



Destructive Thinking and its Relationship with the Psychological Well-being of Al-Zahraa University Students

Zahraa Khudaier Abbas

Al-Zahraa University for Women

Abstract

The current study aimed at identifying the relationship between the psychological well-being of female students at Al-Zahraa University for Women. The sample included (400) female students, using a criterion of how destructive thinking can be measured consisting of 20 sections divided into 4 dimensions that contain 5 sections each. This depends on the dimensions and sections of measurement (that deals with destructive thinking). The dimensions of destructive thinking are represented as follows (categorical thinking - personal superstitious thinking - limited thinking - polyanna thinking). Measuring the psychological well-being of students has also been depended, which consists of 42 sections divided into 6 dimensions including 7 sections each. The results of this study has revealed that there is a contrastive associative relationship between destructive thinking and the psychological well-being of the university students.

Chapter One:

Introduction /

The concept of thinking is something that we build within ourselves and that thinking is built socially as seen by sociologists (Thvayer-Bacon, 2000:22) and it affects the experiences and information of people as between Epstein (Epstin) that people have two defined systems for processing information, the rational system (Rational system) works according to logical calculations and is free from emotions, and its effectiveness can be measured by recognized mental intelligence tests, and the experiential system, which learns according to the experiences that the individual



has stored in his life and is unaware and automatic and occurs unintentionally and is linked to emotions as the experiential system works on Processing information that was formed as a result of experiences automatically, as these experiences affect people's perceptions of reality and reactions towards different situations (Chang, 2014:13). Which requires a person to focus on a high concentration to distinguish between them (Kushel, 2004:92), and the experience system has the main role in maintaining what is true and rejecting what is destructive, and through it correcting wrong ideas and beliefs (Epstein, 2014:317) and the ability to manage negative or painful feelings It is necessary for long-term psychological well-being, and between Huppert (2009) that psychological well-being may be at risk when negative feelings are extreme and long-term and interfere with a person's ability to perform in his daily life and thus affect his way of thinking, and vice versa, individuals who enjoy high levels of psychological well-being They are characterized as having high confidence in their high ability to face their destructive thoughts and adversity, and tend to perceive problems as challenges rather than threats or uncontrollable situations, in addition to that they think of ways to enhance themselves and motivate themselves and show perseverance when facing difficult situations (Schwarzer & Warner, 2019) and thus, they have a higher degree of satisfaction with life and integration among individuals, and an increase in the level of psychological well-being is one of the most important factors in an individual's satisfaction with his goals and desires in life (Singh et al, 2019).

Research objectives: The current research aims to identify:

1. Destructive thinking among female students of Al-Zahra University, peace be upon her.



2. The psychological well-being of the female students of Al-Zahra University, peace be upon her.
3. The statistically significant differences of destructive thinking according to the stage variable (first-second-third-fourth).
4. Statistically significant differences for psychological well-being according to the stage variable (first-second-third-fourth).
5. The Correlative Relationship of Destructive Thinking with the Psychological Well-Being of Female Students of Al-Zahra University, Peace Be Upon Her.

Research Limitations: The current study was limited to the study of destructive thinking and its relationship to psychological well-being.

Define terms:

First: destructive thinking

Epstein defined it:

“It is thinking about negative events, thinking in a categorical way, overgeneralizing, and showing unwarranted anxiety in ways that increase feelings of sadness and stress without accomplishing anything worthwhile” (Katz & Epstein, 1991:792).

- The researcher adopted the theoretical definition (Epstein 1991), due to its reliance on Epstein's (cognitive-experiential theory) in destructive thinking.

- Action definition: It is the score obtained by the respondent by answering the paragraphs of the destructive thinking scale for the purposes of the current research.

Second: psychological well-being



Ryff (1995: p721):

It is a broad range of positive thoughts that includes positive assessments of oneself and one's past life (self-acceptance), a sense of continued growth and development as a person (personality development), a belief that one's life is meaningful (life purpose), and having good relationships with others (relationships). positivity with others), the ability to effectively manage one's life and the world around oneself (environmental mastery), and a sense of decision-making power (autonomy).

- The researcher adopted Ryff's definition (Ryff, 1995: p721) theoretically.
- Action definition: It is the score obtained by the respondent through his answer to the paragraphs of the psychological well-being scale.

Chapter Two (Theoretical Framework):

Most human thinking occurs automatically, depending on the unconscious tacit knowledge and following non-rational principles that are usually adaptive, but they can be non-adaptive in certain situations (Cerni, 2009:55). Consciousness and subconsciousness are similar to the generation of snow, but the subconscious represents more than two-thirds. The small part represents consciousness, and he believes that the processing of conscious and explicit information is not achieved until after the pronunciation is done. The unconscious processing is a special case that results from repression and the pronunciation does not take place, that is, it is prohibited to anticipate anxiety from pronouncing it. Which causes mental disorders and the formation of destructive thoughts (Epstein, 1999: 2014). Some psychologists, including Freud, Ellis, and Seligman, explained how automatic unconscious interpretations of reality take place by influencing feelings and behavior. As it is known, the cognitive therapist seeks to detect automatic and



illogical thoughts. And self-destructive, so that the individual can know how those thoughts create the problems he faces, and then the individual can correct the biased and erroneous thoughts (Epstein, 1998:83). They engage in ineffective interaction processes through absolute generalization directed towards self and others. (Epstein & Meier, 1989:335)

The researcher relied on Epstein's epistemological-experiential theory, which dealt with the concept of destructive thinking, and summarized its concept as follows:

Cognitive-Experiential Theory:

Epstein (1973-2014) worked on the formulation and development of the cognitive-experiential theory, which stands for CET, where the theory deals with the interpretation of dual cognitive processes differently from the theories that explained the dual cognitive processes. An integrated theory of personality that is compatible in some respects with many learning theories and cognitive theories in how information is processed (Epstein, 2011, Demirtas & Guven, 2017).

The theory assumed that there are two systems for processing information, namely the rational system and the experimental system, and that both systems work separately on the one hand, and on the other hand, that both systems work in parallel and form a dual-interaction process, and the experimental system often helps the interaction between the two systems. The rational system can affect the experimental system Through the associations that it creates, it is assumed that both systems contribute to the formation of behavior (Epstein, 2014:12). Here is an explanation of both systems:

1-Experiential System



According to CET theory, the experiential system is closely related to emotions (Epstein et al. 1996), and it learns directly from experience and is able to operate at both high and low levels (especially when interacting with the rational system). The experiential system can have an important impact. In the processes of insight and imagination, the experiential system tends to process information in the subconscious automatically, quickly, effortlessly, and efficiently (Denes-Raj & Epstein, 1994:821). It also has the ability to process simple and complex information, and the experiential system solves some problems more effectively than the rational system (Epstein 1994).

2- Rational System

According to (CET) theory, the rational system is an inferential system that works according to a person's understanding and ability to think logically and operates at the conscious level and is able to use complex language and complex logical reasoning and its functions are connected in the human brain. Based on this system, individuals try to solve problems by The way of logic and supporting solutions with evidence (Epstein, 2014; Epstein 1996).

Dimensions of destructive thinking:

Epstein explained that there are four dimensions of destructive thinking, the most important of which are:

1- Categorical Thinking:

Categorical thinking refers to "looking at things categorically as either black or white without a middle ground" as they see people as either friends or foes. The categorical thinking consists of two components: the methodology of thinking, and the content



of thinking, and they are in constant interaction to form categorical thinking. Individuals who have high categorical thinking are intolerant of others, and view individuals as untrustworthy (Epstein, 2014:166). As they assume that there is only one right way to do anything, it is easy for them to take actions and decisions because things seem so clear to them (Epstein, 1998:43). Categorical thinking may be useful in some situations where time is tight and quick action is required (Epstein, 2014:22).

2- Personal Superstitious Thinking

Personal superstition refers to “personal superstitions that a person believes other than traditional superstitions that cause disappointments. Examples of this are the belief that if something good happens to you, it will be offset by something equally bad, or if you talk about something you hope for, it won’t come true.” Individuals who enjoy constructive thinking do not believe that talking about the possibility of success will prevent them from succeeding (Epstein, 1998:44). Individuals who have highly personal superstitious thinking defend themselves against threat and adversity more than their interest in achieving happiness. They tend to be pessimistic, feel helpless and be They are prone to depression and have difficulty controlling their feelings (Epstein, 2014: 166). A study (Epstein & Pacini, 1999) found that personal superstitious thinking is associated with sadness, feelings of worthlessness, pessimism, lack of spontaneity, nervousness, and repressed anger. , guilt, hopelessness, low self-esteem, submissiveness, low positive affect, and unsatisfactory relationships (Epstein & Pacini, 1999).

3- Esoteric Thinking



Limiting thinking refers to “traditional superstitions and belief in phenomena that cannot be validated and are scientifically questionable.” Examples of limiting thinking include belief in the existence of ghosts, astrology, magic, and luck (Epstein, 2014:167). High levels of limiting thinking indicate a lack of discipline, thinking, and an over-reliance on traditional, intuitive, superstitious impressions. It includes a belief in lucky charms. Although not focused on negative thinking, it is associated with a tendency to have depressive episodes, suggesting that people who are less disciplined and rational in their thinking are more likely to be depressed than others. High scores in limited thinking are inversely related to rational thinking (Pacini et al., 1998).

4- Naive optimism

Naive optimism refers to "jumping into a positive outcome situation after a positive outcome has occurred."

Naïve optimists are convictions too simple to be useful guides in the real world—for example, that everyone should love their parents or that people can achieve whatever they want if they have enough willpower. Naive optimists are highly positive thinkers who have all the right ideas, perform conventionally accepted beliefs, and don't overthink things. They love people, are liked by others (everyone likes an optimist), are often forgiven for their mistakes, and feel that everything is okay. In contrast to the more pragmatic optimism that is part of behavioral conditioning, naive optimism carries overly positive thinking. They have a simplistic view of life, a tendency to ignore unpleasant realities, and a failure to take preventive action in threatening situations (Epstein, 1998, 2014). Naive optimism is closely



related to categorical thinking but is more negative, and they are also very likely to have unrealistic positive opinions. About themselves (Epstein, 2014:168)

Carol Ryff's Model of Psychological Well-Being (Ryff)

Ryff presented a model for the interpretation of psychological well-being. This model stems from the fact that psychological well-being is not limited to a mere absence of mental disorders and diseases, but rather a set of positive traits and characteristics that help the individual to live in an appropriate manner (Ryff, 1989). According to this model, psychological well-being includes a set of related dimensions. with each other, and between which there is a dynamic interaction, namely:

Dimensions of psychological well-being:

- 1- Independence: It refers to the independence of the individual and his ability to make decisions, resist social pressures, and control and regulate personal behavior during interaction with others.
- 2- Environmental mastery: the ability of the individual to be able to organize conditions and control many activities, and to benefit in an effective way from the conditions of the surrounding conditions, and to provide the appropriate environment, and personal flexibility.
- 3- Personal growth: the individual's ability to develop his abilities, increase his effectiveness and personal efficiency in various aspects, and feel optimistic.



4- Positive Relationships: The ability of the individual to form and establish positive mutual friendships and social relations with others on the basis of: friendliness, sympathy, mutual trust, understanding, influence, friendship, give and take.

5- The purpose of life: the individual's ability to objectively define his goals in life, and to have a clear goal and vision that directs his actions, actions, and behaviors with perseverance and determination to achieve his goals.

6- Self-acceptance: It refers to the ability to realize oneself and positive attitudes towards oneself and one's past life, and acceptance of the various manifestations of oneself, including positive and negative aspects (Ryff & Singer, 2008).

Chapter three research methodology and procedures

This chapter includes a presentation of each of the research methodology, procedures and descriptive in the relational relationship.

First: Research Methodology:

The researcher adopted the descriptive correlational approach in the research.

Second: Research Population:

The current research community was determined by the female students of Al-Zahra University, peace be upon her, in the scientific and human specializations for the academic year (2022_2023), which numbered (2502) students.

The current research sample consists of (400) female students, representing 16% of the research community.

Third: Search tools:



Destructive thinking scale: It consists of 20 items distributed on four dimensions, with 5 items for each dimension. The researcher adopted Epstein's cognitive-experiential theory and relied on Epstein's list, which measures destructive thinking. The dimensions of destructive thinking were represented by the following (categorical thinking _ personal superstitious thinking _ limited thinking _ optimism slob)

Psychological well-being scale: It consists of 42 items distributed over six dimensions, with 7 items for each dimension

Statistical analysis of the items of the destructive thinking scale

a. The relationship of the paragraph score with the total score of the scale

Pearson's correlation was calculated between the score of each paragraph and the total score of the destructive thinking scale. The paragraph is equal to or greater than the tabular value of the Pearson correlation coefficient, which is equal to (0.128) at the level of significance (0.01), and the tabular value of the Pearson correlation coefficient is (0.098) at the level of significance (0.05).) and a degree of freedom (398). Table No. (1) shows the correlation coefficients of each paragraph with the total degree.

Schedule(1) The relationship of the paragraph score with the total score of the destructive thinking scale

معامل الارتباط	الفقرة	معامل الارتباط	الفقرة
**0.612	11	**0.595	1



**0.596	12	**0.673	2
**0.573	13	**0.472	3
**0.612	14	**0.643	4
**0.650	15	**0.488	5
**0.477	16	**0.571	6
**0.556	17	**0.637	7
**0.563	18	**0.536	8
**0.427	19	**0.658	9
**0.681	20	**0.421	10

* D at the level of significance (0.05)

** D at the level of significance (0.01)

It is clear from the above table that all paragraphs are acceptable because the values of the correlation coefficients are greater than the tabular value of the Pearson correlation coefficient (0.128) at the level of significance (0.01) and the degree of freedom (398).

B- The relationship of the degree of the paragraph with the total degree of the field to which it belongs

Pearson's correlation was calculated between the score of each paragraph and the total score of the field to which it belongs. The paragraph is considered acceptable if it is equal to or greater than the tabular value of the Pearson correlation coefficient,



which is equal to (0.128) at the level of significance (0.01). The tabular value of the Pearson correlation coefficient is (0.098) at the level of significance. Significance (0.05) and a degree of freedom (398). Table No. (2) shows the correlation of each paragraph with the total degree of the domain to which it belongs

schedule (2) The relationship of the paragraph score with the total score of the field to which it belongs

المجال	الفقرة	معامل الارتباط	المجال	الفقرة	معامل الارتباط
التفكير التصنيفي	1	**0.706	التفكير المحدود	11	**0.731
	2	**0.664		12	**0.816
	3	**0.782		13	**0.751
	4	**0.767		14	**0.743
	5	**0.687		15	**0.698
التفكير الخرافي الشخصي	6	**0.833	التفاوت الساذج	16	**0.687
	7	**0.717		17	**0.710
	8	**0.863		18	**0.695
	9	**0.739		19	**0.748
	10	**0.812		20	**0.824

* D at the level of significance (0.05)

* * D at the level of significance (0.01)

It is clear from the above table that all paragraphs are acceptable because the values of the correlation coefficients are greater than the tabular value of the Pearson



correlation coefficient (0.128) at the level of significance (0.01) and the degree of freedom (398).

C_ The relationship of the field to the field and the field to the total degree

Pearson correlation coefficient was calculated between the score of each domain and the other domains, and between the score of each domain and the total score of the scale. The value of the Pearson correlation coefficient is a criterion to know that the scale is internally consistent if the value of the Pearson correlation coefficient is equal to or greater than the tabular value of the Pearson correlation coefficient, which is equal to (0.128) at the level of significance (0.01), and the tabular value of the Pearson correlation coefficient is (0.098) at the level of significance (0.05) and degrees of freedom (398), and Table (3) illustrates this.

schedule(3)

The relationship of the field to the field and the field to the total

المتغيرات	التفكير المدمر	التفكير التصنيفي	التفكير الخرافي الشخصي	التفكير المحدود	التفاؤل الساذج
التفكير المدمر	1	-	-	-	-
التفكير التصنيفي	**0.690	1	-	-	-
التفكير الخرافي الشخصي	**0.729	**0.691	1	-	-
التفكير المحدود	**0.702	**0.688	**0.717	1	-
التفاؤل الساذج	0.783	**0.802	**0.792	**0.788	1

* D at the level of significance (0.05)



* * D at the level of significance (0.01)

It is clear from the above table that the scale is internally consistent because the values of its correlation coefficients are greater than the tabular value of the Pearson correlation coefficient (0.128) at a level of significance (0.01) and a degree of freedom (398).

Psychological well-being scale: The researcher relied on the Riff scale (1989) for psychological well-being consisting of (42) items distributed on (six dimensions). The dimensions were as follows:

(independence - environmental mastery - personal growth - positive relationships - life purpose - self-acceptance)

Statistical analysis of the items of the psychological well-being scale

A- The relationship of the paragraph score with the total score of the scale

Pearson's correlation was calculated between the degree of each item and the total score of the psychological well-being scale. The item is equal to or greater than the tabular value of the Pearson correlation coefficient, which is equal to (0.128) at the level of significance (0.01), and the tabular value of the Pearson correlation coefficient is (0.098) at the level of significance (0.05).) and a degree of freedom (398). Table No. (1) shows the correlation coefficients of each paragraph with the total degree.

معامل الارتباط	ت	معامل الارتباط	ت	معامل الارتباط	ت
** 0.657	29	** 0.605	15	** 0.582	1
** 0.547	30	** 0.666	16	** 0.530	2



** 0.637	31	** 0.596	17	** 0.627	3
** 0.596	32	** 0.589	18	** 0.553	4
** 0.566	33	** 0.638	19	** 0.512	5
** 0.622	34	** 0.638	20	** 0.594	6
** 0.514	35	** 0.517	21	** 0.567	7
** 0.633	36	** 0.620	22	** 0.678	8
** 0.619	37	** 0.725	23	** 0.618	9
** 0.584	38	** 0.656	24	** 0.601	10
** 0.598	39	** 0.578	25	** 0.573	11
** 0.587	40	** 0.576	26	** 0.603	12
** 0.703	41	** 0.658	27	** 0.530	13
** 0.634	42	** 0.685	28	** 0.619	14

* D at the level of significance (0.05)

** D at the level of significance (0.01)

It is clear from the above table that all paragraphs are acceptable because the values of the correlation coefficients are greater than the tabular value of the Pearson correlation coefficient (0.128) at the level of significance (0.01) and the degree of freedom (398).

B _ The relationship of the degree of the paragraph with the total degree of the field to which it belongs

Pearson's correlation was calculated between the score of each paragraph and the total score of the field to which it belongs. The paragraph is considered acceptable



if it is equal to or greater than the tabular value of the Pearson correlation coefficient, which is equal to (0.128) at the level of significance (0.01). The tabular value of the Pearson correlation coefficient is (0.098) at the level of significance. Significance (0.05) and a degree of freedom (398). Table No. (4) shows the correlation of each paragraph with the total degree of the field to which it belongs.

* D at the level of significance (0.05)

** D at the level of significance (0.01)

It is clear from the above table that all paragraphs are acceptable because the values of the correlation coefficients are greater than the tabular value of the Pearson correlation coefficient (0.128) at the level of significance (0.01) and the degree of freedom (398).

C_ The relationship of the field to the field and the field to the total degree

Pearson correlation coefficient was calculated between the score of each domain and the other domains, and between the score of each domain and the total score of the scale. The value of the Pearson correlation coefficient is a criterion to know that the scale is internally consistent if the value of the Pearson correlation coefficient is equal to or greater than the tabular value of the Pearson correlation coefficient, which is equal to (0.128) at the level of significance (0.01), and the tabular value of the Pearson correlation coefficient is (0.098) at the level of significance (0.05) and degrees of freedom (398), and Table (3) illustrates this.

المتغيرات	الرفاه النفسي	الاستقلالية	التمكن البيئي	النمو الشخصي	العلاقات الايجابية	الغرض من الحياة	تقبل الذات
الرفاه النفسي	1	-	-	-	-	-	-



-	-	-	-	-	1	**0.682	الاستقلالية
-	-	-	-	1	**0.684	**0.753	التمكن البيئي
-	-	-	1	**0.754	**0.752	**0.734	النمو الشخصي
-	-	1	**0.757	**0.758	**0.816	**0.748	العلاقات الايجابية
-	1	**0.707	**0.695	**0.758	**0.787	**0.760	الغرض من الحياة
1	**0.704	**0.698	**0.729	**0.748	**0.639	**0.753	تقبل الذات

* D at the level of significance (0.05)

** D at the level of significance (0.01)

It is clear from the above table that the scale is internally consistent because the values of its correlation coefficients are greater than the tabular value of the Pearson correlation coefficient (0.128) at a level of significance (0.01) and a degree of freedom (398).

Reliability

The stability of the two scales was verified by Cronbach's Alpha method, where the reliability coefficient of Cronbach's alpha for the destructive thinking scale was (0.872), while the reliability coefficient of Cronbach's alpha for the psychological well-being scale was (0.869).



The fourth chapter

This chapter includes presenting the results of the current research according to the objectives set in the first chapter and after conducting the statistical analyzes that were obtained by applying the tools of the current research on the basic research sample and then interpreting the results in the light of the theories and models adopted and discussing them in the light of previous studies that Related to the research variables and then come up with a set of conclusions, recommendations and proposals as follows:

The first objective: to identify the destructive thinking of the female students of Al-Zahra University, peace be upon her

The t-test for one sample to identify the significance of the difference between the arithmetic mean and the hypothetical mean of the destructive thinking scale

الدالة	القيمة التائية المحسوبة	الوسط الفرضي	الانحراف المعياري	الوسط الحسابي	العينة
دالة**	11.035	60	20.06256	48.9300	400

* The tabular t-value is (1.96) at the level of significance (0.05).

** The tabular t-value is (2.57) at the level of significance (0.01).

It is clear from the above table that the research sample has destructive thinking with a high degree, because the calculated t-value (11.035) is greater than the tabular t-value (2.57) with a level of significance (0.01) and a degree of freedom (399), and this significance is in favor of the hypothetical mean, and it turns out that the sample does not have thinking This is due to the experiences of the students and their



geographical system responds automatically and constructively in the situations that confront them due to lack of belief and a large extent in personal superstitions and weakness in limited thinking, i.e. gives explanations in some situations as carrying moderation without a decisive judgment and they have realistic optimism for events and situations.

الدالة	القيمة التائية المحسوبة	الوسط الفرضي	الانحراف المعياري	الوسط الحسابي	العينة
دالة**	7.764	126	28.95277	137.2400	400

The tabular t-value is (1.96) at the level of significance (0.05).

** The tabular t-value is (2.57) at the level of significance (0.01).

It is clear from the above table that the research sample enjoys psychological well-being because the calculated t-value (7.764) is greater than the tabular t-value (2.57) with a level of significance (0.01) and a degree of freedom (399). The results of this goal can be explained by students who value goals in life They are happier and more psychologically well-being than those who live an empty life without goals for life, and therefore the more they are stripped of ideas that are destructive to their aspirations and goals, the more they feel comfortable and high psychological well-being.



The third objective: to identify the statistically significant differences of destructive thinking according to the stage variable (first-second-third-fourth).

One-way analysis of variance to identify differences in constructive thinking among female students of Al-Zahra University

الدلالة	القيمة الفائية النحسوبة	متوسط المربعات	درجات الحرية	مجموع المربعات	مصدر التباين
غير دالة	1.755	584.310	3	1752.930	بين المجموعات
		332.954	396	131849.668	داخل المجموعات
			399	133602.598	الكلي

*Tabular p-value = (2.60) with a level of significance (0.05) and two degrees of freedom (3-396)

** Tabular p-value = (3.78) with a level of significance (0.01) and two degrees of freedom (3-396)

Since the calculated p-value (1.755) is smaller than the tabular p-value (2.60) with a level of significance (0.05) and two degrees of freedom (3-396), then there are no statistically significant differences in destructive thinking according to the stage variable.

The fourth objective / identifying statistically significant differences in psychological well-being according to the variable of the stage (first-second-third-fourth).



One-way analysis of variance to identify differences in the psychological well-being of Al-Zahra University female students

الدالة	القيمة الفائية النحسوبة	متوسط المربعات	درجات الحرية	مجموع المربعات	مصدر التباين
غير دالة	2.099	71.605	3	214.816	بين المجموعات
		34.110	396	13507.694	داخل المجموعات
			399	13722.51	الكلي

*Tabular p-value = (2.60) with a level of significance (0.05) and two degrees of freedom (3-396)

** Tabular p-value = (3.78) with a level of significance (0.01) and two degrees of freedom (3-396)

Since the calculated p-value (2.099) is smaller than the tabular p-value (2.60) with a level of significance (0.05) and two degrees of freedom (3-396), then there are no statistically significant differences for psychological well-being according to the stage variable.

Fifth: The correlation of destructive thinking with the psychological well-being of the female students of Al-Zahra University, peace be upon her.

The correlation between destructive thinking and psychological well-being among female students of Al-Zahra University

العلاقة الارتباطية	المتغيرات	
-0.528	الرفاه النفسي	التفكير المدمر



*Tabular value of the Pearson correlation coefficient (0.098) with a degree of freedom (398) and a significance level of 0.05

* Tabular value of the Pearson correlation coefficient (0.128) with a degree of freedom (398) and a level of significance (0.01)

It is possible to explain this result to the fact that destructive thinking leads a person to potential problems from a psychological point of view, which makes his generalizations of situations inaccurate and incorrect. Self-acceptance, positive relationships, independence, life purpose, and environmental mastery all of this led to an inverse relationship between destructive thinking and psychological well-being.

Conclusions:

1- Not believing in personal superstitions or that prevail in society and in realistic and constructive thinking. This led to destructive thinking not being at a high level among university students.

2- The age stage of the research sample is the stage of growth and maturity, which includes achieving some of their life goals and striving to achieve other goals and feeling that life has a meaning. This is what led them to feel psychological well-being.

3- Because of the closeness of the educational levels and the same geographical environment, there were no differences between the educational stages in destructive thinking and psychological well-being.

4- The lack of harmony between living with destructive thoughts and psychological well-being at the same time led to an inverse relationship between the two variables.



Recommendations:

- 1- Holding training workshops to educate university students about destructive thinking and its danger to an individual's life.
- 2- Holding training workshops to help university students feel more psychological well-being.

Suggestions:

- 1- Studying the relationship of destructive thinking with other variables such as (habits of mind, intellectual humility, moral personality).

References:

- Chang, Mei-I.(1996).Characteristics associated with resilience in battered women. (A Doctoral Research Project), Indiana State University Terre Haute, Indiana .
- Epstein, S. (2014). Cognitive-experiential theory: an integrative theory of personality. New York: Oxford University.
- Katz , L. , & Epstein , S . (1991). Constructive thinking and coping with laboratory-induced stress. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology , 61 ,789–800 .
- Singh,pradhan,R ., panigrahy, n., & Jena , L.(2019). Self- efficacy and workplace well-being:moderating role of sustainability practices . An International Journal.



- Kushel,G.(2004). Mind Laundry concept and format . Replika Press.
- Thayer-Bacon, B. (2000). Constructive Thinking Versus Critical Thinking. Journal of the Canadian Philosophy of Education Society ,13 (1),21-40.
- Cerni, T, (2009). Information-processing and Leadership in School Principals: Cognitive-experiential self theory and transformational leadership. (Master's Theses), University of Western, Sydney.
- Epstein , S. (1998). Constructive thinking: Th e key to emotional intelligence. Westport, CT : Greenwood Publishing .
- Epstein , S. (1999). The interpretation of dreams from the perspective of cognitive-experiential self-theory. In J. A. Singer , & P. Salovey (Eds.), At play inthe fields of consciousness: Essays in honor of Jerome L. Singer (pp. 59–82).Mahway, NJ : Lawrence Erlbaum .
- Epstein , S. , & Pacini , R. (1999). Constructive thinking and coping with stress in the everyday life of college students . (Statistically analyzed unpublished data). . in Epstein, S. (2014). Cognitive-experiential theory: an integrative theory of personality. New York: Oxford University.
- Epstein, S. (2014). Cognitive-experiential theory: an integrative theory of personality. New York: Oxford University.
- Epstein, S. , & Meier , P. (1989). Constructive thinking: A broad coping variable with specific components. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology , 57 , 332–349 .



- Epstein. S. (1994). Integration of the cognitive and the psychoanalytic unconscious. *American Psychologist*, 49 , 709–724.
- Demirtaş, A. Güven.M.(2017). The effect of cognitive-experiential theory based psycho-educational program on constructive thinking. *Journal Cogent Psychology* , 4, 1-13.
- Pacini , R. , Muir , F. , & Epstein , S. (1998). Depressive realism from the perspective of cognitive-experiential self-theory. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 74 ,1056–1068 .
- Ryff, C.(1989) . Happiness is ever thing, or is it?Explortion on the meaning of psychological well – being . *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 57(6). 1069- 1081.
- Ryff, C.D. & Singer, B . (2008). Know Thyself and Become what You Are: A Eudaimonic Approach To Psychological Well- Being.,*Journal of happiness Studies*,9,13-39.