Developing a rating form for negative thoughts.
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Negative thoughts

- 80-99% of normal population (Clark & Rhyno, 2005)
- Suppression is not working (Wenzlaff & Wegner, 2000; Hooper, Saunders, & McHugh, 2010)
  - Derived generalization of thought suppression (Hooper et al., 2010)
- Defusion works better
  - e.g. Masuda et al., 2004, 2007, 2009


How do we measure negative thoughts?

- Self-report (i.e. items about thoughts in general)
  - e.g. WBSI (Wegner, 1989), CFQ-13 (Gillanders et al., 2013), BAFT (Herzberd et al., 2012).
  - Pro: Easier to validate
  - Con: Always group-level


How do we measure negative thoughts?

- Specific thoughts ratings
  - e.g. Believability, discomfort or willingness of specific thought
  - e.g. Masuda et al., 2004 & 2009
  - Pro: Clinically relevant for individual
  - Con: Difficult to validate


The BeNDWill (not final name)

- A negative thought is rated on four 5 or 9 point dichotomous Likert scales
  - Believable-Unbelievable (Healy et al., 2008)
  - Negative-Positive
  - Comfortable-Uncomfortable (Healy et al., 2008)
  - Willingness to experience (Healy et al., 2008)
“The BeNDWill” Instruction

“Now pick a negative thought about yourself that you would rate as at least BELIEVABLE, NEGATIVE, UNCOMFORTABLE and that you are UNWILLING to be thinking about. Make sure that it […] is something that has been showing up for you for a while - not just today.”
Evaluation 1: Duff, Larsson, & McHugh

- Correlational analysis of the four scales with each other and
  - AAQ-2
  - CFQ-13
  - MAAS
  - GHQ-12
Evaluation 1: Duff, Larsson, & McHugh

- Negativity and Discomfort $r = .64^{**}$
- Discomfort and Willingness $r = -.48^{**}$
- Negativity and Willingness $r = -.49^{**}$
- Believability and Negativity $r = -.27^{*}$ (moderate)

- AAQ-2 and Discomfort $r = .35^{*}$
- CFQ-13 and Discomfort $r = .34^{**}$
- CFQ-13 and Believability $r = .29^{**}$
Evaluation 1: Duff, Larsson, & McHugh

- The ratings do correlate strongly within themselves but not so much as to be the same things.
- AAQ-2 and willingness does not seem to be correlated for these thoughts.
- No GHQ-12 correlations indicate non-clinical measure (or just participants)
- Still CFQ-13 and AAQ-2 did seem to map on to comfort.
Evaluation 2: Larsson, Hooper, McHugh, & Bennett

Time 1
Pre-intervention mood and process measures and thought ratings.

Time 2
- **Defusion instruction**
- **Cognitive restructuring instruction**
- **No instruction control**

Time 3
- 5 daily defusion text message reminders and online thought log.
- 5 daily cognitive restructuring text message reminders and online thought log.
- 5 daily text message reminders for online thought log.

Time 4
Post-intervention mood and process measures and thought ratings.
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Evaluation 2: Larsson, Hooper, McHugh, & Bennett

- Although baseline/naturalistic correlations were strong between the negativity, discomfort and willingness scores at post they had moved in different directions.
- Dividing neg/disc/will allowed for a negative evaluation to remain high for negative thoughts (e.g. “I will always be a failure”).
- Sensitive to defusion intervention (high ES)
Future

- Define strengths and weaknesses.
- 5 or 9 item version
- Coupled with behavioural measures
- Employ in clinical population
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