rational-Emotive and Cognitive Behavior Therapy*, 10, (1992).
33. Williams, J.M.G., Watts, F.N., MacLeod, C., & Mathews, A., *Cognitive psychology and emotional disorders*, England, Chichester: Willey (1997).
34. Young, J.E., *Cognitive therapy for personality disorders: A schema-focused approach*, Sarasota, Fl: Professional ResourceExchange (1990).
35. Zurawski, R.M., Smith, T.W.. Assessing irrational beliefs and emotional distress: Evidence and implications of limited discriminant validity. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 34(2), (1987).
36. \*\*\* Chestionarul-SID, *Arhiva S.E.P.A.*, București: M.Ap.N. (1992).
37. \*\*\* Scală de evaluare a vulnerabilității la stres - S.E.V.S.-A, *Arhiva S.P.*, București: M.Ap.N. (2009).

**Table 1.** Means, standard deviation and inter-correlations among the study's variables (N = 90)

Variables	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21
<i>Criteria - Irrational beliefs</i>																					
1. Achievement (NR)	--																				
2. Approval (NA)	.362**	--																			
3. Comfort (NC)	.590**	.577**	--																		
4. Justice (NJ)	.601**	.453**	.744**	--																	
5. Self-downing (EP)	.329**	.500**	.441**	.348**	--																
6. Other-downing (EC)	.234*	.299**	.511**	.491**	.311**	--															
7. Irrational beliefs (overall) (IB)	.759**	.658**	.860**	.821**	.617**	.582**	--														
8. Rational beliefs (RB)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	--													
<i>Criteria - Dimensions of stress</i>																					
9. Ambiance (A)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	--												
10. Damaging ego/Self harm (PE)	.286**	-	.234**	-	-	-	.260*	-.262*	.637**	--											
11. Interpersonal relationships (RI)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	.689**	.658**	--										
12. Occupation (AP)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	.637**	.634**	.689**	--									
13. Use of time (AT)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	.598**	.531**	.650**	.714**	--								
14. Lifesyle (RV)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	.465**	.297**	.445**	.492**	.537**	--							
15. Total stress value (TS)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	.799**	.769**	.846**	.886**	.852**	.664**	--						
<i>Criteria- Dimensions of status</i>																					
16. Age (V)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	.312**	.233*	.236*	-	.240*	--					
17. Ocupa□ia (O)	-	.311**	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	--				
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	.349**	.372**	.432**	.432**	.363**	.295**	.463**	.508**	--				
<i>Predictors - Dimensions of personality</i>																					
18. Stability (S)	-	-.212*	-	-	-	-	-	.219*	-.324**	-.452**	-	-.400**	-.361**	-	-.390**	-	-	--			
19. Integration (I)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-.394**	.400**	.589**	.365**	.421**	.469**	-.253*	.516**	-	.329**	.493**	--			
20. Dinamism (D)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-.279**	.495**	.285**	.364**	-.230*	-	.358**	-.266*	-	.382**	.530**	--		
21. Total personality score (P)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-.323**	-.420**	.640**	.349**	.492**	.448**	-	.530**	-	-	.769**	.861**	.778**	--	
Means	10.84	8.76	9.79	10.18	8.16	8.93	57.19	16.16	12.00	19.73	18.72	25.56	28.23	22.01	126.1	33.24	2.41	25.86	25.73	16.38	67.97
SD	3.80	2.47	3.77	3.66	2.94	3.10	14.90	2.72	3.45	4.59	4.46	6.12	5.53	4.57	23.28	7.19	.65	2.93	3.45	2.83	7.44

\*\* Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

\* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)

**Table 2.** A summary table of hierarchical regression predicting stability (S) and the criteria identified in three cases

Stability (S)	R	R <sup>2</sup>	ΔR <sup>2</sup>	β	Sig.	R <sup>2</sup> <sub>c</sub>	F <sub>c</sub>	Sig. F <sub>c</sub>	D-W
<b>Case one</b>	.212 <sup>a</sup>	.045	.034			.045	4.135	.045	1.8
Approval				-.212	.045				
<b>Case two</b>	.552 <sup>b</sup>	.305	.255			.305	6.069	.000	1.6
Ego injury - EP				-.503	.000				
Achievement - NR				.369	.018				
Approval - NA				-.113	.391				
Comfort - NC				-.098	.593				
Irrational beliefs - NR				-.084	.743				
Age (AG)				.079	.431				
<b>Case three</b>	.495	.245	.228			.245	14.148	.000	1.5
Ego injury - EP				.211	.033				
Achievement - NR				-.513	.000				

Dependent variable: Stability

a. Predictors: (Constant), Approval

b. Predictors: (Constant), Ego Injury - EP, Achievement - NR, Approval -NA, Comfort -NC, Irrational beliefs - NR, Age - AG

c. Predictors: (Constant), Ego Injury - EP, Achievement - NR

**Legend:** R - multiple correlation, R<sup>2</sup> - the proportion of the predicted value variation in relation to the value of combined predictors, ΔR<sup>2</sup> - R<sup>2</sup> correlation in accordance with the number of predictors and subjects, β - standardized coefficients used to predict the standardized values, Sig. - Significance of regression coefficients, R<sup>2</sup><sub>c</sub> - the effect on R<sup>2</sup> by removing each predictor, F<sub>c</sub> - the value of the change's effect, Sig. F<sub>c</sub> - the significance of the change's effect, D-W - Durbin-Watson test on the condition of independence of errors, F - the significance test in the ANOVA model, Sig. - the significance of the F test