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The basic psychometric characteristics of the Common Belief Scale (CBS) of the YIPTIS, Your Irrational Personality Trait Inventory Score, were investigated. The CBS was formulated within Ellis's conceptual framework of Rational Behavior Therapy. Designed for use with adults of at least normal intelligence, its purpose is to evaluate the strength of identification with a specified set of common irrational beliefs which are hypothesized to lead to emotional disturbance.

Subjects taking part in this study were volunteers ranging in age from seventeen to twenty-seven. The total sample of 186 subjects was composed of 105 females and 81 males. Approximately one half of the subjects were administered the CBS and the Taylor Manifest Anxiety Scale (TMAS). The remaining subjects were administered the CBS in a two week test-retest design. Item means, standard deviations, and item-total correlations were computed for each item on the CBS. The reliability of the scale was investigated by test-retest and split-half procedures. The structural validity of the instrument was investigated through a factor analysis procedure conducted to determine the number and strength of the factors measured. The concurrent validity of the CBS was investigated in a correlate design between the CBS and the TMAS. The results indicated that the majority of items were reliable indicators of the total score and contributed to the reliability of the instrument. Suggestions were made to improve weak items. The reliability procedures all yielded coefficients of approximately .80. Structural validity was
investigated by a factor analysis which yielded fourteen reliable factors; ten of these factors were conceptually related to specific irrational beliefs or to the central concepts of the RBT theory. The concurrent validity of the instrument was supported by a low but significant correlation between the CBS and the TMAS. It was concluded that in its present form the CBS of the YIPTIS is an adequately reliable instrument for its intended use as an aid in identifying irrational beliefs in a therapeutic setting. Recommendations for improvement of the scale and further research are discussed.
Introduction

The central theme of Rational Behavior Training (RBT) is that emotional or psychological disturbances are largely the result of illogical or irrational thinking. It has been hypothesized that if an individual can identify and rid himself of his own irrational beliefs and consequent behaviors and then subsequently learn to base his thinking and behavior on a defined set of rational criteria, he will lead a much happier and more effective life (Ellis, 1962; Goodman & Maultsby, 1974).

The YIPTIS, Your Irrational Personality Trait Inventory Score, formulated within the conceptual framework of RBT, contains 179 common irrational perceptions, traits, and beliefs ascribed to by most people to varying degrees and causing them emotional distress (Maultsby, 1971). The items of the YIPTIS are written in the form of what Ellis (1961) terms "self-talk." Self-talk is thinking in the form of an inner dialogue or unspoken conversation with oneself. Self-talk that is irrational can lead to emotional pain.

The YIPTIS is composed of three subtests which are each arranged in a Likert scale format (Maultsby, 1971). The Common Perception Scale (CPS) was designed to reflect irrational "perceptions or observations which most people in this society make about themselves" (Maultsby, 1971, p. 19). The Common Trait Scale (CTS) is an attempt to "reflect irrational traits or habits typical of many people" (Maultsby, 1971, p. 12). The Common Belief Scale (CBS) was designed to "reflect irrational beliefs which most people in our society hold to some degree" (Maultsby, 1971, p.12). According to Maultsby (1971) strong identification with the
perceptions, traits, and beliefs contained in the YIPTIS will leave the individual vulnerable to sustained negative emotions and prone to neurotic behavior.

The aim of the YIPTIS is to give a rapid self-assessment of an individual's irrational thinking and behaviors. This information can then be used within the RBT framework to eliminate the dysfunctional thinking and behavior patterns.

The extent of the YIPTIS' usefulness was unclear due to a lack of reported research with the instrument. This study was designed to investigate the basic psychometric characteristics of the YIPTIS as an instrument for identifying neurosis producing beliefs.
Cognition and Emotion

Rational Behavior Training is a system of psychotherapy formulated by Albert Ellis (1962) and developed by Maxie Maultsby (1971). It is based on a model of psychopathology which assumes that emotional arousal is largely influenced by cognitive processes (Ellis, 1955). Emotional disturbances and most forms of psychopathology in western civilization according to the theory are caused by the belief in and actions based upon a set of common illogical and self-defeating ideas (Ellis, 1961). Relief from emotional disturbance is most efficiently and effectively achieved in rational therapy by first discovering the illogical and irrational beliefs an individual holds which are causing his disturbance. Secondly, the therapist demonstrates how and why these beliefs are irrational and self-defeating. Next, the therapist engages the individual in actively challenging and ridding himself of his irrational beliefs. Finally, the therapist teaches a more rational philosophy and belief system on which the individual can base his subsequent behavior.

In order to understand the role that these irrational beliefs play in emotional disturbance it is first necessary to understand the RET theory of the nature and anatomy of emotions. This theory is based on the assumption that human emotion is intrinsically an attitudinal and cognitive process (Ellis, 1962). However, in addition to the cognitive process, Ellis stresses the importance of the interdependent physiology of the human body systems and processes in the arousal of what we call
emotion. Ellis (1962) cited Cobb (1950) in pointing out that the human
life processes of sensing, moving, thinking, and emoting are integrally
related and operate through the sensorimotor processes, autonomic
nervous system, and the the cognitive processes. Control over one's
domestic feeling may be achieved in one of four major ways:

(a) by electrical or biochemical means (e.g., electroshock
treatment, barbituates, or tranquilizing or energizing drugs);
(b) by using one's sensorimotor system (e.g., doing movement
exercises or using yoga breathing techniques); (c) by employing
one's existing emotional states and prejudices (e.g., changing
oneself out of love for a parent or therapist); and (d) by
using one's cerebral processes (e.g., reflecting, thinking,
or telling oneself to calm down or become excited). (Ellis,
1962, p. 40)

These modes of effecting the emotional state frequently interact as
when the yoga practitioner through sensorimotor processes alters his
body biochemistry, and also his cognitive processes. RBT theory
stresses the importance of the role of cognitive processes in causing
and sustaining emotional reactions.

Much physiological evidence for the relationship between cognition
and emotion has been reviewed by Bousfield and Orbison (1952). They
concluded that contradictory to the previous beliefs that emotional
processes originate in subcortical or hypothalmic centers of the brain,
the cortex and frontal lobes seemed to be involved in the inhibition,
instigation, and sustaining of emotional reactions. In a comprehensive
discussion of emotion Arnold (1960) stressed the personally evaluative
nature of emotions. She defined emotion as:

the felt tendency toward anything intuitively appraised as
good (beneficial), or away from anything intuitively appraised
as bad (harmful). This attraction or aversion is accompanied
by a pattern of physiological changes organized toward approach
or withdrawal. (Arnold, 1960, p. 182)

The view that emotions are a kind of personal appraisal or evaluation
with physiological correlates is quite similar to Ellis' formulation.
"Emotions may therefore simply be evaluations which have a strong bodily component, while so-called nonemotional attitudes may be evaluations with a relatively weak bodily component" (Ellis, 1962, p. 44).

Both Ellis and Arnold attribute the origins of an emotional response to evaluative thinking. Because of the highly developed language system which exists in western civilization most human thinking takes the form of internal words, phrases, and sentences. Thus the individual is constantly describing, interpreting, and evaluating his world to himself through his internal language or what Ellis (1961,) terms "self-talk." Strongly evaluative self-talk in relation to any object, event, person, etc. is the source of most felt emotion.

Evidence for the assumption that self-talk can induce emotional reactions has been offered by Velten (1967) who experimentally induced feelings of elation and depression in subjects through the use of self-referent statements. Subjects were assigned to five treatment groups on a random basis. One group read and concentrated on sixty self-referent statements intended to be elating. A second group read sixty self-referent statements intended to be depressing. A third group read sixty statements which were neither self-referent nor pertaining to mood; this was done in order to control for the effects of reading and experimental participation per se. The fourth and fifth groups were controls for demand characteristics of the experiment. Before the stimulus was administered, two measures of mood were taken. Then following the administration of the stimulus the subjects were given seven behavioral tasks to perform. Measures of performance on five of the seven tasks distinguished significantly the experimentally induced depressed and elated groups from the control groups.
Another experiment designed to test Ellis' assumptions about the causative role which self-talk plays in emotional arousal was conducted by Rimm and Litvack (1969). The experimental subjects of this study read triads of sentences culminating in negative affective conclusions in which the first sentence of each triad was an observation, e.g., "I failed this test." The second sentence was an inference, e.g., "I may be kicked out of school," and the third sentence of each triad was an evaluation, e.g., "That would be awful." Control subjects read triads of sentences which were affectively neutral and which did not culminate in evaluative conclusions. It was hypothesized that subjects reading the negative affective sentences would have a greater emotional response than the subjects reading the affectively neutral sentences. It was also hypothesized that in the negative affective sentence triads the emotional response of the subjects would become greater as subjects read from the first sentence of the triad (observation), to the second sentence (inference), to the third sentence (evaluative). The sentences in each triad were read ten seconds apart, with 15 seconds between triads. The emotional response was determined by measures of the Galvanic Skin Response (GSR) and respiratory changes of the subjects. The themes for the sentences were those judged to be relevant to college students.

The hypothesis that subjects reading the negative affective sentences would have a greater emotional response than subjects reading neutral sentences was supported. However, as Rimm and Litvack (1969) concluded, since affective stimuli elicit more emotion than neutral stimuli by definition, the result was as much a validation of methodology as support for the hypothesis. The second hypothesis that the greatest emotional
response would be elicited by the evaluative sentences followed by the inferential sentences, with the observational sentences arousing the least response, was not supported. In fact, the observational sentences were associated with the greatest emotional response in this study.

The subjects' immediate emotional response to the observational sentence is entirely consistent with the evaluative thinking view of emotions when understood in terms of what Maulsby (1971) calls "thought-shorthand." Maulsby explains that certain familiar situations or people elicit a reflexive emotional response in which no self-talk is apparent. It may actually seem to an individual that a situation caused an emotional reaction with no intervening personal evaluation. What has happened, however, is that the familiar situation which has always been responded to in the past with emotion-arousing self-talk has acquired conditioned stimulus properties and is capable of producing a reflexive emotional response. The relevancy of the sentence themes in the Rimm and Litvack study could well have provided an opportunity for a thought-shorthand reaction resulting in immediate emotional responses by subjects to the observational sentences.

In keeping with the view that emotions are personal evaluations with cognitive origins and subsequent physiological correlates Ellis (1962) distinguishes between an immediate or intuitive emotional reaction and prolonged or sustained emotions. The distinction is best viewed as relative rather than reflecting any major difference in the nature or origin of the emotion. Both the immediate emotional reaction and sustained emotion involve a sensing-moving-thinking-emoting complex and both in varying degrees rely on past experience for an interpretive evaluation. The sustained emotion is the result of a person's "reflective appraisal" of a situation based on his attitudes, philosophy of life,
etc. The immediately felt emotion similarly is influenced by the person's attitudes and philosophy, but is elicited as an immediate sensory response to a stimulus, and little or no "reflective appraisal" is involved.

Ellis (1962) uses as an example of a sustained emotion: an individual who narrowly escapes being hit by a car while walking across the street. The pedestrian's immediate emotional reaction as he sees the car bearing down on him is fear. This immediate emotional response involves the sensing (visual)-thinking ("I am in danger")-moving (flight)-emoting (fear) complex. Now if the individual continues to think about the event throughout the day and he remains emotionally affected by it, his feeling of fear or anxiety becomes a sustained emotion. To maintain the fear or anxiety in this way the individual must be thinking about the event in a highly personalized and evaluative way, e.g., "I could have been killed. How horrible!"

Irrational Ideas and Emotional Disturbance

Prolonged emotional reactions are inseparable from sustained strongly evaluative self-talk. By continually talking to himself about how awful (evaluating) it would have been had he been struck by the car, the individual in this example actually created and sustained his anxiety. To unnecessarily sustain unwanted negative emotions with thinking that is illogical and irrational causes most of the emotional and psychological disturbances in our society (Ellis, 1962). Ellis states that there are 11 common irrational beliefs which most people socialized in our culture accept to varying degrees, and which "seem inevitably to lead to widespread neurosis."

The 11 common irrational ideas are:

1. The idea that it is a dire necessity for an adult human being to be loved or approved by virtually every significant other person in his community.
2. The idea that one should be thoroughly competent, adequate, and achieving in all possible respects if one is to consider oneself worthwhile.
3. The idea that certain people are bad, wicked, or villainous and that they should be severely blamed and punished for their villainy.
4. The idea that it is awful and catastrophic when things are not the way one would very much like them to be.
5. The idea that human unhappiness is externally caused and that people have little or no ability to control their sorrows and disturbances.
6. The idea that if something is or may be dangerous or fearsome, one should be terribly concerned about it and should keep dwelling on the possibility of its occurring.
7. The idea that it is easier to avoid than to face certain life difficulties and self-responsibilities.
8. The idea that one should be dependent on others and needs someone stronger than oneself on whom to rely.
9. The idea that one’s past history is an all-important determiner of one’s present behavior and that because something once strongly affected one’s life, it should indefinitely have a similar effect.
10. The idea that one should become quite upset over other people’s problems and disturbances.
11. The idea that there is invariably a right, precise, and perfect solution to human problems and that it is catastrophic if this perfect solution is not found.

(Ellis, 1962, p. 61)

In support of Ellis’ contention that belief in these 11 irrational ideas is neurosis producing, MacDonald and Games (1972) found a positive correlation between endorsement of these irrational ideas and several measures of psychopathology. Using Ellis’ 11 irrational values as items they developed a Likert scale with a range of scores of from 1 (completely agree) to 9 (completely disagree) which indicated the degree to which an individual identified with each irrational value. This scale was correlated with the California Psychological Inventory (CPI), Eysenck’s Neuroticism Scale, and the Taylor Manifest Anxiety Scale. Correlations with the 18 CPI scales were all in the predicted direction with 10 reaching significance at the .05 level. Significant correlations (p < .01) were also obtained between the Ellis scale scores and the Eysenck Neuroticism Scale and the Taylor Manifest Anxiety Scale.
These 11 ideas are irrational and illogical in two basic ways. First, many of these ideas reflect distortions of reality. Beck (1966) has identified six types of cognitive distortion made by depressed patients: 1) arbitrary interpretation - forming an interpretation with no factual evidence to support the conclusion or when the conclusion is contrary to the evidence, 2) selective abstraction - focuses on detail taken out of context, 3) overgeneralization - drawing a general conclusion about one's ability, performance, or worth on the basis of a single incident, 4) magnification and minimization - errors in evaluation so gross as to constitute distortion, 5) inexact labeling - in which the affective reaction is proportional to the descriptive labeling of the event rather than to the actual intensity of a traumatic situation. All of these distortions were distinguished by a characteristic bias against oneself. Similar paralogical distortions were also noted in Beck's non-depressed patient control group, suggesting that cognitive distortion may be common to many types of psychopathology.

The making of unrealistic demands upon the world is a characteristic neurotic distortion that is common to many of Ellis' 11 irrational ideas. An unrealistic demand may be signaled by the demanding individual's use of the word "should" in relation to the desired event. The use of the word should may indicate an expectation that things will be a certain way. Vertes (1971) calls this the "should of obligation," because the individual seems to believe that the world is obliged to align with his wishes. Vertes contrasts the irrational should of obligation with the realistic "should of probability" which indicates a strong or fairly definite probability that some event will take place. Vertes identifies four elements which distinguish the should of obligation from the should of probability:
1) The event is treated as an absolute rather than as a probability. 2) Other activities are based on the fact that the expected event will occur. 3) Feeling that someone is responsible for the expectancy not materializing. 4) Feeling that things can be easily and readily changed to meet expectations. (Vertes, 1971, p. 23)

The should of obligation is an irrational distortion because absolute statements frequently are not justified in the context of the situation, nor are they consistent with reality. The use of absolute statements frequently creates artificial "needs" out of "desirables." For example, "I must have an apology" is a created need. Thinking in these terms generally leads to catastrophizing if this demand, now an artificially created need, is not met, e.g., "This is unbearable."

Demanding and expecting that the world be different than it is often turns an undesirable situation into an unbearable one. In addition, if the expected event does not occur the person may refuse to recognize the discrepancy or may initially feel confusion or some strong emotion. It almost naturally follows that someone must be responsible for the expectancy not materializing. The accusing finger of blame is pointed at oneself or at another. It is then magically expected that once the wrong doer is aware of his mistake or is made to feel guilty he will readily change to meet the expectancy. The unrealistic demand implied by the irrational use of the word should is one common distortion of reality which results in strong negative emotions.

The second and possibly the most harmful element of the common irrational beliefs is contained in the popular notion of personal worth. The popular view, according to Ellis (1962), equates a person's behavior, achievements, and the evaluation of others with the individual's personal worth or intrinsic human value. This is a self-defeating philosophy in that it unnecessarily leads the individual to evaluate
himself as a "fool" if he makes a foolish mistake, a "loser" if he loses, and "unlovable" if he is rejected. Such a needlessly self-deprecating view can result in such feelings as self-hatred, depression, or anxiety.

To equate one's worth with one's achievements makes success and achievement a necessary condition for self-acceptance. An artificial "need" is thus created, and as Ellis contends:

Since no one can be competent and masterful in all or most respects and most people cannot be outstanding in even one major respect...to demand that one must succeed is to make oneself prey to anxiety and feelings of worthlessness. (Ellis, 1962, p. 63)

The philosophy of achievement sets the individual in a competitive position with others, in which he is not only striving for his best (which is desirable) but is comparing himself to the best in others. He thus relinquishes control of the situation because he cannot control the behavior of others, and since the probability of becoming the best in anything is quite low for any individual he seems doomed to failure and feelings of hopelessness and worthlessness (Ellis, 1962).

Finally, the idea that an adult human being's self esteem and personal worth depend on the approval or love of others artificially transforms love-approval from a highly desirable thing to a dire necessity. The individual who does not feel loved or approved by his significant others is likely to feel like a worthless person, and virtually everyone is faced with disapproval or rejection at one time or another if not daily. Even the person who manages to win the approval of everyone he considers important, if he believes this to be absolutely necessary, will worry about keeping it. In striving for the approval of others the individual becomes less self-directing and gives up many of his own desires and preferences. In the end, as Ellis states, "He is likely to behave so insecurely and annoyingly around others that [he]
does lose their approval or respect and thereby defeats [his] own goals" (Ellis, 1962, p. 62).

Achievement and approval are both highly valued in our society. They are valued because they are generally beneficial to both society and the individual. However, the belief that a person is worthless, and need feel worthless because he does not achieve or is not approved of is without foundation. This belief along with beliefs that are based on a distorted view of reality are challenged and replaced with a more rational and self-enhancing philosophy in RBT (Criddle, 1974).

The goal of RBT is to eliminate unnecessary unhappiness so the individual is allowed the freedom to live his life as pleasurably and effectively as he can (Ellis, 1962). This is achieved by changing the individual's belief system from one based on many irrational assumptions which result in many self-defeating behaviors to a belief system that is more consistently logical and rational. Rational "is that ... [behavior, emotion, or thought] which is congruent with reality and that helps the individual to gain satisfaction and to avoid pain" (Vertes, 1970, p. 19).

It is the responsibility of the individual and only he can determine for himself the rationality of any emotion, thought, or behavior in any situation. Maultsby (1971) offers five criteria to guide the individual in making this determination. The rationality of any thought, emotion or behavior can be determined if the individual asks himself:

1. Is it based on the acceptance of objective reality?
2. Is it life preserving?
3. Does it enable me to achieve my self-determined goals?
4. Does it create a minimum of significant internal conflict?
5. Does it create a minimum of significant conflict with my environment?

The amount of conflict considered to be significant is "the amount that
you don't want to have and will act to avoid" (Maultsby, 1971, p. 4). The rationality of any behavior is relative. The more criteria that are met the more rational the behavior. Generally, if a person meets three out of five criteria most of the time his behavior can be considered rational. These criteria are designed to serve as guides for decision making by the individual, not decision makers for him. Only he alone can choose the rational approach for himself in any life situation (Maultsby, 1971).

To assist the individual in realizing and eliminating his self-defeating distortions the therapist repeatedly points out the illogical and irrational nature of this thinking which is creating the emotional disturbance. The individual is encouraged and assisted through several self-help techniques to discover his own distorted thinking and to correct it with a more rational view (Goodman & Maultsby, 1974).

Many of the common irrational beliefs are associated with the concept of one’s personal worth. The RET therapist attacks the notion that one’s personal worth has an extrinsic nature and is somehow related to achievement or approval. The therapist substitutes the concept of the "fallible human being" (Maultsby, 1974), which acknowledges man as an imperfect, mistake-making creature who possesses intrinsic personal value which is conceived of as "the individual's being, aliveness, or becoming - which gives him the possibility or potentiality of being happy" (Ellis, 1962, p. 153).

Thus, the RET therapist strives to replace the individual's irrational beliefs about himself and his world with a more realistic and rational view. The therapist assists the individual in evaluating his behavior in terms of the defined criteria for rational behavior so that
the individual may more effectively act to achieve his self-determined goals.

Numerous discussions of clinical case studies are available in the literature which demonstrate that RBT has been used effectively as a therapeutic technique for a variety of emotional and behavioral disturbances in both children and adults (Ellis, 1961; Goodman & Maultsby, 1974; Grossack, 1965; Kassinove, 1972; Meichenbaum, Gilmore & Fedoravicius, 1971; Meichenbaum & Goodman, 1971; Sherman, 1967; Wagner & Glicken, 1966). Ellis (1961) reports success using this approach with an individual having a long history of psychopathic behavior. Sherman (1967) has found RBT to be useful as an approach for the treatment of alcoholics, and Kassinove (1972) reports on his successful use of RBT in treating a young man's fear of sexual intercourse. Meichenbaum, Gilmore and Fedoravicius (1971) have demonstrated the effectiveness of RBT as treatment for speech anxiety. The RBT approach has also been shown to be effective in counseling children (Wagner & Glicken, 1966). Grossack (1965) reports that after reading the works of Albert Ellis, attending his workshops and studying his taped therapy sessions he tried RBT on nine heterogeneous patients. He concluded that for him RBT worked more quickly and effectively than the Rogerian and analytic techniques he had been taught to use. Goodman and Maultsby (1974) discussed the case histories of several individuals and the significant reduction in their self-defeating behavior and unwanted emotions following RBT. In each case the irrational beliefs of the client were identified and challenged. The client was shown how his irrational beliefs were creating his emotional disturbance and how he could replace them with a more rational belief system. In addition, the client was given homework assignments designed to facilitate adoption of a more rational belief system and to
help him learn new desired behaviors. These case study examples provide indirect evidence in support of the theoretical position of RBT.

In addition to the clinical evidence for the effectiveness of RBT as a therapeutic technique, it has also been demonstrated experimentally that RBT is effective in reducing negative affect (Burkhead, 1970; Trexler, 1971). In Burkhead's study four groups of subjects were given an annoying electric shock on a random schedule with a one in five probability of receiving the shock. Varying conditions of RBT were assigned to the four groups. Group I received RBT from a therapist who was present (P) during the administration of the shock. Group II listened to a tape recording of RBT principles during the administration of the shock (PT). Group III listened to a tape recording which reinforced their irrational thinking about the shock situation (NT). Group IV read a magazine during the administration of the shock (C). The emotional responses of the subjects were defined and measured by changes in Galvanic Skin Response (GSR) and responses on the Multiple Affective Adjective Check List (MAACL). It was hypothesized that the groups that were taught RBT would have less emotional responses to the shock situation than the group where irrational beliefs were reinforced or the control group.

The results of Burkhead's study showed that the groups exposed to the personal therapist (P) and the positive tape (PT) conditions had significantly lower GSR responses and a less anxious profile on the MAACL profiles. No significant differences on the GSR or MAACL measures were found between the (P) or (PT) groups, indicating that the presence per se of the therapist had no appreciable effect on the subjects' emotional responses. These results support Ellis' view that irrational beliefs result in negative affect and that if these beliefs are challenged and replaced with a more rational view than the individual can rid himself
of unwanted negative emotions.

In a controlled study Trexler (1971) tested the relative effectiveness of RBT, an attention placebo (relaxation training), and no treatment in reducing public speaking anxiety. For his experiment Trexler randomly divided a speech class into an RBT group, a relaxation training group, and a no treatment group. Each subject gave an initial speech and two judges rated them on three observational measures. In addition to the observational measures, five self report measures were taken. Following four sessions of treatments the subjects gave a final speech and were retested with the same observational and self-report measures. The results indicated that the RBT treatment was more effective than the relaxation training in reducing public speaking anxiety as it was measured in this experiment. The relaxation training group also improved significantly over the no treatment group.

Therapeutic change ultimately results when the individual challenges and discards his irrational and neurosis-producing beliefs and replaces them with a more rational belief system with the guidance of an RBT therapist (Ellis, 1962). To challenge and discard the old belief system it is first necessary to discover what specific beliefs the individual holds which are inherently irrational and are responsible for his unwanted emotions and behaviors.

**Development of the YIPTIS**

To aid the individual in identifying his own irrational beliefs Maultsby (1971) developed the YIPTIS. The YIPTIS consists of three inventories: the Common Belief Scale (CBS), the Common Perception Scale (CPS), and the Common Trait Scale (CTS). Goodman and Maultsby (1974) state that a high correlation exists between these three scales.
The YIPTIS is a self-rating questionnaire arranged in a Likert scale format. The items of the scale represent irrational self-talk which is reflected as a perception, trait, or belief (Maultsby, 1971). Little information on the development of the YIPTIS was available in the literature. Maultsby (1971), however, states:

Starting with the knowledge of recent research in human psychophysicsiology and human experimental psychology, and adding my own observations of emotionally distressed patients ...after five years of clinical testing, I formulated the YIPTIS, which contains the 179 most common, irrational personality traits which account for unhappiness in the daily lives of normal people. (Maultsby, 1971, p. 22)

A preliminary investigation by MacDonald and James (1972) indicated that the construction of such a scale based on Ellis' irrational beliefs was feasible and that identification with these beliefs may be associated with psychopathology. MacDonald and Games (1972) evaluated the internal consistency (reliability) of Ellis' common irrational beliefs and the validity of identification with these beliefs as indicators of psychopathology. They created a Likert scale consisting of each one of Ellis' irrational beliefs followed by a scoring range from 1 (completely agree) to 9 (completely disagree). Sixty undergraduate students were used as subjects for the internal consistency study.

Pearson Product Moment correlations between each statement and the total for all 11 statements revealed that nine of the statements were reliably associated with the total score. Items seven (It is easier to avoid certain difficulties and self-responsibilities than to face them.) and nine (Past experiences and events are the determiners of present behavior; the influence of the past cannot be eradicated.) were not shown to be associated with the total score nor were they correlated positively with the other statements. A Cronbach Alpha was computed as an estimate of the internal consistency of the nine-item
instrument. The instrument yielded a reliability coefficient of .73. A cross validation study was conducted using 37 graduate students as subjects. The same nine statements were found to be reliably associated with the total score and a Cronbach Alpha of .79 was obtained from this cross-validation sample.

In support of Ellis' contention that identification with these irrational beliefs leads to neurotic behavior, significant correlations were found between subjects' endorsement of these irrational ideas and several measures of psychopathology. On the California Personality Inventory 10 of the 18 scales were significantly correlated with MacDonald and Games' measure of irrational beliefs scale at the .05 level. Significant correlations between (a) their measure of irrational beliefs and the Eysenck Neuroticism Scale \( r = .37 \), (b) the Taylor Manifest Anxiety Scale \( r = .41 \), (c) Internal-External Locus of Control \( r = .44 \) were found. The results of this study indicated that irrationality as defined by Ellis is a measurable trait. In addition this study offers further support for the theoretical position of RBT.

The theoretical position of RBT is that emotions are largely influenced by the cognitive processes. It follows that emotional disturbances originate and are sustained by the cognitive processes. Much of the emotional disturbance suffered by individuals in our society has been linked to a set of common irrational and self-defeating ideas (Ellis, 1962). MacDonald and Games (1972) have demonstrated that identification with these beliefs is associated with several measures of psychopathology. Since it is purported that the individual's own subset of these irrational beliefs has created his neurosis, then it is advantageous to the therapeutic process to identify these beliefs. Maultsby has developed the YIPTIS for this purpose. Since limited information
was available on its development, reliability, or validity it was the purpose of this study to further evaluate the usefulness of the YIPTIS as an instrument for detecting irrational, neurosis producing beliefs.

Statement of Problem

The purpose of this study was to evaluate the YIPTIS as an instrument for identifying irrational and neurosis related beliefs. Cross validation of the Common Belief Scale (CBS) of the YIPTIS was accomplished and the basic psychometric characteristics of the scale were further evaluated.
Method

Subjects

Subjects taking part in this study were volunteers from introductory psychology classes at Western Kentucky University ranging from seventeen to twenty-seven years of age. A total of 186 subjects, composed of 105 females and 81 males participated.

Apparatus

Two measurement procedures were used. First the CBS of the YIPTIS was a 41 item self-rating questionnaire of irrational beliefs arranged in a five point Likert scale format (See Appendix A). Secondly, the Taylor Manifest Anxiety Scale was a self-rating questionnaire of clinically and experimentally demonstrated anxiety symptoms (See Appendix A).

Procedure

All 186 subjects were administered the CBS of the YIPTIS. Approximately one half of this sample, 82 subjects, were also administered the Taylor Manifest Anxiety Scale immediately following completion of the CBS. The remaining 104 subjects were retested with the CBS of the YIPTIS two weeks later.

Design and Analysis

Item Statistics

A mean, standard deviation, and an item-total correlation were computed across all 186 subjects for each item of the CBS. This was done to evaluate the contribution that each item made to the variance and reliability of the scale.
Reliability

A test-retest reliability coefficient was computed for the CBS protocols of 104 subjects. This procedure provided a measure of the stability of the CBS by estimating the amount of variable error produced by random fluctuations in scores from one time to another.

A split-half correlation coefficient was also computed for the initial CBS protocols of the same 104 subjects. The odd numbered items formed one half of the scale and the even numbered items formed the other half of the scale. This procedure provided a measure of the equivalence of the items within the scale. The Spearman Brown prophecy formula was used to correct for test length, which was reduced by one half in dividing the scale. The Guttman procedure for estimating split-half reliability was also applied.

Validity

The concurrent validity of the CBS was evaluated by a Pearson product-moment correlation procedure between the CBS and the TMAS for 82 subjects. A principle components method of factor analysis employing a varimax rotation was conducted for the 186 CBS protocols. The purpose of the factor analysis was to determine the structural validity of the CBS, i.e., the number of different factors with which the CBS measures and the amount of total variance associated with each factor. The relationship of the identified factors to the common eleven irrational beliefs and to the central concepts of the RBT theory were then examined for their logical and face validity.
Results and Discussion

Item Statistics

The item means, standard deviations, and item-total correlations for each item across all subjects on the CBS are presented in Table 1. The majority of the items were found to be reliable indicators of the total score and contributed to the reliability of the instrument. However, six of the forty-one items (10, 14, 17, 23, 32, 41) produced non-significant item-total correlations at the .05 level with 184 df. Several factors were hypothesized to account for the weakness of these items.

The face validities of item 10 (I believe there is a me and another "real" me.) and item 32 (I believe that if I really make an honest effort to do something and I fail at it, that means that I can't do the thing; so, there is no rational reason to persist in trying to do it.) were questionable. In this form these items did not appear to be conceptually related to any of the common eleven irrational beliefs nor logically related to any of the central concepts of the RBT theory.

The validity of item 14 (I believe I am incapable of sexually satisfying most normal members of the opposite sex.) appeared to be dependent on the sexual experience of the respondent. As the majority of subjects in this study were college freshman many of them may not have had the sexual experience necessary to formulate a belief about their sexual inadequacy. As a result, responses to this item would not necessarily be related to the rational construct. The correlation of this item with the total scale may have been low as a result of the sample utilized.
TABLE 1
CBS Item Statistics
(N = 186)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Means</th>
<th>Std Dev</th>
<th>Total Correlation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TTFM</td>
<td>2.15054</td>
<td>0.90579</td>
<td>0.22891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITFM</td>
<td>2.92473</td>
<td>1.07790</td>
<td>0.39487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1TFM</td>
<td>2.80107</td>
<td>1.16620</td>
<td>0.42040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFm</td>
<td>2.62901</td>
<td>1.07401</td>
<td>0.30064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFM</td>
<td>4.27957</td>
<td>1.01732</td>
<td>0.50430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFm</td>
<td>1.67742</td>
<td>1.24910</td>
<td>0.27210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFm</td>
<td>3.14409</td>
<td>1.11496</td>
<td>0.16791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFm</td>
<td>2.44624</td>
<td>1.00544</td>
<td>0.35169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFm</td>
<td>4.04A19</td>
<td>0.04315</td>
<td>0.10472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFm</td>
<td>2.41540</td>
<td>1.28552</td>
<td>0.11525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFm</td>
<td>2.70430</td>
<td>1.02070</td>
<td>0.17129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFm</td>
<td>3.19355</td>
<td>1.20827</td>
<td>0.31416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFm</td>
<td>2.95161</td>
<td>1.19506</td>
<td>0.13685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFm</td>
<td>1.82796</td>
<td>1.01474</td>
<td>0.14521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFm</td>
<td>3.36021</td>
<td>1.19701</td>
<td>0.34179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFm</td>
<td>1.60215</td>
<td>0.05205</td>
<td>0.22343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEM</td>
<td>1.43011</td>
<td>0.74104</td>
<td>-0.05369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFm</td>
<td>1.04409</td>
<td>1.05646</td>
<td>0.32062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TM</td>
<td>3.00000</td>
<td>0.06901</td>
<td>0.40709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFM</td>
<td>3.72501</td>
<td>0.96707</td>
<td>0.23404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFM</td>
<td>2.72501</td>
<td>0.90169</td>
<td>0.20030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFm</td>
<td>2.10200</td>
<td>1.22095</td>
<td>0.29900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFm</td>
<td>2.23110</td>
<td>1.06811</td>
<td>0.15144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFm</td>
<td>2.36021</td>
<td>0.92660</td>
<td>0.30100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEM</td>
<td>3.71505</td>
<td>1.02177</td>
<td>0.44061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFm</td>
<td>2.93011</td>
<td>1.10571</td>
<td>0.39530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFm</td>
<td>2.9462</td>
<td>1.15547</td>
<td>0.41030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFm</td>
<td>2.00064</td>
<td>1.06996</td>
<td>0.30546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFm</td>
<td>3.70968</td>
<td>1.11093</td>
<td>0.43129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFM</td>
<td>3.61290</td>
<td>1.02430</td>
<td>0.49120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFM</td>
<td>3.41915</td>
<td>1.11129</td>
<td>0.41647</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFM</td>
<td>1.79012</td>
<td>0.96092</td>
<td>0.11796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFm</td>
<td>2.69892</td>
<td>1.11238</td>
<td>0.41710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFM</td>
<td>2.65054</td>
<td>1.09615</td>
<td>0.39646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFm</td>
<td>4.11441</td>
<td>1.00711</td>
<td>0.44710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFm</td>
<td>3.42473</td>
<td>1.20215</td>
<td>0.111168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFm</td>
<td>3.71110</td>
<td>1.14032</td>
<td>0.56173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEM</td>
<td>3.24711</td>
<td>1.06193</td>
<td>0.39071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFm</td>
<td>3.06452</td>
<td>1.09047</td>
<td>0.41024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFM</td>
<td>2.48925</td>
<td>1.03579</td>
<td>0.41775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFm</td>
<td>1.99462</td>
<td>1.11742</td>
<td>0.00253</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Item 17 (I believe I should be more masculine.) produced the lowest standard deviation (0.74) of the forty-one items on the scale. The lack of variability in response to this item accounted for the low item-total correlation.

Item 23 (I believe that worry does sometimes help me.) assumed that worry could be beneficial. Identification with this belief is thus considered irrational. However, Spielberger (1972) has discussed research which indicated that low levels of anxiety can enhance performance on some perceptual-motor and cognitive tasks and can also serve as a motivator. It would appear then that "worry does sometimes help" and that this belief is not related to the neurosis producing irrational construct.

Item 41 (I believe that magic or supernatural powers are causal factors in life events.) was not completed by twelve subjects. In the analysis missing data was given a neutral score. The influence of the missing data plus the vague meaning of the statement may have produced a low item-total correlation.

Appendix B contains a rewritten version of the items with non-significant item-total correlations. These items were rewritten to eliminate the problems cited above. Appendix B also contains a group of items which had adequate item-total correlations but were rewritten due to the vague meaning of the items. A further discussion of these items and their influence on the reliability of the scale appears in the following section.

Reliability

The test-retest reliability analysis yielded a stability coefficient of .82. Internal consistency was evaluated by several split-half procedures which resulted in a correlation between forms of .67. This was corrected to a reliability coefficient of .80 by use of the Spearman-Brown
prophecy formula. The Guttman split-half reliability procedure yielded a coefficient of .80.

These results indicate that the CBS is an adequately reliable instrument. The test-retest procedure has provided evidence for the stability of the instrument. The variance in performance from the first testing to the second testing two weeks later can be partially accounted for by a true fluctuation in the construct. The test-retest procedure, however, is also influenced by the subjects' remembering their responses, which tends to increase the reliability coefficient. In general, random fluctuations in performance and measurement error did not significantly impair the reliability of the instrument.

The split-half and Guttman procedures indicated the internal consistency of the CBS. It appeared that this instrument was comprised of a homogeneous group of items mainly sampling a single construct. Measurement error from this procedure resulted from variance in response within the instrument. This type of error may be caused, for example, by the imprecise wording of an item which may make it open to various interpretations. This type of error probably accounted for a significant proportion of the error variance on the CBS.

The CBS is particularly vulnerable to this type of error because it frequently uses terms which have a clearly defined and distinct meaning within the RBT framework, such as "should," "need," and "must have" but appear to be open to varying interpretations by many subjects. According to Vertes (1971) the use of these words signals an unrealistic demand that is being made on the world. If not met the demanding individual will conclude that some injustice has been done and will likely feel anger, depression, self-blame or some other negative emotion. Whether all people who identify with such CBS items as "I believe I
ought to be or should be different from what I am" and "I believe I need more self-confidence" interpret them as a dire need or blind expectation is doubtful. The respondent may not focus on the implications of the words "should" and "need" but may rather respond on these items to the idea of its being more desirable to be different or to have more self-confidence. As a result a person who believes strongly that he would like to be different or have more self-confidence, which may be quite rational, is likely to respond in the irrational direction to these items on the CBS.

Seven items (1, 4, 9, 13, 17, 21, 38) have been identified which appear to be open to varying interpretations. These items have been rewritten and appear in Appendix B.

The arrangement of some of the items on the CBS may have produced a spurious increase in the reliability of the scale. Several pairs of items [(2, 3), (26, 27), (33, 34), (39, 40)] which sample the same specific belief appear together in the present format of the scale. It is possible that a subject's response on the first item of the pair would influence his response on the following item. This could introduce a bias into the measurement of the construct that would tend to erroneously increase the test reliability. This problem could be corrected by separating these pairs of items.

In its present form the CBS appears to be an adequately reliable instrument. The recommended changes in the items and the format of the scale, however, can be expected to result in a more accurate instrument.

Validity

A Pearson product moment concurrent validity procedure between the CBS and the Taylor Manifest Anxiety Scale (TMAS) yielded a coefficient of .27. The correlation of .27 obtained between these scales for 82
subjects was significant from a zero correlation at the .01 level. This low but significant relationship between the CBS and the TMAS was consistent with MacDonald and Games (1972) finding of a significant correlation between identification with Ellis' common eleven irrational beliefs and the TMAS. MacDonald and Games reported a correlation of .41 which was significant at the .01 level.

The TMAS has been shown to be a valid and reliable indicator of manifest anxiety (Taylor, 1953). It also has a demonstrated usefulness as an indication of neurosis (Matarazzo, 1955). The TMAS then is a useful indicator of one type of negative emotion, which is a common symptom of neurosis.

The correlation between the CBS and the TMAS offers empirical support for the view that identification with the beliefs on the CBS is associated with heightened anxiety. This correlation seems impressive if it is noted that identification with the irrational beliefs comprising the CBS is expected to evoke a wide range of negative emotions, e.g. anger, depression, guilt, as well as anxiety. As anxiety is a common symptom of neurosis the relationship between the CBS and the TMAS indicates that the CBS has potential usefulness in evaluating neurosis related irrational beliefs.

A factor analysis of item responses revealed that the CBS was composed of fourteen reliable factors with eigenvalues greater than 1.0. These fourteen reliable factors accounted for 64% of the total variance. Table 2 contains the factor loadings assembled with the varimax rotation. After rotation the items from each factor with factor loadings of approximately .30 or greater were selected and examined for their conceptual relationship. It was found that most of the fourteen factors were logically and conceptually related to one or more of the eleven
<table>
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<tr>
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</thead>
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<td><img src="image" alt="Factor 7 Table" /></td>
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</table>
common irrational beliefs or to one of the central concepts of the RBT theory (See Appendix C for further detail).

The factor which accounted for the largest percentage of the variance was labeled Emotional Magic. The items which composed this factor were logically related to the belief that emotions are responses that arise independently of our thinking and of our control. They also conveyed a belief in the benevolent power of an emotional response to resolve conflict if it is an honest emotional reaction. According to RBT theory this is an unrealistic and self-defeating view of emotions. The central tenet of RBT theory is its explanation of emotional arousal which emphasizes that an emotional response to a situation is directly related to the individual's cognitive interpretation of that situation. As such, emotions are controllable. With regard to the value of an honest emotional response, it is clear that a person may honestly feel rage or depression but if this feeling has arisen from irrational thinking his emotional reaction is probably more self-defeating than containing any benevolent problem-solving qualities.

The factors labeled Dissatisfaction with Self, Need for Improvement, and Self-Image, are all closely linked, conceptually. The items which composed these factors reflect another way of thinking which the RBT system considers common but irrational. These items generally indicated a need to feel competent and adequate in all possible respects before the person could accept himself. A person who believes he must be thoroughly competent, and without fault or weakness to be acceptable will always be prone to feelings of dissatisfaction and non-acceptance of himself.

The Need for Approval factor contained a cluster of items which corresponded with one of the common eleven irrational beliefs. These
items reflect an impossible demand that one must be loved or approved of by virtually every significant other.

The items of the Projecting Blame factor corresponded to another of the common irrational beliefs. These items indicated a belief that other people or external events are the cause of one's unhappiness.

The Punishment factor is the logical follow-up to the Projecting Blame factor. The items of this factor reflected the belief that there are objectively defined standards of right and wrong which can best be maintained by the use of punishment and guilt.

The factor labeled Bad Me reflected a rejection of self or at least some aspects of the self. It indicated a belief that something about oneself is unworthy and unacceptable. The rational alternative to this belief and one of the central themes of the rational philosophy is the concept of the fallible human being.

The You are Your Behavior factor as in the Bad Me factor reflected an irrational view of personal worth which is antithetical to the fallible human being concept. A person who has accepted his own fallible nature would realize, for example, that foolish behavior does not make one a fool.

The Less Worthy factor reflected an attitude often adopted by individuals who believe that they need the love or approval of virtually every significant person in their lives. This inevitably leads to unhappiness as they never get what they want or think they need.

Four of the reliable fourteen factors (9, 12, 13, 14) could not be labeled. These factors did not have enough conceptually linked clusters of items to provide a logical label for the factor. The majority of items comprising these factors, however, could be individually linked to one or more of the common eleven irrational beliefs or central concepts.
of the RBT theory. It should be noted, however, that the number of subjects utilized in this analysis (186) was quite small for factor analytical purposes and the results can give only a general indication of the factors present. The four unnamed factors could join other factors or form a single more meaningful factor with a larger sample.

From an examination of the conceptual content of the items in each factor it was evident that few of the factors were dominated by items which reflected a single irrational belief. Most of the factors contained clusters of items that corresponded logically to more than one of the common eleven irrational beliefs. As a result, a one to one correspondence between beliefs and factors was not present.

The factors that did not correspond to any single irrational belief did, however, relate to the central concepts of RBT. The major tenet of RBT is that emotions have cognitive origins and can be controlled. The single factor, Emotional Magic, accounting for the largest percent of the variance of the CBS is logically related to this concept. Similarly, the concept of the fallible human being is one of the most important aspects of the rational philosophy. Many of the common irrational beliefs reflect an illogical, self-defeating means of self-evaluation. Several of the identified factors on the CBS also reflect illogical and irrational self-evaluations.

The factor analysis revealed fourteen reliable factors, ten of which were conceptually labeled and logically linked to Ellis' irrational beliefs or to the central concept of the theory. This finding has provided evidence for the content validity of the CBS.
Implications

The YIPTIS was developed as a self-assessment instrument for adults of at least average intelligence to evaluate their strength of identification with a defined set of common irrational and neurosis related ideas (Maultsby, 1971). The YIPTIS is a checklist of specific perceptions, traits, and beliefs in the form of self-talk which reflects these common irrational ideas. It is purported that in a therapeutic setting the information obtained from the YIPTIS can be used by the client and therapist to identify the specific irrational ideas and behaviors that are creating and sustaining the client’s disturbance. Identification of the client’s own irrationalities is an important step within the RBT model of psychotherapy (Ellis, 1962).

The present study has indicated that the CBS of the YIPTIS is an adequately reliable instrument for use as an aid in evaluating the strength and presence of irrational beliefs in a college student population. It appeared to be sampling the major irrational beliefs and assumptions which the RBT theory hypothesizes to be neurosis producing. This study also indicated that identification with these beliefs was associated with anxiety, a common symptom of neurosis (Coleman, 1972). In its present form the CBS appears to be a potentially useful aid in identifying irrational beliefs associated with anxiety and neurosis.

The present research does, however, indicate that further development of the CBS could improve the usefulness of the instrument. Rewritten versions of the items identified as having non-significant item-total correlations may improve the reliability and validity of the scale.
In addition, Hanley (1959) has shown that wording of personality test items which leaves the meaning of items open for varying interpretations can result in an acquiescent response bias. The imprecise wording of some of the CBS items together with the scoring of agreement with these statements of beliefs as irrational may result in an acquiescent response set. A future study could investigate the degree to which such a response bias influences scores on the CBS.

Although the present study has found the CBS to be a potentially useful instrument in its present form, further development of the scale is recommended to improve the basic psychometric characteristics of the scale. The CBS is one of three scales which comprise the YIPTIS. The psychometric characteristics of the Common Perception Scale (CPS) and the Common Trait Scale (CTS) also need further investigation. The degree of correlation between these three scales should also be established.

In addition to further development of the total YIPTIS battery some future research with the CBS is recommended. The influence of the rewritten versions of the identified weak items (Appendix B) on the reliability and validity of the scale should be examined. The present study provided preliminary evidence for the presence of a number of identifiable factors associated with specific irrational beliefs or specific RBT concepts. The factor analytical approach to the structural validity of the CBS should be further examined with a factor analysis utilizing a larger sample size.

Investigation of the influence of the social desirability of the perceptions, traits, and beliefs contained in the YIPTIS might be done. The influence of the social desirability factor on the respondents' performance on the scale could provide further insight into the interpretation of information obtained by the YIPTIS. MacDonald and Games
(1972) found a low correlation between the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale and identification with a scale composed of Ellis' eleven irrational ideas. They concluded that their scale was free from a social desirability response bias.

Further validation of the YIPTIS as an indicator of psychopathologically related perceptions, traits and beliefs is also recommended. The YIPTIS scores of diagnosed patients beginning therapy could be compared to a "normal" control group. Further validation could also be achieved by investigating the correlation between the YIPTIS and established measures of psychopathology such as the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI).
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Test Booklet and Directions for the
Common Belief Scale and
the Taylor Manifest Anxiety Scale
We would appreciate your cooperation in this research project by completing this short questionnaire on commonly held beliefs. Your responses will be kept confidential. It is not the purpose of this study to examine or evaluate any individual's specific responses or total questionnaire.

Detach the answer sheet from the test booklet and print your name, age, sex, and date of birth at the top of the answer sheet in the spaces provided. It is necessary to put your name on the answer sheet because you may be asked to complete a second questionnaire at a later date and this answer sheet will then be returned to you.

Now, look at #1, #2, #3, and #4 on the answer sheet and notice that the answer sheet is numbered from left to right. This is unusual so please be careful to follow this number sequence when recording your answers.

PART I

The statements on the Common Belief Scale are beliefs that many people hold. Below each statement is an estimate range. Please mark on the answer sheet (not the test booklet) the word that seems most accurate and appropriate to you.

This form is concerned with your usual state of mind or belief strength. Daily fluctuations which change with the times, the places, and the people involved will constitute periodic exceptions in your way of thinking but only your most common, or typical belief strengths should be marked.

In terms of percentage of time, "mildly" is about 25%, "moderately" is about 50%, and "strongly" is about 75% of the time. Don't skip any items.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Mildly</th>
<th>Moderately</th>
<th>Strongly</th>
<th>Absolutely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>I believe that I ought to be or should be different from what I am.</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>I believe I need more self-confidence.</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>I believe that I would like and accept myself better if I had more self-confidence.</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>I believe I ought to be a better person.</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>I believe all people should have worthwhile lives.</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>I believe that if I act differently from my usual self, I will be a phony.</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>I believe that a person's behavior describes the person.</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>I believe I am a born worrier.</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>I believe that people should live up to their potential.</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>I believe there is me and another &quot;real&quot; me.</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>I believe that my emotional feelings are more important for my self-understanding than my thoughts.</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>I believe a person has got to be unhappy if he has few or no real friends (i.e., people who really care).</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>I believe I should be more intelligent than I am.</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>I believe I am incapable of sexually satisfying most normal members of the opposite sex.</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. I believe people must have goals, purpose, and direction in life which are generally accepted as worthwhile before they can accept themselves.</td>
<td></td>
<td>b</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. I believe that if people really get to know the real me, they will not like me.</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. I believe I should be more masculine.</td>
<td></td>
<td>b</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. I believe I should be more feminine.</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Regardless of their attempts to deceive me, I believe that I can tell pretty well what people are thinking about me.</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. I believe what is real to me is the most important reality for me to consider when solving my personal problems.</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. I believe I ought to try to please other people even if I am not pleased.</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. I believe that it is my regrettable or abnormal past that is causing most of my personal problems.</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. I believe that worry does sometimes help me.</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. I believe that most people who don't behave the way they should behave ought to be punished.</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. I believe that it is natural and normal to get upset if really important things don't go the way they should.</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. I believe that people who try to control their emotions don't really enjoy life; they are like robots.</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Mildly</td>
<td>Moderately</td>
<td>Strongly</td>
<td>Absolutely</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. I believe a person is happiest when his emotions are free and uncontrolled.</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>e</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. I believe that a person who does not feel guilty about his shortcomings and failures is not a whole person; I mean, that person has to be some kind of psychopath.</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>e</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. I believe that how badly I feel when a loved one leaves me or is hurt shows me how much I really care for that person.</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>e</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. I believe that being really sincere in my desires and really honest in my emotional experiences are the most important factors that make things turn out the way I want them to.</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>e</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. I believe that my present emotional responses to people and life events are the only real, natural and normal feelings for me to have, and I wouldn't be &quot;for real,&quot; the real me, if I changed this.</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>e</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. I believe that if I really make an honest effort to do something and I fail at it, that means that I can't do the thing; so, there is no rational reason to persist in trying to do it.</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>e</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. I believe that if certain people were to treat me the way they should, I could feel better and/or accept myself better.</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>e</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. I believe that if I could make certain people see how their actions cause emotional pain, they would treat me better.</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>e</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
35. I believe that people have to like themselves in order to accept themselves. a b c d e

36. I believe that there are standards of right and wrong that ought to be followed regardless of personal feelings. a b c d e

37. I believe that everyone needs and has to be loved in order to accept himself. a b c d e

38. I believe that everyone ought to put other people's feelings ahead of their own more often. a b c d e

39. I believe that how other people treat you is the main factor in determining your feelings of worth and self-acceptance. a b c d e

40. I believe that if people would just be honest with me, I wouldn't have so many emotional problems. a b c d e

41. I believe that magical or other supernatural powers are causal factors in life events. a b c d e
PART II

Directions

Turn your answer sheet over. At the top print your name in the space provided. The statements on Part II of this questionnaire are to be answered either True or False as they most commonly describe your feelings, beliefs, or behaviors. Mark your responses on the back of your answer sheet (not the test booklet) beginning with #151, and again working from left to right on your answer sheet. To indicate true on your answer sheet mark the space under (a). To indicate False, mark the space under (b). Do not skip any items.
PART II

151. I do not tire quickly.
152. I am often sick to my stomach.
153. I am about as nervous as other people.
154. I have very few headaches.
155. I work under a great deal of strain.
156. I cannot keep my mind on one thing.
157. I worry over money and business.
158. I frequently notice my hand shakes when I try to do something.
159. I blush as often as others.
160. I have diarrhea ("the runs") once a month or more.
161. I worry quite a bit over possible troubles.
162. I practically never blush.
163. I am often afraid that I am going to blush.
164. I have nightmares every few nights.
165. My hands and feet are usually warm enough.
166. I sweat very easily even on cool days.
167. When embarrassed I often break out in a sweat which is very annoying.
168. I do not often notice my heart pounding and I am seldom short of breath.
169. I feel hungry almost all the time.
170. Often my bowels don't move for several days at a time.
171. I have a great deal of stomach trouble.
172. At times I lose sleep over worry.
173. My sleep is restless and disturbed.
174. I often dream about things I don't like to tell other people.
175. I am easily embarrassed.
176. My feelings are hurt easier than most people.
177. I often find myself worrying about something.
178. I wish I could be as happy as others.
179. I am usually calm and not easily upset.
180. I cry easily.
181. I feel anxious about something or someone almost all of the time.
182. I am happy most of the time.
183. It makes me nervous to have to wait.
184. At times I am so restless that I cannot sit in a chair for very long.
185. Sometimes I become so excited that I find it hard to get to sleep.
186. I have often felt that I faced so many difficulties I could not overcome them.
187. At times I have been worried beyond reason about something that really did not matter.
188. I do not have as many fears as my friends.
189. I have been afraid of things or people that I know could not hurt me.
190. I certainly feel useless at times.
191. I find it hard to keep my mind on a task or job.
192. I am more self-conscious than most people.
193. I am the kind of person who takes things hard.
194. I am a very nervous person.
195. Life is often a strain for me.
196. At times I think I am no good at all.
197. I am not at all confident of myself.
198. At times I feel that I am going to crack up.
199. I don't like to face a difficulty or make an important decision.
200. I am very confident of myself.
Rewritten Versions of some of the
Common Belief Scale Items
1. I believe I have to change some things about myself before I can accept myself.

4. I believe that I cannot change some of my bad habits.

9. I believe that people who don't live up to their potential are wasting their lives.

10. I believe there are things about myself I can never accept.

13. I believe that if I had more intelligence I would be happier.

17. I believe if I were more masculine I would accept myself more.

21. I believe that I am selfish because I usually please myself first and others second.

23. I believe that it is natural to worry about the future.

32. I believe that failure is one of the hardest things for me to accept.

38. I believe that everyone should put other people's feelings ahead of their own more often because it is the right way to be.

41. I believe that I have little control over what happens in my life.
Common Belief Scale Factor Compositions
Factor 1: Emotional Magic

20. I believe what is real to me is the most important reality for me to consider when solving my personal problems.

25. I believe that it is natural and normal to get upset if really important things don't go the way they should.

26. I believe that people who try to control their emotions don't really enjoy life; they are like robots.

27. I believe a person is happiest when his emotions are free and uncontrolled.

29. I believe that how badly I feel when a loved one leaves me or is hurt shows how much I really care for that person.

30. I believe that being really sincere in my desires and really honest in my emotional experiences are the most important factors that make things turn out the way I want them to.

31. I believe that my present emotional responses to people and life events are the only real, natural and normal feelings for me to have, and I wouldn't be "for real," the real me, if I changed them.

Factor 2: Dissatisfaction with Self

1. I believe that I ought to be or should be different from what I am.

2. I believe I need more self-confidence.

3. I believe that I would like and accept myself better if I had more self-confidence.

4. I believe I ought to be a better person.

8. I believe I am a born worrier.

Factor 3: Need for Approval

5. I believe all people should have worthwhile lives.

7. I believe that a person's behavior describes the person.

12. I believe that a person has got to be unhappy if he has few or no real friends (i.e.; people who really care).

15. I believe people must have goals, purpose, and direction in life which are generally accepted as worthwhile before they can accept themselves.
35. I believe that people have to like themselves in order to accept themselves.

36. I believe that there are standards of right and wrong that ought to be followed regardless of personal feelings.

37. I believe that everyone needs and has got to be loved in order to accept himself.

39. I believe that how other people treat you is the main factor in determining your feelings of worth and self-acceptance.

Factor 4: Projecting Blame

13. I believe I should be more intelligent than I am.

22. I believe that it is my regrettable or abnormal past that is causing most of my personal problems.

33. I believe that if certain people were to treat me the way they should, I could feel better and/or accept myself better.

34. I believe that if I could make certain people see how their actions cause emotional pain, they would treat me better.

40. I believe that if people would just be honest with me, I wouldn't have so many emotional problems.

41. I believe that magical or other supernatural powers are causal factors in life events.

Factor 5: Self-Image

17. I believe I should be more masculine.

18. I believe I should be more feminine.

Factor 6: Need for Improvement

4. I believe I ought to be a better person.

13. I believe I should be more intelligent than I am.

Factor 7: Punishment

15. I believe that people must have goals, purpose, and direction in life which are generally accepted as worthwhile before they can accept themselves.

21. I believe I ought to try to please other people even if I am not pleased.
24. I believe that most people who don't behave the way they should behave ought to be punished.

28. I believe that a person who does not feel guilty about his shortcomings and failures is not a whole person; I mean, that person has to be some kind of psychopath.

36. I believe that there are standards of right and wrong that ought to be followed regardless of personal feelings.

Factor 8: Bad Me

1. I believe that I ought to be or should be different from what I am.

10. I believe there is a me and another "real" me.

16. I believe that if people really get to know the real me, they will not like me.

22. I believe that it is my regrettable or abnormal past that is causing most of my personal problems.

Factor 9: You are Your Behavior

6. I believe that if I act differently from my usual self I will be a phony.

7. I believe that a person's behavior describes the person.

31. I believe that my present emotional responses to people and life events are the only real, natural and normal feelings for me to have, and I wouldn't be "for real", the real me, if I changed them.

Factor 10: Less Worthy

21. I believe I ought to try to please other people even if I am not pleased.

38. I believe that everyone ought to put other people's feelings ahead of their own more often.

Unnamed Factor I:

12. I believe a person has got to be unhappy if he has few or no real friends (i.e.; people who really care).

14. I believe I am incapable of sexually satisfying most normal members of the opposite sex.

39. I believe that how other people treat you is the main factor in determining your feelings of worth and self-acceptance.
Unnamed Factor II:

9. I believe that people should live up to their potential.

11. I believe that my emotional feelings are more important for my self understanding than my thoughts.

19. Regardless of their attempts to deceive me, I believe that I can tell pretty well what people are thinking about me.

29. I believe that how badly I feel when a loved one leaves me or is hurt shows how much I really care for that person.

30. I believe that being really sincere in my desires and really honest in my emotional experiences are the most important factors that make things turn out the way I want them to.

Unnamed Factor III:

23. I believe that worry does sometimes help me.

Unnamed Factor IV:

32. I believe that if I really make an honest effort to do something and I fail at it, that means that I can't do the thing; so, there is no rational reason to persist in trying to do it.