

Further examination of the factor structure of the Comprehensive assessment of Acceptance and Commitment Therapy processes
Ti Hsu¹, Lesa Hoffman² & Emily B.
Kroska¹

¹Department of Psychological and Brain Sciences, University of Iowa

²Department of Psychological and Quantitative Foundations, University of Iowa

BACKGROUND:

Psychological flexibility is the main target of intervention of Acceptance and Commitment Therapy (ACT; Hayes et al., 1999). The Comprehensive assessment of Acceptance and Commitment Therapy processes (CompACT; Francis et al., 2016) was developed to address the limitations of previous questionnaires assessing the construct. The current study aimed to further validate the CompACT's proposed three-factor structure with confirmatory factor analysis and examine its longitudinal measurement invariance.

METHOD

- Non-clinical sample of U.S. adults
- Confirmatory factor analysis and item factor analysis performed in Mplus v. 8.3 (Muthén & Muthén, 1998-2017).
- Measurement invariance examined over three timepoints over the span of three months (*Ns* = 485, 360, 269).

A CompACT short form demonstrated

adequate reliability, as well as partial

measurement invariance over time.

CompACT-15 Items	CompACT Item #
penness to Experience (OE) Subscale	
ne of my big goals is to be free from painful emotions.	2
try to stay busy to keep thoughts or feelings from coming.	4
tell myself I shouldn't have certain thoughts.	8
go out of my way to avoid situations that might bring difficult thoughts, feelings, or ensations.	11
work hard to keep out upsetting feelings.	15
ehavioral Awareness (BA) Subscale	
rush through meaningful activities without being really attentive to them.	3
find it difficult to stay focused on what's happening in the present.	9
ven when doing the things that matter to me, I find myself doing them without paying ttention.	12
do jobs or tasks automatically, without being aware of what I'm doing.	16
seems I'm "running on automatic" without much awareness of what I'm doing.	19
alued Action (VA) Subscale	
can identify the things that really matter to me in life and pursue them.	1
make choices based on what's important to me, even if it is stressful.	7
behave in line with my personal values.	10
am able to follow my long-term plans times when progress is slow.	17
can keep going with something when it's important to me.	23

RESULTS

- A three-factor model provided inadequate fit for the original items at each timepoint.
- The CompACT-15 short form demonstrated adequate fit for the data at all three time points (for all fit indices except for χ2):
 - **Baseline**: $\chi 2$ (df = 87) = 174.51, TLI = .96, CFI = .97, RMSEA = .05 [CI: 0.04, 0.06], SRMR = 0.05.
 - **Follow-up 1**: χ 2 (df = 87) = 191.47, TLI = .94, CFI = .95, RMSEA = .06 [CI: 0.05, 0.07], SRMR = 0.06.
 - **Follow-up 2**: χ 2 (df = 87) = 141.647, TLI = .97, CFI = .97, RMSEA = .05 [CI: 0.03, 0.06], SRMR = 0.05.
- Item factor analysis (IFA) indicated that response options were differentiable for the 15 items, and that the three factors demonstrated good reliability (≥.80) over the range of the traits. BA's reliability ≥.80 when trait values are at -2.5 SD below the mean and remain at ≤.94 to +1.6 SD above the mean. VA's reliability ≥.80 when trait values are at -3.6 SD below the mean and remain at ≤ .94 to +1.7 SD above the mean. OE's reliability ≥.80 when trait values are at -2.6 SD below the mean and remain consistent at .90 to +2.5 SD above the mean.
- Results of longitudinal measurement invariance analyses indicated that:
 - Partial metric (weak), partial scalar (strong), and partial residual (strict) variance invariance held over time.
 - Full structural invariance also held.

IMPLICATIONS:

- Partial measurement and full structural invariance of the CompACT-15 indicates that it can be used to measure change in each latent factor over time.
- Further testing of the CompACT-15 is necessary in different and diverse samples.