The Effect of a Defusion Technique with Negative and Positive Self-Statements: Using FAST to Explore the Defusion Process in Terms of RFT and the DAARRE Model Maho Konda and Shinji Tani The College of Human Science, Ritsumeikan University

Background

Defusion can be defined in terms of three aspects: procedure, process, and outcome (Assaz, Roche, Kanter, & Ochiro, 2018). Although a large number of defusion studies was conducted, *only a small number of researchers has* conducted defusion studies that have focused on the investigation of defusion-the-process based on Relational Frame Theory and related models such as DAARRE model.

What is the whole process that can yield the effect of defusion-the-procedure?

Operational Definition of Defusion and Hypothesis

Defusion = disrupting transformation of function and arbitrary applicable relational response, which allow people to distance from context (e.g., self-statements) that prevent them to live in a way they want (Blackledge, 2007; Harris, 2007).

Defusion-the-process: The changes in C_{rel} and C_{fun} which were involved in one's relational framing for self-statement (i.e., increasing derivation, decreasing coherence, increasing orienting functions, increasing evoking functions), and the increase in the behavioral fluency in the relational framing (Blackledge,

Defusion-the-outcome:

The reduction in the believability of positive/negative self-statements (i.e., less likely to treat selfstatement as the absolute truth, which is unchangeable and irreversible) and the correlation between the believability of positive/negative self-statements would be yielded (more likely to observe the positive/negative self-statements independent from each other; Assaz et al., 2018; McHugh et al.,

Hypothesis 1:

Defusion technique can reduce...

- the absolute value of Strength of Relation (SoR), the index of Function Acquisition Speed Test (FAST).
- the believability of positive/negative self-statements.



Participants: 23 participants (4 male, 19 female, $M_{age} = 26.52$, SD = 6.04, age range = 21 - 42 years old) were randomly assigned to either the experimental (Defusion; DF) or control (Non-Defusion; NDF) condition. FAST Stimuli : [Baseline 1 & 2] : nonsense syllables; [the correct responses at the consistent block]: press M if "positive self-statements" or "may be true/fact"; [the correct responses at the inconsistent block] : press M if "positive self-statements" or "may not be true/fact" and press Z if "negative self-statements" or "may be true/fact". FAST Criterion: 10 consecutive correct response by the end of each block (100 trials), otherwise the data was excluded from FAST analysis.

Results:

ts

The Difference in Believability of Self-Statements Between DF and NDF Condition	The Correlation Between The Believability of Negative and Positive Self-Statements in NDF Condition.	The Correlation Between The Believability of Negative and Positive Self-Statements in DF Condition.
*	120	120



(3) There was no significant differences in the absolute value of SoR on FAST between conducted. At individual level, the prediction made by the DAARRE model indicated below could predict 70% of NDF participants' response tendencies on FAST, whereas only 50 % of DF participants' response tendencies on FAST was successfully predicted by the prediction.

Conclusion:

- "labeling a thought" defusion technique could help people to be *less likely to treat their positive and negative self-statements as the absolute* truth and allow one to observe the positive and negative self-statements as the statements that simply appeared in one's mind, which was independent from each other.
- The defusion-the-process remined unclear. No significant difference in the absolute value of SoR was found between the conditions.
- At the individual level, the successful prediction rate for FAST response tendency differed between DF condition and NDF condition \rightarrow This 3. difference may reflect the possibility that a *defusion technique might affect individual's Crel and Cfun differently depending on their* original way of relational framing, and the DAARRE model may be useful upon making prediction regarding dynamic interactions of *Crel and Cfun.* RFT and the DAARRE model might be useful for analyzing further defusion process *especially at individual level*.



• Further analysis about defusion would be required \rightarrow Using RFT related model such as the DAARRE model might be beneficial for • Sample size were too small; *more participants would be needed*. Future • The study simply compared two conditions and not directly observed the changes in participants relational framing; *pre-post* analyzing and gaining insights about defusion-the-process, especially at the individual level. Limitation Implication & RFT based analysis might be useful not only for studying defusion-the-process, but also for analyzing individuals' relational framing in design would be preferred in order to observe it. FAST criterion was employed upon analyzing its data; assessing participants relational framing with learning slopes on FASTA Direction flight such as in the context of counseling session; it might allow practitioners to evaluate on-going process of relational framing may be useful for making data exclusion less and precise assessment more. during the session and determine how, to what, where, and when to approach for helping their clients.

References

- Assaz, D. A., Roche, B., Kanter, J. W., & Oshiro, C. K. B. (2018). Cognitive Defusion in Acceptance and Commitment Therapy: What Are the Basic Processes of Change? *Psychological Record*, 68(4), 405–418. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40732-017-0254-z
- Blackledge, J. T. (2007). Disrupting verbal processes: Cognitive defusion in acceptance and commitment therapy and other mindfulness-based psychotherapies. The Psychological Record, 57(4), 555-576. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF03395595
- Harris, R. (2007). The Happiness Trap: How to Stop Struggling and Start Living. Wollombi: Exisle Publishing
- Hayes, S. C., & Smith, S. (2005). Get Out of Your Mind & Into Your Life: The New Acceptance & Commitment Therapy. Oakland: New Harbinger Publications.
- Kishita, N., Muto, T., Ohtsuki, T., & Barnes-Holmes, D. (2014). Measuring the effect of cognitive defusion using the Implicit Relational Assessment Procedure: An experimental analysis with a highly socially anxious sample. Journal of Contextual Behavioral Science, 3(1), 8–15. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcbs.2013.12.001
- Masuda, A., Hayes, S. C., Sackett, C. F., & Twohig, M. P. (2004). Cognitive defusion and self-relevant negative thoughts: Examining the impact of a ninety year old technique. Behaviour Research and Therapy, 42(4), 477-485. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.brat.2003.10.008
- McHugh, L., Stewart, I., Almada, P., & Hayes, S. C. (2019). A Contextual Behavioral Guide to the Self: Theory and Practice. Oakland: New Harbinger Publications.