

Competence in RFT and BA Essay Questions:

Please select one (1) of the following essay questions (approx. 500-1000 words) and provide your response in a separate Word Document when you submit your application. In your answer, please refer to the core properties of RFT (i.e. arbitrarily applicable relational responding and transformation of function) and your working knowledge of core behavioral principles (i.e. operant and respondent conditioning).

1. Describe a time when your knowledge of basic behavioral science (RFT and BA) aided you to create, understand, or adapt an intervention or exercise for a particular situation, whether it was therapy, coaching, training or supervision.
2. Explain how you impart your knowledge of RFT and BA to influence the work of a professional, whether an ACT practitioner or otherwise?
3. Drawing on your experience, provide some examples of Transformation of Functions you have seen in a client's behavior in the therapy room, you have tracked outside the therapy room, or in the training context. Present your examples adapting the language for the following two scenarios: as you would do for a colleague coming from a different (theoretical) tradition and then for a 10 year old child.
4. Provide an example and a commentary of how a particular paper on RFT/BA/Basic Science has influenced your ACT training/therapy. You may imagine presenting this to your training audience or to a Peer Reviewed ACT trainer.

Marking criteria for Basic Science Criteria Essays

Relational Frame Theory

Accepted	Answer clearly shows an understanding of Behavior Analysis and Relational Frame Theory and its defining features (e.g. arbitrarily applicable derived relational responding, mutual and combinatorial entailment, transfer of stimulus function, etc.). The scientific and technical terms are used correctly and precisely for the level of analysis chosen. Examples are clear, coherent and relevant for the reader or the trainees. The answer demonstrates a plausible application of the relevant theoretical concepts to the training / supervision or therapy context that is described in the question. The behavior analytic and contextual underpinnings of RFT or the referring basic theory must be evident. The answer is enriched by reflection on personal experience. The way in which basic science has influenced the behavior of the applicant is appreciable in the essay. The value of the scientific basis of ACT in informing the behavior of the applicant is appreciable by the reader. Citation of scientific material is reported correctly. The corrections of the reviewer are limited to refinements, or need of clarification of content.
Accepted with Guidance	The answer shows some understanding of Behavior Analysis and Relational Frame Theory. The scientific and technical terms are used for the most part correctly for the level of analysis reported. At least one example may be clear and of some interest for the reader or trainee. The answer may be relatively basic or limited in creativity. The answer may suggest a more formulaic understanding of the application of RFT and BA. There may still be some minor misunderstandings of some aspects of the material, but these are compensated for in some other aspect of the answer. The answer does not suggest complete confidence in the material, the behavioral nature of RFT may be less evident. If the answer is enriched by reflection on personal experience, this may not be clearly linked to the theory cited. Overall, however there is sufficient evidence of understanding and application to consider that the candidate has at least a basic appreciation of how the work of an ACT trainer is informed by RFT and BA. Citation of scientific material is reported correctly for the most part. The corrections of the reviewer are extended to the theory reported and the need for clarification of the examples and may include suggestions of advanced or recent

	reading on the subject.
Rejected with Minor Revisions	The answer does not really show an understanding of how BA and RFT are applied to the context outlined in the question. There may be some material that is relevant but overall the candidate's understanding of BA and RFT shows some important misunderstandings or gaps in knowledge. The understanding of BA and RFT as a theory might be sufficient to achieve a Accepted with Guidance, but the application is flawed, implausible or reveals errors in using RFT and BA. Or the use of the theory and the scientific terms to explain examples to the audience contains more than one error or incoherence that may affect audience understanding of the theory. The behavioral nature of basic principles of RFT is missed. The answer may show some understanding of RFT and BA, but it does not really engage with the context outlined in the question (i.e. the applicant has written what they know about RFT, without linking this to the relevant context) or the reflective part is not linked to basic theory. Citation of scientific material may be reported incorrectly for the most part. The corrections of the reviewer are extended to the theory reported and the need for clarification of the examples and may include suggestions of basic text reading on basic science.
Rejected with Major Revisions	The answer reveals a lack of knowledge of BA and RFT and its application. There are gaps and misunderstandings in knowledge of RFT, there is no attempt to use concepts drawn from RFT to address the context described in the question. The answer is superficial or implausible and shows errors in both understanding and application of basic science theory. The answer suggests that the applicant does not really know how ACT training, supervision, coaching or therapy is related to RFT and BA. Citation of scientific material is missing. The corrections of the reviewer are extended to the theory reported and the need for clarification of the examples and may include suggestion of basic text reading on basic ACT text as well as basic science papers.

Understanding of Functional Contextualism Essay:

Please select one (1) of the following essay questions (approx. 500-1000 words) and provide your response in a separate Word Document when you submit your application. In your answer, please refer to the core features of Functional Contextualism (i.e. root metaphor and truth criterion).

1. Explain, in what ways might having knowledge of functional contextualism influence your work as an ACT practitioner in your specific context?
2. Why do the answers to so many questions about ACT begin with, "Well... it depends...?" Please share an example of a time when you have responded in this way and how it went.
3. How does functional contextualism inform your practice? In your answer please refer to the core features of FC and give examples of their influence in your practice, both in the form of success and what core features are more difficult to "own" in your practice.
4. Provide an example and a commentary of how a particular paper on functional contextualism has influenced your ACT training/therapy. You may imagine presenting this to your training audience or to a Peer Reviewed ACT trainer.

Marking criteria for Basic Science Criteria Essays

Functional Contextualism

Accepted	Answer clearly shows an understanding of functional contextualism, including many of its important elements (e.g. pragmatic truth, workability, ownership of analytic goals, a-ontological stance). The answer demonstrates a plausible application / underpinning of the relevant philosophical concepts to the training / supervision or therapy context that is described in the question. Examples are clear, coherent and relevant for the reader or the trainees. The functional contextual perspective is 'owned' or defended by the answer and it is evident how that leads to successful working. The answer is enriched by reflection on personal experience. The way in which functional contextualism has influenced the behavior of the applicant is appreciable in the essay. The value of the philosophical position of ACT is appreciable by the reader. Citation of scientific material is reported correctly. The corrections of the reviewer are limited to refinements, few imprecisions or need of clarification of few sentences.
Accepted with Guidance	The answer shows some understanding of functional contextualism and its application to the context that is outlined in the question. The answer may be relatively basic or limited in creativity. The answer may suggest a more formulaic understanding of the philosophical position. There may still be some minor misunderstandings of some aspects of the material, but these are compensated for in some other aspect of the answer. The answer does not suggest complete confidence in the material, the pragmatic stance may be less evident and the answer may inadvertently suggest ontological assumptions. Overall however, there is sufficient evidence of understanding and application to consider that the candidate has at least a basic appreciation of how the work of an ACT trainer is informed by functional contextualism. If the answer is enriched by reflection on personal experience this may not be clearly linked to the philosophical position. Citation of scientific material is reported correctly for the most part. The corrections of the reviewer are extended to the theory reported and the need for clarification of the examples and may include suggestions of advanced or recent reading on the subject.
Rejected with Minor Revisions	The answer does not really fully show an understanding of how functional contextualism is applied to the context outlined in the question. There may be some material that is relevant but overall the candidate's understanding of functional contextualism shows some important misunderstandings or gaps in knowledge. The understanding of functional contextualism as a position might be sufficient to achieve a Accepted with Guidance, but the application is flawed, or unclear. The pragmatic nature of functional contextualism is missed and the answer uses ontological assumptions to provide an answer to the question. The answer may show some

	understanding of functional contextualism, but the answer does not really engage with the context outlined in the question (i.e. the applicant has written what they know about functional contextualism, or the reflective part is not linked to the philosophical position of FC). Citation of scientific material is reported incorrectly for the most part. The corrections of the reviewer are extended to the theory reported and the need for clarification of the examples and may include suggestions of basic text reading on basic science.
Rejected with Major Revisions	The answer reveals a lack of knowledge of functional contextualism and how it informs or underpins the work of an ACT trainer. There are gaps and misunderstandings in knowledge of functional contextualism, there is no attempt to use concepts drawn from functional contextualism to address the context described in the question. The answer is superficial or implausible and shows errors in both understanding and application of functional contextualism. The answer suggests that the applicant does not really know how ACT training, supervision, coaching or therapy is related to functional contextualism. Citation of scientific material is missing. The corrections of the reviewer are extended to the theory reported and the need for clarification of the examples and may include suggestions of basic text reading on basic ACT text as well as basic science papers.